

3rd ITU INTER-REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON WRC-15 PREPARATION
1 SEPTEMBER 2015
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 is being provided in an unedited 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.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to Geneva and to the third ITU interregional workshop on WRC-15 preparation. We are very happy to have you all here and we will start with opening remarks from the ITU Secretary-General Mr. Houlin Zhao.

>> HOULIN ZHAO: I start immediately? So Excellencies, distinguished Chairmen of the regional groups and organizations, Ladies and Gentlemen, dear colleagues. Good morning. It is my great pleasure to welcome to you this third and the last ITU interregional workshop WRC-15 preparations.

I'm doing it also on behalf of the director of our Radiocommunication Bureau your dear friend Mr. Francois Rancy who unfortunately cannot be with us today. He has requested me to convey to you his warmest regards and best wishes for successful event.

Very good feedback and appreciation received after the first and second workshops, successfully organized in 2013 and last year, 2014 has shown how important all the opportunities are to meet formally and informally, exchange of views, providing information and explanation for a better understanding of the difficult issues and the World Radiocommunication Conference 2015 agenda. This third workshop is one those last opportunities, of course, from ITU headquarters, you might have another opportunities in the regional preparation, coordinations.

And I'm very pleased to see all of you here present today and ready to further contribute to the preparatory process towards radio assembly 2015 and WRC-2015.

After the successful achievement of the second session of CPM 2015 March, April this year with approval and publication and due time of the CPM report in the six official languages of the union we can now focus more directly on the final stage of the WRC-2015 preparations.

In so doing we can note with satisfaction the Consensus reached already at the CPM on a single possible method to address a number of issues on the WRC-15 agenda dealing such as for the feeder links to non-GSO systems in the MSS in the five gigahertz band. The allocation of new spectrum for the implementation of WAIC. The more efficient usage of existing frequencies for onboard communications and critical functions of ships in restricted waters.

In addition the progress made by the ITU-R studies on global flight tracking, global flight tracking for civil aviation has been reported by the BR director to WRC-15 in response to PP-14 Resolution 185. I hope that the spirit of high reactivity shown by the highest organ in the ITU to this very important

issue with also prevail at WRC-15 when it consider the possible options envisaged at this stage.

And just for your information personally I'm contacting the Director-General of EKO to see if she, this lady can join us at WRC-15 to address this very important issue I'm pretty sure she can find time to escape from her very heavy schedule after she took office this month that she will come. I should also thank the director of the BR for the preparation of his report to WRC-15 to be considered and approved in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

This report contains valuable information, in particular on the difficulties or inconsistencies encountered in the application of the radio regulations.

Dear colleagues, we have now reached an important landmark towards the WRC-15 preparation with the completion of the CPM report and final steps of the ITU-R studies for WRC-15.

I should here acknowledge all the efforts put in to the process by you our members under the very high level and competent leadership of the Chairmen of all responsible groups, Study Groups, special Committee and the CPM itself.

The importance and volume of the work carried out can be easily measured by the increase of more than 20% of the number of pages in the CPM report, I heard that it is more than 800 pages. Of course, at the council meeting we discuss to reduce the paper, not to increase the paper. But here we see 20% of increase of pages of the report.

But of those pages I think you cannot cut them. I think it is all contains very valuable output and agreement reached so far and provide a very good, very solid base for our preparations for WRC-15. So compared to the last output of WRC-12, so this is 20% increase of pages. As well as by the thousands, again pages, thousands of pages approved and published in the many new or revised ITU-R recommendations and reports. Good thing is we do not print those pages. We published electronically online. So I think I was -- I was told that after CPM we printed very few hard copies to offer to those who really want it. Without all those efforts during the last three and a half years we would have not been able to carry out successfully the ITU-R preparatory study for WRC-15 and provide the ITU Member States with the necessary information to well address the complex topics on the WRC-15 agenda and prepare their proposals and common proposals to the conference.

On your side and to facilitate to the review analysis and study of the thousands proposals expected prior to and during WRC-15 the Secretariat has developed and made available new tools on the Web. We encourage to continue the use of these tools with in particular the conference proposal interface for the preparation and submission of the proposals.

Dear friends we are here today to continue the implementation of Resolution 72, WRC-07 and to the trend toward increasing the number of common and coordinated proposals, which should guarantee the same level of achievement at WRC-15 than at WRC-12.

This process which highlights the great spirit of international cooperation that marks the ITU tradition of Consensus building, has proved to be more and more successful within and between the various regional groups for many WRCs now. So let's continue this good practice.

I am pleased to see that the six main regional groups, APT, ASMG, ATU, CEPT CITELE and RCC and several Member States are well represented today at this workshop and this shows the increasing importance the ITU membership gives to the role of the WRC process, to improve the regulatory procedures and to provide frequency and orbit resources for new technologies and the technical framework for the operation of services.

I am confident that this high level participation at our workshop during the coming three days will enable a successful exchange of information for the benefit of all of us, this should facilitate the clear understanding of the methods in the CPM report and of the advanced common positions and proposals to WRC-15 as well as of the BR director's report. Be sure that the staff of the bureau present at this workshop will also be pleased to provide any information you might need about the different topics on the WRC-15 agenda.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to remind also that the informal group of representatives of the

regional groups for the preparation of the WRC-15 and the radio assembly 15 that met alongside the CPM early this year agreed to draft a structure for WRC-15 and are supporting the candidacy of Mr. Festus Daudu from Nigeria as WRC-15 Chairman. And to that Mr. Akira Hashimoto from Japan as radio assembly 2015 Chairman.

This will greatly assist in the efficient preparation of these two major events. I was really pleased with this agreement by our members, although still informally, but this is the first time in our history that we agreed at the very early stage of candidacy of Chairman of WRC and radio assembly. So I'm also very pleased to see the candidate for the Chairmen already took some efforts to participate at regional consultation meetings with some members and their efforts will help us to run our radio assembly and WRC very smoothly. So I encourage you to offer your best support to them and cooperation with them.

I will close my remarks by wishing you bon courage with assurance that all ITU staff will assist you in every way possible during this meeting. May I also offer my very best wishes for an enjoyable stay in Geneva and successful meeting. But unfortunately I will not be able to stay with you all these three days. I have to leave Geneva this afternoon. So I wish you all best time in Geneva and successful workshop. Thank you.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you Mr. Secretary-General and Mr. Houlin Zhao will have to leave us now because he has other engagement but we will keep him informed about the progress we make in these three days. Thank you for being with us for the opening.

>> HOULIN ZHAO: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So we will continue with the agenda and the first thing we have this morning is the presentation of the director's report to the WRC-15 which I will have the pleasure to briefly introduce on behalf of Mr. Rancy. So as you know the report on the activities of the Radiocommunication Sector since the last World Radiocommunication Conference is submitted to WRC-15 pursuant to the provisions of CV180 and item 9 of the agenda of the conference. This report is available on the website of the conference as document 4.

To facilitate the consideration of the variety of subjects dealt with in this report it is structured in various parts and each part is presented in a separate Addendum as it is indicated in the summary table that you can see on the screen. Part I of the report deals with the activities of the communication sector since WRC-12. It is structured along with the four main activities of the sector which are to establish and update the radiofrequency spectrum and satellite orbits which is section 1 of the Addendum 1 and to implement and apply international regulations on the use of radiofrequency spectrum as satellite orbit which are sections 2 and 3. To establish and update worldwide recommendations, reports and handbooks for the most efficient use of radiofrequency spectrum and satellite orbits which are sections 4 and 5 of this Addendum, and to inform and assist the ITU-R membership in radiocommunication matters which are sections 6, 7 and 8.

It is worth noting that section 4 includes an overview of the Study Group activities since the last Radio Assembly and outlines the response by the Study Groups to the decisions of RA-12, highlights the conference preparatory activities for WRC-15 and provides an overview of the support provided by the Bureau for this work.

Part 2 of the report summarizes the experience of the Radiocommunication Bureau in administering the radio regulations including the difficulties and inconsistencies encountered in the application of the relevant provisions. It should be noted that some of the issues reflected in this part of the report are explicitly on the agenda of WRC-15. Part 3 reports on the activities of the radio regulations board between WRC-12 and WRC-15. It includes the results of the board's work specifically regarding the review of the rules of procedure, the decisions of the Bureau, cases of harmful interference and of alleged contravention or nonobservance of radio regulations.

Section 8 includes opinions that may benefit from consideration of the WRC-15. Recording the report of the RRB to WRC-15 on Resolution 80 according to the decision of the WRC-07, it is presented

in a separate document to the WRC-15 which is document 14.

Part 4 or Addendum 4 summarizes the information related to the management and evolution of the Maritime mobile service identities number and resource since WRC-12 as instructed by Resolution 344. Part 5 reports on changes in the allocation of call signs between the end of the WRC-12 and July 2015 according to the provisions of number 1933 of the radio regulations. And part 6 reports on the implementation of Resolution 547 more specifically on the updating of the remarks' columns in the tables of Article 9A of Appendix 38 and Article 11 of Appendix 30 of the radio regulations.

Finally as you all know the ITU 2014 Plenipotentiary conference adopted Resolution 185, Busan 2014 on global flight tracking for civil aviation, which resolves to instruct WRC-15 pursuant to 119 of the ITU Convention to include in its agenda as a matter of urgency the consideration of global flight tracking, proving if appropriate various aspects of matter taking in to account ITU-R studies.

Resolution 185 instructs the director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to prepare a specific report on the matter for consideration by WRC-15. Therefore as instructed by this Resolution the report has been prepared and submitted to the conference as WRC-15 document 5.

This was just a brief overview of the director's report to the WRC-15. As it was the case in previous conferences we are double- checking the report to detect possible errors or omissions as well as collecting comments from our members which will be part of our revised version of the report to be posted towards the end of this month.

As you have noticed in the workshop agenda we don't have enough time to discuss the details of this report during the workshop itself as most of the time available has been devoted to share the regional positions and various agenda items of the conference. However, if you have questions regarding specific issues contained in the report you may wish to address the concerned BR chief of the department online. They are all here with us today and we wanted to have them on the podium for you to identify them and be able to contact them. We have Mr. Mendez from the terrestrial services department and Mr. Henry from the space services department. On my left hand Mr. Landry from the Study Group department and we all know Mr. Aubineau, who you can contact regarding the specifics for the presentation of proposals to the conference and other related aspects. All of us are here as well as the other colleagues from the BR department to provide support and clarify any doubts that you might have.

Having said that we would break for a short while in order to have all the regional coordinators come to the podium who are the real actors in this workshop. And we will have with them a brief presentation on their regional positions on the various agenda items of the conference. So we'll break for 20 minutes. And so see you at 10:20. Thank you.

(Break).

>> CHAIR: Welcome back. So in this second part of the session we will have presentations of the coordinations of the -- coordinators of the various regional groups on the stages of their preparation of the WRC-15. And then we will have a presentation by the BR on the overall preparation of the conference.

So we will start with the regions and we will do it by alphabetical order. So we will start with APT and we have the pleasure of having Mr. Alan Jamieson who is the Chairman of APT to brief us on the status of the preparation from the APT side. Dr. Alan Jamieson.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good morning, to you and to everyone. It is certainly a pleasure to be here and to speak to you about the preparations that the APT as one of the regional groups have reached in terms of their preparations for the WRC. I would like to start with an outline of the structure of the APT preparatory group. And we commenced our work in September of 2012 when we held the first meeting of the APT preparatory group for WRC-15.

The group is currently Chaired by myself and I'm supported in that by two Vice-Chairs, Mr. Kavouss Arasteh from Iran and Dr. KJ Ri from Korea and we have Mr. John Lewis. The over all structure of the APT was based on the CPM chapter structure. So we had six working parties and essentially the agenda

items for WRC-15 were divided up and in accordance with the CPM structure among those six working parties.

At this point I should make the observation that the APG is also responsible for preparations for the Radiocommunication Assembly and we treat the considerations and discussions and concerns regarding the preparation for the RA as a special ad hoc task of the APG. So that lies somewhat outside our working party structure. The first two meetings of the APG were quite preliminary. The first meeting is largely organizational. The second meeting is to come to terms with our understanding of what the agenda items are about and what the status of the studies of the ITU-R and the Study Groups, how they are progressing. And what the expectations are for those meetings to deliver. By the time of the third meeting we are starting to get to a position where preliminary views are emerging and we do our best to start to document those. At that stage there are still many differences and they are reported and documented so that they can be carried forward to the next meeting.

The fourth meeting which was held in February of this year, the views of the APT country are starting to reach a degree of maturity. Clearly that meeting was quite close to the CPM and yes, indeed it did have an objective of preparing any APT inputs for the CPM as well as progressing the APT preliminary views on the WRC agenda items. We have recently concluded our fifth meeting in the last week of July in Seoul, in Korea. At that meeting we did develop views that we had on common positions for both the RA and the WRC.

Under our working methods we call our preliminary views for the conference preliminary APT common proposals, PACPs. And so it was very important that we finalize those at that meeting because that was our last opportunity to formulate proposals for the conference. Similarly for the RA typically we do not have many contributions or inputs to the RA. When there are issues of significance for APT members they generally come from the members directly. But in some cases there is a need for an APT common view on a proposal for the RA.

And for the RA this year we do indeed have a common proposal on one item. So the major focus of our fifth meeting was on the preparation of the PACPs. The next stage of the process concerns the circulation of those preliminary proposals to our members to request their support or opposition to those PACPs. Essentially to vote on them whether they are in favor or whether they oppose a particular PACP.

The voting criteria that we apply is shown on this -- if we could have the next slide, please, on the bottom of this slide. If the PACP is to become an APT common proposal it needs to be supported by at least 25% of the APT members. That's the administrations of the APT. We currently have 38 members of the APT. So essentially we would be looking for ten members to support a PACP to turn it in to an APT, the approval process and that you will recall that members can vote either in favor or to oppose a proposal. And for it to remain as an ACP it has to be supported by at least ten members but not opposed by 50% or more of the number of members who support the proposal.

So if there were ten members in support and five members voted against it, then it would not become an ACP, even though that would mean that it would be a large number of members which are abstaining.

Similarly if there were let's say 12 members supporting and if there were six or more members opposing then that would not become an accepted APT common proposal. So in summary we have reached essentially the end of the APT preparatory process stage 1 with the preliminary APT common proposals have now been drafted and prepared. They have been circulated. The close-off date for the administrations to vote on those proposals is the 18th of September. And quite soon following that then the results of the voting will be circulated to APT members and we will know the position on which of our preliminary positions have been turned in to APT common proposals.

There is essentially a third stage to our process and that concerns our coordination meetings which we will hold during the RA for RA matters and also during the WRC for obviously issues which come up during the conference and if there is a need to develop or change our positions on the basis of events

that occur at the conference. And those will be taken under consultation and advisement at our coordination meetings during the conference. That is a very brief summary is the position of the APT in terms of its preparatory work at this point. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So the idea as you have seen is to have the overall status of preparation of the various regional groups. We will get in to the details of each position and each agenda item in the following sessions during the week. So it is just an overall let's say report on the status of preparations. So thank you very much Dr. Alan Jamieson. We will go now to ASMG and we will have Tariq Al Awadhi who is the Chairman of ASMG to report on the status of the region. Tariq you have the floor.

>> TARIQ AL AWADHI: Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. First of all, I would like to thank ITU for organizing this ITU interregional workshop on WRC-15 preparation.

As you may be aware that last week the ASMG has conducted their final preparation meeting for WRC-2015 in Morocco and we come up end of meeting with number of proposals.

Next slide, so I will give here a brief about the structure of ASMG, the mechanism, work of ASMG and then later position for WRC agenda item as we agreed that will be given later on by each representative later on.

Next one, yeah. The ASMG group being established in 2001 by a decree from Arab ministerial council for ICT under the Arab league and their main role is to make the preparation for WRC and all other regional related to Radiocommunication Sector. So this is the main role of ASMG as been given by Arab ministerial council for ICT. The next slide. The structure of the management team of ASMG right now is Chairing by myself Tariq Al Awadhi and we have six Vice-Chairmen. Dr. Azul from Egypt and from Morocco, and from Salta and from Sudar and from Lebanon and from Algeria. So these are Vice-Chairmen of this cycle of ASMG team.

One of the things that we have developed in this cycle of ASMG WRC 2012 is to develop different Working Group and assign each Working Group number of agenda items that they can work on it, prepare everything and submit it to the Steering Committee or to the Plenary session of the ASMG. So we had developed five Working Groups as you can see Working Group 1 which is mobile broadband services, working group 2, science services, Working Group 3 terrestrial navigation and Working Group 4, space, satellite services, and Working Group 5 which is general issues.

So those Working Groups doing the necessary preparation developing Plenary position for ASMG and if there would be any contribution to be prepared for during the cycle to the Working Group or Study Group ITU, then submitted to the Plenary of ASMG group in order to approve it and send it.

The responsibilities as we say it about those Working Groups is to develop follow-ups, make studies, take technical analyses and submit proposals of WRC agenda. The next one. Now this is the important for the ASMG preparation for WRC-2015 and after the cycle of 2012 we have developed a number of Working Groups, elected new management team and we give each one of them -- each Working Group what to do during this cycle. The next slide. Yeah. Now this is the most important slide for all of you that how we prepare Arab common proposal. And we have made decision that if there will be nine countries supporting any position then it will become as Arab common proposal and this is what we have done during last week meeting.

Previously before 2012 there was also one condition that if there be no more than three countries opposing then there will be an Arab common proposal. If three countries or more there will be no common proposal. This condition we have removed it. Nine countries to support the position some that will be become Arab common proposal. Based on this -- on the decisions that we made after 2012, we work on that one and last week we have gone through all agenda items based on position from each countries. We come up with number of Arab common proposal for all agenda items that supporting by nine countries or more.

The last week meeting we had only 15 countries attended, seven countries was not available. So still now we are coordinating with those seven countries. However for all agenda items now we have Arab

common proposal which will be ready to be submitted to ITU for WRC-2015 in two weeks. All documents sent to ITU. It does not mean that we don't have different views on different agenda items. You will see it in WRC-15. There will be a number of agenda items we have different views than Arab common proposal from different countries. And we have agreed to mention those as multi country contributions.

We will say the names. It is number of agenda items and only number of countries who are supporting that position against the position of Arab common proposal.

So this is related to WRC-2015. Similarly we have made preparation for Radiocommunication Assembly and we have number of contributions to Radiocommunication Assembly modifying some Resolution and supporting some recommendation that has been conducted during the study cycles.

So Mr. Chairman this is a brief of ASMG and general positions and, of course, later sessions we will give you detailed position on each agenda item. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Tariq. So we follow with ATU and for that we have Mr. Kezias Mwale who will present the status of the preparations on behalf of Mr. Sumalia who is the Secretary-General of the African Telecommunication Union. You have the floor.

>> KEZIAS MWALE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I'm doing this on behalf of Mr. Sumalia who would have loved to be here personally, but we have had a big clash with an African union meeting for Ministers responsible for ICTs. They are meeting during this same week in Adsabaa. So what I will try to do is walk you through document 6 to this workshop. So I go straight to paragraph 1 of section 1 which is the preparations themselves. After that I will go to the outcomes of the preparations, then give you a -- what we think would be the expected impact and then outline the next steps.

So in paragraph 1, what we are saying is we commenced the preparations for WRC-15 in what we think was a good time because we started the process three months after WRC-12 and this was via the first African preparatory meeting for WRC-15 called AP 151 in Dakatar March 2015. The outcomes of that meeting were that we agreed on the plan for WRC-15 preparations. We also appointed the chapter coordinators. So based on the outcome of CPM-15.1 we created a disparities and grouped the agenda items and asked and appointed the chapter coordinators to oversee the work in those areas.

Crucially we also have noted the African spectrum Working Group, because we didn't have by that time a Study Group within the ATU.

Related to agenda 1.2 we established a work plan for the general frequency plan modification and coordination in view of the second digital dividend. In paragraph 2, what we are saying is simply to cite the subsequent meetings that followed. So APM 15.2, January 2015 APM 2, January this same year APM 3 and then finally the big one, the fourth and final which was held in Nairobi, Kenya from 20th, 23rd July. We make a remark on APM 15.4, saying that it attracted the highest number of countries and Delegation of 300 plus. The region also convened two OFSOG meetings. These meetings were mainly dedicated to the technical studies under 1.2. So through that platform the region managed to put in input papers towards the wake of the GTG and the 1.2.

Not related to WRC-15 but we also report the that OFSOG managed to sort of start studies for introduction of digital sign broadcasting and optimization of Geneva 8.4 in Africa but related to WRC-15 OFSOG conducted studies assessing current the future use and invite you to take a look. We also attempted to sort of assess IMT spectrum requirements, this didn't go well because it would appear that the countries misunderstood the questionnaire or rather maybe the questionnaire was not properly crafted. But never mind. What we also did Mr. Chairman is we participated quite actively in our view in your wake here at ITU. So from CPM-15.1 and CPM-15.2 the GTG and the various study groups.

So in section 2 we give you the outcome of the process that we've outlined. So we have reached Consensus on 64 out of the 82 total issues for WRC-15. That represents a percentage of about 80%. And considering the fact that we have 54 African states, five subregions, various expressions, different levels of development, we believe, Mr. Chairman, that that 80% represents a good mark. By the way

see the distinction. We are very happy that we managed to agree on those majority of the issues. I also point out here that we've agreed to common input to RA-15 regarding the issue of out of band emission under 1.2. In there you will see at least 36 countries signing that common input to alongside other countries from the other regions.

And we are grateful for that. Now you may be asking what happens to the other 18 issues that are still open. So for those open issues what was agreed was that the subregions will continue to progress them in their subregional meetings. And that should there be any development we will be able to agree either via correspondence or when we come here. Mr. Chairman, I know that the subsequent sessions will treat the depth and the length of what has been agreed so far as common positions in various subregions but what we believe here is that we give you the very highlights of what those 80% agreed common positions entail. So No. 1 they entail a fair balanced approach towards spectrum use and planned use for the UHF spectrum. Lower age than 694 between IMT in the UHF. Also they entail a proposal to earmark portions of the L-Band for IMT. They entail preservation of the core C-band. Here I have to stress we are not talking about the extended C-band. 3.6 to 4.2 the region believes this should remain for satellite service.

No. 4, the channel plan and out of band emission 1.2. The region looks forward to implementing the second digital emission immediately after WRC-15. To craft a plan a band emission that leverages the current existing user equipment for the 700 megahertz band.

That 80% Mr. Chairman also reflects an inspiration to add more spectrum for F (inaudible) and satellite service. This is in order to have a better image for data collection for climate change and all this in order to perhaps we can have more focused and more informed and better informed climate mitigation measures.

We also agreed to the work agenda. We also agreed to the primary allocation for the radio location service in the 77 gig. We also agreed on the improvements to ITU satellite resource use. Something subject to rather in particular focused on our region. So in the 3.4, 4.2, what we agreed was that these should continue to be protected wherever possible and to ask for heightened caution when coordinating them. No. 10 is retention of Resolution 80. We believe the elements there are quite relevant and still valid in the future. For the global flight tracking we fully support the thrust and the principle of the matter. However we could not progress on the actual technicalities but we believe the kickoff of the conference the region will be able to bring something also related to the technical aspects.

By then at the end of the day when all those -- hopefully when all these 11 issues are sort of also endorsed at the WRC, what do we mean? What we mean is to have a balanced development for radiocommunications and sense ICTs in Africa. So we should not progress on mobile forgetting satellite. We should not progress only on satellite forgetting amateur and Maritime but to have a balanced approach. All this is meant for continued socioeconomic development. The next steps are like I highlighted after the fourth and final regional meeting, the subregions have met, some are yet to meet in order to try and progress on those 18 open issues.

Perhaps that is something that I need to stress. Lastly, I simply want to be very clear here and to thank all the other regional organizations. So the CEPT, the CITELE and APT and the ASMG and for the technical collaborations and particularly on the proposed structure for the WRC and also the informal agreement on the candidature of Nigeria, in particular Festus Daudu. We are very thankful to the industry. All of them the satellite, mobile the amateur, Maritime every one of them for having journeyed with us in the preparatory process. Thank you and thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comprehensive report. Next is CEPT and we have with us Mr. Alexander Kuhn who is the Chairman of CPG. Alexander you have the floor.

>> ALEXANDER KUHN: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman and good everyone. I am coming from Germany and I am leading the CPG 15 preparatory group since 2013. We have held seven meetings and starting in April 2012. Our Chairman was Mr. Steve Mond from the UK who unfortunately passed away in the year 2013. So I was elected by the members of the CEPT in the year 2013. I have

been supported with management time by two Vice-Chairmen and one position is still vacant in this year. One is present tomorrow again. And that's Golf Ossinger from the Netherlands. The conference preparatory group is responsible for preparing the WRC and the Radiocommunication Assembly and bring forward there the proposals and also common views during the conference and coordination during the conferences in both conferences. We are supported there and we divided up the work in four project teams which do all the preparatory studies and preparing the relevant output documents. These project teams are led by several Chairmen, Mr. Martin Fenton and Victor from France and Russian Federation and Mr. Ossinger and from France. We have a little bit changed the order from the CPM chapter, strategy to something along the lines where we believe that the ITU Study Groups meetings could be better reflected by our project team sessions. So this is the reason for having this kind of point. Having the next slide, please. Our deliverables for WRC-15 and RA-15 are first of all, European common proposals and we have general guidelines rules coming to that ones. We will vote, we have reached the staff of a draft ECP of the final meeting of the CPG to come to an ECP with support of at least ten CEPT administrations out of the 48 and have not more opposition than six. After having this stage cosignature period will occur and has already occur for the first September of CEPT and we have another document regarding the agenda items which is CEPT briefs. There is some more detailed CEPT position going forward than is agreed by Consensus at each stage. At project team level and also at the CEPT level. We have coordination meetings at all ITU-R meetings mainly coming up for RA-15 and WRC-15. So we have constantly a dialogue between the regional organizations and the reflection of the discussions and negotiations during the conferences there as well. The coordination could take place in two levels. The first level is only between the coordinators, between the regional organizations and we have then a head of Delegation coordination meeting I guess there will be two or three times during each week of the WRC and maybe two times at the RA week. Next slide please our seventh meeting we held in Portugal in June agreed already on the final adoption of the first set of European common proposals and these are on the agenda items 111, 112, 971 -- you see everything also with the information on the different project teams. So from PTA this has already been an outstanding issue and then from PTB satellite part we have agreed on 17, 911, 912 and 110 and several issues and 911, 912. Found agreement on some subjects of the PTC. So on the aeronautical and Maritime and also regarding the WAIC issue and finally with regards to the Mobile Broadband issues we agreed on ECPs coming up in several subparts except one band, that's 2.7, 2.9 gigahertz and we found agreement, except for issue of protection of aeronautical and Maritime. All details will be given in the course of this interregional workshop and by the relevant CEPT coordinator. All these European common proposals were sent out for signature by the CEPT administrations and we received huge support of them. So we have at least 28 countries supporting the single ECP up to 39. And all contributions have already been presented to the WRC-15 S contributions using the conference proposal interface. Next slide, please and then we are coming to the different agenda items. Just to highlight here in the top right corner you will find the indication of the CEPT coordinator. It is Mr. Pasi. You can contact him for further details. Coordinators will form our coordination team during the conference and between the action between the different regional organizations in the last meetings here. My appreciations to all the regional organizations for their very intensive exchange of views which we had during the last three and a half years already, also to the ITU for providing us the community to come to this interregional workshops and present our views and go forward also with some other views and take them in to account during our preparational activity.

And finally I would like to highlight some issues regarding the RA. We are fully supportive on a rev process regarding the Resolutions and recommendation and we are working on recommendation for out of band limits and also very keen to bring forward the ITU structure in a way that we believe that we have then a common understanding and the way forward with a study period coming up to WRC-19 which we are able to continue in the way that we have done for WRC-15 already and we will see some proposals regarding ITU-R Resolution 1 which contains the working method and we will have updates

with regard to the special Committee where we believe that we will have exchange of views during the course of this meeting. Thank you very much and with this Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the floor back to you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Alexander for your clear report. Next is CITELE and we have Mr. Carmelo Rivera who is the Vice-Chairman of WRC-15 preparations. Mr. Carmelo Rivera please.

>> CARMELO RIVERA: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. As you mentioned my name is Carmelo Rivera Vice-Chairman for the WRC Working Group CITELE. CITELE started meeting immediately after the WRC-12. We have had two meetings per year since then. Our last meeting was in Ottawa just a couple of weeks ago. The Chairman of the WRC Working Group within PCC 2, which is a Permanent Consultative Committee under CITELE is Mr. Hector Budi who could not be here with us this week. My count we have approved at the meeting a couple of weeks ago at least 121 inter-American proposals that will be sent to the WRC. Our WRC Working Group structure was formed at one of our first meetings and we tried to stay with the CPM structure as much as possible but, of course, we had a few differences. As you can see here we have kept most of them together and a slight different from the rest of the regions I see. You will also see the coordinator for each one of the chapters that we had formed. And these will be the primary points of contact for the chapter but we also have Rapporteurs for each one of the agenda items under the WRC.

And that list can be -- will be provided to all the regions before the WRC.

The way we work our system is we start out with preliminary views from each administration. We go on then to what we call a preliminary proposal which is a proposal brought in by a Member State but not supported by any others at the time. When a proposal is supported by another administration it becomes a draft inter-American proposal.

When it is supported by at least 6 Member States but not opposed by at least 50% of the members supporting, it will become an inter-American proposal when discussions have ended on that proposal.

As I mentioned we have 121 coming forward. That doesn't include any addition, modifications, suppressions and so on. Right now we have one draft inter-American proposal that is being distributed to the Member States. They have until the end of this week to indicate their support to elevate that to an inter-American proposal.

As you can see we have IPs adopted on all agenda items except for a few that are mentioned here at the slide. As the Chairman mentioned we will continue discussion on all of these agenda items during this week. I want to thank the ITU for giving us this opportunity to exchange information. And the other regions for their coordination and assistance in forming our proposals also. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr. Carmelo Rivera for this clear presentation. So last but not least is the RCC and we have Mr. Albert Nalbandian who is the Chairman of WRC-15 Working Group. Albert you have the floor.

>> ALBERT NALBANDIAN: Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Chairman. Colleagues, at outset I would like to join others in our positive appreciation of the Bureau which constantly carries out preparatory work for the conference. It is not the first cycle. We have been meeting one another regularly and discussing various aspects of preparation for the conference.

Now also would like to say in this connection is that we say that the key to a successful conference is good preparation. And all of the elements of good preparation pertain to operations within a region coordination between regions and then the next stage is that the conference and that is compromise on adopting decisions by Consensus and we have three meetings and they correspond to each one of these elements, these stages. Before turning to the specific work done in the RCC I would like to draw your attention to the special nature of the conference.

The agenda of the conference including the conference in 2015 covers a number of issues, questions both on spectrum and bands. We are almost looking at the entire spectrum and also with regard to majority of cases of radio telecommunications rather and their applications.

I would like to once again highlight that in connection with the problem of flight 370 the ITU has responded swiftly to the situation by including on the agenda an agenda item with regard to the relevant Resolution and this is going to be considered by WRC in 2015. The next point I would like to know is that the decisions of the conference, the last conference I mean, touch on the interest of almost all humanity both of administrations and of commercial organizations.

And also ordinary users who have been able to use all the advantages of ICT in recent years. Now let us return to the actions of and activities of the administrations of RCC. Not only in the RCC but also in other areas, too, we have a lot of in common. Work on preparing for the WRC actually began during the WRC-12. Like other regional organizations we have a structure, and we have a coherent process for considering proposals. We have an institution that is coordinators and we do not follow the CPM structure. We follow the agenda.

The agenda of the WRC-15 is the basis for us. So for each agenda item we have our relevant coordinator who working on the results of research taken out -- undertaken within the region and also based on what is happening in the ITU-R prepares proposals firstly we prepare a position. And a positional document for the RCC. So since 2013 we have had this document on the RCC website. So we have been consistent in our position and our work has always been accessible to those who are interested in finding out more about it.

Then the Working Groups, the Chair of the work -- the Working Group, the Chair which is me held seven meetings. One of those was before the radio -- sorry, since 2012 and the next meeting will be in September from 7th to the 10th of September.

And the 10th of September they will be closing a ceremony in which we will have interpretation in to English. So all of those who would like to participate in to meeting will be able to and the aim of these meetings is to conclude work on common proposals. At the moment we have about half of the agenda items have been turned in to a common proposals at all levels and they have been sent in to the ITU. I'm not going to go in to the specific detail. But these will be considered at further meetings and I'd like to draw your attention to one thing. These unfinished proposals that we have include such agenda items, agenda item 7. We all understand that from a satellite Point of View it is a very important agenda item. It covers procedures in this area. And this list covers issues of GFT, and also problems, issues rather on which we help assisting the director in preparing a report from the conference in 2015. But there are general issues here and we haven't finished working on them yet. Some are still outstanding.

In conclusion I would like to underline that when the Working Group began its work we had general principles which were drawn up. These pertain to any agenda item and this is what you can see on the screen now. And these mean first and foremost equal -- equitable access to orbit resources, compatibility between radio services and providing regulatory and technical provisions for the development of new technologies.

As part of such an approach we, of course, must strike a balance between existing systems and this is particularly important we need to take in to account the different technological and economic opportunities available to different administrations.

Regional members and so on. Now as regards this issue, well, in preparation of WRC we have institutions who work on preparation of the WRC. We have the Study Groups, for example. We have CPM. And we have many fora working on international level to prepare for the conference. We have the RAG, too, the Radio Advisory Group and we also have other areas, too. And this -- in this -- in these areas the RCC participates actively. What I would like to say is the fundamental Resolution that we are working on is Resolution No. 1 of the ITU-R.

In its time a group was created which worked by correspondence, a representative from France who worked on this. And it was very successful. And I think taking in to account the opinion of all the participants the assembly took the right corresponding decision. Once again I'd like to say that we all need to prepare to make compromises and we will have to make the compromises at the conference and we need to be sure that the decisions that we take are for the benefit of all mankind. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Albert. We have heard from the six coordinators. We are also very supportive of this process of regional preparations for the conference. It has shown over the past conferences that it is very efficient way of preparing for the conference, not only the discussions within the regions but also among regions as you have correctly represented and we see all these processes very positive and helping towards a more efficient conference. Also this type of interregional workshops in order to gather everyone and even more so the countries that don't belong to a specific regional group as well as highlighted during the last council meeting is taken care of and also a part of this process.

So having said that as we have some time before going to the presentation of the BR on the world preparation of the conference I might open the floor for some questions or comments to the coordinators on their presentations if there are any. So I don't see any. So we will be able to go more in to the specifics of this agenda item. Let me pass the floor to Philippe Aubineau who will present us a status of the overall ITU preparations for both the assembly and the conference 2015. Philippe.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you very much, Mario for this introduction. So I will try to provide you this morning some further information for the preparation of RA-15 and WRC-15, a view from the ITU. I will start by reminding us one of the main objectives of these workshops is to try to come to more and more common proposals to the WRC-15 and that should facilitate as it was proven in the past the work of the WRC towards more Consensus at it. So we have as you can see on this screen we have received already a number of input documents from the regional groups, No.s 7, 8 and 9. Not all the common proposals have been submitted from the groups as you understood from the previous presentations this morning but we understand that the work is progressing well and everything should be submitted well on time for us to finalize these documents and upload them on the Web page of the conference.

And we are also -- and then the understanding that the common proposals from the other three groups will come very shortly and also available on time prior to WRC-15. You could see on the other part of this slide that there is a number of other input documents to the WRC. You have heard this morning that document 4 and 5 from the BR director are already available and document 4 as Mario explained has a number of addenda. Another document important for the work of WRC-15 is for information which is document 3. It is available. And what will come next in terms of report to WRC will be the RA report to WRC but that would be able only during the first week of the WRC, of course, after the RA-15 and we also expect to receive a number of multi country proposals that are not mentioned here. You have heard them mentioned already this morning. As well as individual proposals from certain countries also are expected.

So on the overall I would just remind you the amount of proposals we had received to WRC-12 which exceeded 3,000 individual proposals. I do not know if we will reach this level at this stage. If we have more common proposals welcome. If we have more individual proposals that will show the difficulties we have to face during the WRC-15 but at the end of the day I am confident that we will have a good outcome of WRC-15.

A bit of summary of the CPM-15 now, just to give you some statistics and one major figure I think is the 20% increase. It was mentioned this morning in terms of number of pages in the CPM report to WRC-15 compared to WRC-12 but it is also true for the number of contributions we have received to WRC -- to CPM and also the participation at the CPM increased to CPM-15 -- sorry to CPM-11. The structure of the CPM followed basically the preliminary structure that was agreed at CPM 1 with six chapters but we have also to address the PP-14 Resolution 185 dealing with global tracking based on the contributions that we have received there was Ad Hoc Group established during CPM 2 to address this issue and also there was a preliminary draft version of the director's report that was made available for early consideration by the membership during CPM.

The CPM report was published on time in six languages and you have on a this slide the details where you can find it. There was two corrigenda issues after the CPM to address some typo graphic errors that

was identified in the report, and I will let you look at those corrigendas explicit. Structure of the CPM report is explained on this slide. The six chapters and regarding the issue of global flight tracking that was agreed to put some text on the annex 1 of the CPM report. So you could find them there some views that were expressed during the CPM without any conclusion. There was also a number of new issues identified in the agenda item 9.2, namely 921, 922 dealing with science services that were put in as a science chapter 2 and a few of the consideration regarding footnote mentioned as director's report that was also put in the last page of chapter 5. This slide gives you some very broad overview of the methods in the CPM report. What we have tried to highlight on this slide is the new elements that were added to the report compared to the draft CPM report. These are highlighted in yellow. You can see on several agenda items there was a number of additional methods added to the CPM report and also all the issues under agenda item 7 from numbers F to numbers L which were developed by the special Committee and provided in the special Committee report to the CPM. They were all agreed and included in the CPM report to WRC-15 with some adjustment based on the input contributions. What you could see also on this slide in the green parts is the items for which there was already a single method proposed or single conclusion agreed in the CPM report and we hope that those issues will be also straight forward at the coming WRC.

The other element that is included in the CPM report is a list of the ITU-R recommendations and ITU-R reports in particular but other ITU publications also that are included or referred to in the CPM report to WRC-15. Of course, this list is dated March, April this year. And since then there was several meetings of the ITU-R responsible groups as well as the ITU-R Study Groups in charge of those topics. And these -- the preliminary draft recommendation report at least for most of them were approved and therefore this updated list of ITU-R publication in support of the WRC-15 will be provided after RA-15 to WRC-15 as a part of the RA report to WRC-15. So you will see there what is available and may be considered by WRC-15. And now I would like to turn to the preparation for RA-15 by first recalling some text from the basic text of the ITU, the constitution and Convention which set up the duty at this of RA-15 as you could read from this slide. And also this is well explained in paragraph 1 of the Resolution ITU-R 1-6 which is supposed to be reviewed at RA-15 but so far the versioning force is 1.6. You can see the list of actions, issues that RA-15 should consider and the date is well-known by everyone already. For the preparation of RA-15 there was a number of actions undertaken by the RAG and also by the Chairman of the Study Groups who had to prepare activities and studies in response to a number of ITU-R Resolutions. They are all listed here on this slide. And that was -- let me say a constant effort by the ITU-R Study Group Chairmen to keep updated the RAG members on the progress of the studies on those Resolutions. ITU-R Resolutions and also some of the Study Groups have considered the future of those ITU-R Resolutions at the last meetings and some of them have also prepared some draft revision of the those ITU-R Resolutions for consideration by RA-15.

There was another part of the work within the RAG that was related to the working methods, generally speaking with the first Resolution on this topics is Resolution 1-6. There was extensive work carried out by the RAG in particular through a correspondence group, Chaired by Mr. Vale from France and this resulted in a draft revision of Resolution 1-6 which is going to be submitted to the RA-15 for further consideration and hopefully approval of this new version of the Resolution.

In that draft revision there is apart from restructuring activity of the Resolution to try to clarify the different parts of it, namely the definition but also mainly the adoption and considered for the different type of deliverables we have in ITU-R, this Resolution is trying also to address a number of unclear situation and hopefully all those will be clarified at the RA-15.

The second Resolutions that was considered among the working methods is Resolution 6-1 which relate to the collaboration with ITU-T and there also we had a group working by correspondence Chaired by Mr. Naszani and sorry if I misspelled the name and this Resolution 6-1 is trying to align the working methods between the two sectors of the ITU and also the RAG was able to come with an agreed revision that would be forwarded to RA-15 for consideration.

Apart from these two Resolutions there was also contributions sent to the RAG concerning other Resolution addressing working methods and on top of that you have a Resolution 2-6 which relates to the CPM. There was also I should point out here Resolution 38-4 which relate to the special Committee along with the two or three others that are mentioned on this slide. For those Resolutions there was no conclusion at the RAG and the RAG invited those administrations to send contributions to RA-15 for further consideration of those Resolutions there.

So you have at the bottom the address of the RAG Web page. I see that the Chairman of the RAG is with us in this meeting. So you may also contact Mr. Oban if you need further information about the RAG. Now turning to the RA-15 Web page, you could see that we have already a number of important information available on the RA-15 Web page. On the right-hand side of the screen you have in particular all the invitation letters that were sent and also that includes some additional details in particular regarding the contribution deadline of 12 October 2015. There was also the at the bottom of this list the letter concerning the appointment of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen for RA-15 which is highlighted at the bottom of this slide and we have a document for RA-15. They are in two categories. First you have the contributions, of course, from the membership and they also include a number of reports and also in particular the report from the Chairman of the special Committee and CPM as well as a report from the director of the BR. But in addition to that we have other series of documents. Up with per Study Group. They are called the series 1,000. So for each study groups and CCV four main documents in those series. 1001 is usually the Chairman's report of that particular Study Group. 1002 would be the list of questions. 1003 the recommendations of relevance for this Study Group. And 1004 will address the Resolutions that Study Group has considered and may propose action on that one. The 1000 will also include any recommendations that have been brought to the attention of the RA for further consideration.

So this is what you could find on the Web page of the RA at this stage as 1000 documents are not all published but that will come soon.

Now turning to the preparation for the WRC-15 again you have here the basic text-based on which we have to carry out the work for WRC-15 and the activity for WRC-15. So again it is a basic proposal WRC-15 is to revise the radio regulation in accordance with its agenda. We had the considered Resolution, this one preference is wrong. We will update this. This 1341. The Resolution of the 13 that 1 enforce and we also have as you understood the PP Resolution 185.

The Web page of the conference provides you already a number of information. We have also here on the right-hand side the invitation letters that were sent to the Member States and observers and also state of Palestine. And also what I would explain next is the information regarding the credentials. We have on the center of this page the access to the basic documents for the WRC-15, the contributions that we contain all the documents in by the Member States in particular to the WRC-15 as well as the number of reports and information papers that also sent to WRC-15. You have here also access directly to the proposal management system. I will say a few words about it and the other documents. There was also links to the different elements of the preparatory process starting with the CPM, the workshops as well as the original preparation with information about all the regions, main six regions. On the left-hand side you have further details about the documentation and proposals and that also some useful information regarding the preparation of proposals and as a participation and registration as well as other practical details for the participants.

So say a few words about the credentials, have listed on this slide as the basic elements that were already issued information included in ITU circular letter 18, sorry, of 2015 which was dated actually 14 April as well as document No. 2 of the WRC-15 which provides these additional details and references to the basic text of the credentials applicable to WRC. So what a credentials are very important, in particular to enable the Member States to have voting rights and also to sign the final Acts. We will see that on the next slide. But what's important to note here is that the original credentials should document be sent to the ITU sufficiently before the opening of the WRC-15 and as indicated in the letter

also it may also be provided on 1st November. But this information should be in order and the reason is mentioned on this slide. So I repeat, if the credentials are in order you will be able to do that but if they are not in order you will not be entitled to exercise right of vote or to sign the final Acts. There is another elements of the credentials mentioned in the letters which concern the transfer of powers. So this explained here as well as the proxy vote at the WRC itself which is also another possibility.

We have already issued information to participants which includes practical informations that are also available on the Web page that is listed on the top of this slide and that relates to all the items that -- and more that are listed on this slide. I invite you to look at this practical information and contact us if you need additional information also.

Now I would like to say a few words about the documents and the proposals to WRC. So first of all, the document is going to be -- the WRC sorry it is going as well as the RA by the way are going to be completely paperless and this is in line with the PP decision and to that aim we have developed a number of facilities to facilitate the analysis and study of -- and review of the proposal and documents that are sent to WRC-15. So this is actually called the proposal management system for WRC-15 and that will enable you to more easily score all the contributions containing proposals that were sent to WRC-15. To facilitate the preparation of the text that would feed this proposal management system we unfortunately have to follow a number of guidelines and templates for the documentation. And in order to facilitate this we have also developed another tool which is called the conference proposal interface, CPI, and you have also the links available here.

I would just stress that the deadline for the submission of proposals to WRC-15 is 19 October 2015 and this deadline is to ensure the availability in the six languages of proposals at the start of WRC-15 in accordance with Resolution 165 of PP-14.

What you could see on this slide also is some other tools such as the sync application which we have developed as a links is already available on the WRC-15 Web page and during the WRC-15 as well as during the RA we will use the SharePoints that those who attended the ITU-R Study Group meets are very familiar with and this SharePoint is an efficient tool we have to enable sharing documents within the drafting groups or subworking groups that are established at RA-15 and WRC-15.

Now this is the proposal management system Web page capture. So what has been done on this slide is to show you through an example how to filter a particular agenda item or particular source and then look at the particular part what we call mapping of the radio regs to see what are the proposals available already on the system for this particular filtering. So here you could see the example taken for Europe, you understood from this morning there was already a number of proposals submitted by Europe in particular on agenda 1.1 and if you filter through the system the part of the radio regs dealing with the range of frequency from 1300 to 1525 megahertz you could see the proposals available from this source.

And by clicking on the items here on the right you could either open the untied document here in a given language and next you have the other five or clicking on the next one open the specific proposal only for this -- from this source and this agenda item and so on and so forth. So this will be available for every individual proposals and you would see also through the system the number of proposals, individual proposals that have been received so far. So we hope -- this tool was available on WRC-12. There was few announcements made to it. But what is important to be able to have correct information in this tool is the quality of the input documents that we receive which facilitate the split of the proposal and the reference of those proposals through this PMS, PMS system. So to achieve this good quality of input document we have for this conference, WRC-15 developed the conference proposal interface, that conference proposal interface was already made available for PP-14 for those who were there. We have, of course, had to adjust and adapt it to the WRC-15 in particular since WRC-15 has a predetermined list of agenda items and WRC-15 has to refer to the administrative regulation which is a radio regulation in the case of WRC. We have also developed to facilitate the understanding of the tool set of guidelines for the preparation of the proposals and then the user guide that is available to explain

how the system works. So you find there on the WRC-15 the links to the CPI and the other guidelines are user guide as well. And this has also been explained in the Addendum 1, WRC-19. What are the guidelines you have here the table of contents and I would simply stress one -- two elements of the guidelines. One is for the submission of documents from the same source as you know we have predetermined list of agenda items and in order to facilitate the location of all the documents from the same source we have suggested to follow a past practice which is to have a basic document and a number of addenda following the suffix for the agenda items and the -- an example is given in annex 1 to the guidelines how to number to those addenda. Another element of the guidelines I would like to stress is in annex 2 and that relates to the usual question we were seeing about how to split the table of frequency allocation if you want to change the allocation in a particular frequency band. And so we have developed this example with three basic steps to follow it and use appropriately the track changes to show at the end what is new and what is proposed to be changed to the table.

As the user face -- the interface -- the user guide of the CPI is composed of different steps from the creation of the skeleton to the modification of the skeleton in order to include the proposals with changes that you want to send to the WRC and then the submission of those proposals to the ITU. So I will not enter the detail of this guideline here. But I really invite you to have a look and contact us in case you have any questions as we already receive several of them.

What I mention also is that available on the WRC-15 Web page is information about the regional preparation. So you heard this morning the status of preparation to WRC-15 and we have tried to keep track of all the meetings that were held as well as the future meetings. So there are still two left as you noted. And they are mentioned also on this page.

And summarized on this slide. Now turning to the informal group on WRC-15 preparation, you have heard this morning that there was good progress made already and there was in particular proposed draft WRC-15 structure that was agreed by the group and which is presented for information on this slide noting that the structure, of course, will have to be finalized at the beginning of WRC-15.

Now turning to the ITU international workshops, so you understood that there was already two workshops held in 2013 and 2014. What I would like to stress here is that we have added on the relevant Web page of the two workshops the archives of the video presentations as well as, of course, the documents for those who were not attending those two workshops and want to know more about the background information that was presented. The first workshop was oriented to the ITU-R responsible groups and the second workshop was looking at the draft CPM report and now we are here at the third and final workshop where we have on the table the CPM report and also you had this morning a brief introduction of the director's report and later on in the three days you will hear more from the regional groups to review position and common proposals. So this is a Web page of this workshop as addressed was mentioned. You received paper at registration. Also providing the preliminary draft programme. And this is also indicated on this slide. For this afternoon we will continue with first panel session to address some analytical issues, 1.5 and global flight tracking in particular as well as some issues included in chapter 3 of the CPM report. We will continue subsequently today with some Maritime issues as well as the amateur under 1.4. Later on tomorrow morning we will have a session dedicated to agenda item 1.1 that is to try to address all the candidate bands that were identified by the CPM in that session. And then we will have a second social tomorrow morning to address agenda 1.2 and 1.3 with some information on the related issue on 917. In the afternoon that would be two sessions to address the satellite allocations including 1.8 and 1.8 is not always considered as an allocation but this will be also covered in that two sessions and on the following day, day three morning that would be for the regulatory aspects of the satellite services and in the afternoon the first session will be for the so-called science issues that you could see on the screen here. And we will finish with some review of the topics that have been identified so far for agenda item 10 and towards some conclusion and closing of this workshops. So with that Mr. Chairman, I would like to close this presentation and, of course, if there is any question can be raised now during the next few minutes

we have before 12 or later. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Philippe. So I think we are all getting more and more familiar with this presentations but as you have noticed they are becoming bulkier and bulkier of the trying to condense all the information possible for you to have a reference where to find the various aspects that you may be interested in for the progression of the conference. I would like to make a comment regarding the deadline for presentation of contributions that was said on 19th of October following the Resolution that asks, two weeks before any event, any conference as a deadline. You might understand the difficulty we would have if we get a majority of the contributions by that date or on that date. So it would be very much appreciated if you can advance the submission of your contributions as much as possible so that we can process them without difficulty and that they will all be translated in to the six languages at the beginning of the conference.

We know that you are all making an effort and we appreciate that and we want to thank the regional groups that have already presented a significant amount of contributions so far. So if there are any questions now for Philippe we might take them because we have some minutes left. If not you can do that any time during the week, of course, or even after. And as I said earlier today please take advantage of your presence here to consult any of our colleagues on any substantial issue regarding the conference or any let's say administrative issue regarding the conference itself or the preparation of your contributions using the CPI preferably. So if there are no other requests for the floor, we might break now for lunch. And we will be coming back at -- yes. The representative from SES please.

>> SES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is actually an announcement for the Delegates in this room. Just at the end of this session now if this is the time for the break, there is a lunch that is being served here in front of room C. This is organized by the satellite community. You are all invited to participate. We will have a short presentation in room C at 12:30 to talk about satellite services and C-band and L-Band. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So having said that, we adjourn the meeting until 2 o'clock and have a nice lunch. Thank you.

(Session concluded at 11:52 CET)

This text is being provided in an unedited 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.

**1 September 2015.
1400 CET.**

This text is being provided in an unedited 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.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats, we will start in one minute.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the first panel session of our meeting, our workshop. Before we start, but let us please check the interpretation.

I can hear the English. Thank you. French. Spanish. Russian. Chinese. Arabic. Thank you.

So all of the interpretation channels are working. Once again, good afternoon, everyone. Let us begin our session. First, panel session, in accordance with the workshop programme is dedicated to agenda item 1.5, the agenda item on global flight tracking. If we have time, then we will also touch on the issues of preparation for agenda items 1.17 and 1.18. That is our programme for this afternoon. We are beginning with agenda item 1.5. I think I should give an introduction about this agenda item, what its background is, questions, to do with the allocation of frequencies for UAS on manned aircraft systems, which were dealt with in WRC 12, as part of the preparation for this conference, a report was prepared, 2171. It contains characteristics of unmanned aircraft systems and also, and this is important, in this case, it's defined the requirements for the frequency spectrum which was needed for the control of unmanned aircraft systems.

This report contained requirements for the systems for direct line of sight and for systems which were beyond direct line of sight, particularly these issues were addressed and resolved in WRC 2012, as we considered allocations for direct line of sight systems, but issues with pertaining to ensuring control and telecommunications with UAS beyond line of sight were included on the agenda of this conference, that is the future conference, WRC-15.

This agenda item is agenda item 1.5, resolution 153, is connected to this. It required the consideration of the possible use of links for, from the FSS, for telecommunications and control of UAS in manned aircraft systems.

When we talk about FSS, that is a fixed satellite service, we understand that this is about the allocation of SSS without the exclusion of frequency bands which are defined under 30 and 30A and 30B.

Resolution 153 looked at the possible use of FSS links for the possible control of unmanned aircraft systems.

Work on and research in this area was carried out by the ITU as mainly led by working group 5B, working party 5B during its study period, and the group is working on a report, covering studies undertaken in this area, and at the end of the day, this should contain technical and operational characteristics of such systems, systems within the fixed satellite service. And also it covers regulatory and aspects of the use of fixed satellite service links for control of unmanned aircraft systems, which are applicable to this agenda item to satisfy this agenda item.

I'd like to say that this report is currently at a preliminary stage, and at the end, this document will be sent for development into a preliminary report, so it's at a very early stage. It has not yet been completed.

However, the studies which have been accessible up to now have been included in the CPM report. Given that the CPM report could not compile a single common view on the results of these studies,

there are options which are reflecting the current situation in the final report. There are two opinions covered here, with regard to the analysis of the results of these studies.

We must recognize, of course, that these opinions are quite contradictory in certain particulars. Nevertheless, these results are included in the CPM report. And as a result of this somewhat contradictory opinions, with regard to the possible use of an FSS link, two methods for satisfying the agenda item are developed.

The first method is a method which proposes the possibility of using FSS links, fixed satellite service links, through introducing the corresponding footnote into the spectrum plan, and covering the technical and regulatory aspects of such use.

That is method A, so-called method A. It's in the CPM report. There are examples of regulatory solutions to this issue on the agenda item. Method B is a method which proposes not making any change to the radio regulations based on the fact that in accordance with the opinions of those who were studying this and proposed this method and proposed its use, say that the FSS link does not provide the necessary situation for ensuring the security and safety are observed. So at the moment, the CPM report contains two methods, and on each of these methods, the CPM report proposes a corresponding regulatory text.

As part of preparation for the conference, one of the important participants in this process is the, is ICAO, an international organisation. I would like to draw your attention to the slide, where I have included an extract from the current ICAO position, and this is available in one of the input documents that we have today. You can look at it in greater detail, because as I'd once again like to say there is only a extract here in the slide.

ICAO has set forth the conditions under which ICAO believes it will be possible to consider the use of FSS bands for the control of UAS on manned aircraft systems. In particular it's noted that if this decision is taken, then it should be limited only to specific cases, and namely cases of linked to the consideration of the use of satellite links for UAS systems. Secondly, that the radio regulations if such a decision were to be taken, these frequency bands should be clearly defined, and it should be clearly defined that these frequency bands could be used for such purposes, and there is the one line article 4.10 of the ITU regulations which recognizes the special protection of safety services, and the fact that there is a requirement for special measures for them, so they are defined as being specially protected, and this is considered in the context of UAS.

So this is ICAO's position as stated. I would like to make a short presentation now on these issues. But I will give the representative of ICAO if one is here to go into greater detail on the position which is presented in this slide.

Yes, ICAO, please. You would like to comment now. Please go ahead.

>> Thank you, Chairman. Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. Chairman, thank you, especially for presenting the three conditions of our positions. These are very very important to us. It looks like, to us, it looks like that the first option in the CPM text may in fact provide a way forward, if sufficient care is taken to incorporate what we have in those three conditions.

Some of you may remember that the original ICAO position before being revised this spring had seven conditions. The remaining four conditions that have been taken out of the main position now, they are still important to us. However, they will be taken care of through the ICAO regulatory framework. The ICAO are in the early stages of development. The technical requirements are not yet defined actually.

As a result, the ITU actions under this agenda item should be focused on providing a regulatory framework for the safe operation of UAS and EPC links in FSS bands under the ITU regulatory regulations and thus obtaining international recognition along with the basis for avoiding harmful interference.

Given that then we can take care of the rest, we believe, within the ICAO regulatory framework. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, ICAO. We will have another opportunity to exchange opinions. If there are any questions from the floor, then we can return to that later.

However, I would like to turn to the next slide at this stage and draw your attention to the information which we have received from the regional organisations, with regard to preparation for the conference. Looking at agenda item 1.5, there are already proposals which have been drawn up on methods to satisfy this agenda item. On the slide, well, I have reflected the positions with the colors green and red as to whether or not they are in favor of one or another measure.

Where the colors are not completely colored in yet, we have information that's come in, namely that the final meeting which should affirm the position of the regional organisation on particular agenda item has not been held yet, so this is a preliminary position. I would hope that we can perhaps get some clarification on this point from representatives of the regional organisations.

You can see, however, on the slide a general overview. But at the same time, based on the information that we have already heard, and based on the documents which have been submitted to this workshop, I'd like to ask the participants in these sectors to comment, perhaps in greater detail, and explain the positions of the regional organisations. And give us some kind of clarification on their positions.

With your permission, I will begin from left to right. I would like to ask Mr. Pastukh, the representative of the RCC to comment on the RCC position on this agenda item, please go ahead, sir.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman. Firstly, I'd like to say that the RCC's position on this proposal has already been determined. In April we adopted a common position of the RCC countries which in your slide is shown as red. So our position is that we would like no change, method B. This proposal was sent in to the ITU.

At the same time, we have been guided by the three main elements which facilitated the adopting of such a decision. The first one, the first element is connected to the use of the frequency bands by satellite services for UAS applications, will lead to an agreement, coordination agreements I mean, achieved by operators of fixed satellite services.

This could become irrelevant and could need to be reviewed as a result of such an application.

Moreover, the conditions for the use of frequency bands might change. The second aspect which we looked at is connected to something else, namely, that the bands of fixed satellite services are also used by earth systems, earth-based systems.

As a result of the use of unmanned aircraft, the interference for earth-based systems will be changed, there will be a difference in the interference. There is no guarantee that the conditions will improve. In fact, they might actually get worse. The third aspect which was under consideration is connected to the fact that it's the ICAO has not given us clear criteria which should be used to protect such applications.

Without knowing what the criteria are it's very difficult to conclude studies, compatibility studies. And as the Chair noted in your documents, the studies have not been completed, due to the fact that we were not able to receive these criteria, and fully correspond, meet the requirements of the studies.

These three basic elements were those which the RCC took into consideration when we expressed a favor for method B.

At the same time, the issue, question rather of the use of unmanned aircraft systems in the FSS band is something which we look at as a un, still outstanding issue. It will be quite difficult decision for the WRC to take without completed studies on this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The representative of the CITEL, please, Mr. Mike Biggs, could you state your position?

>> MIKE BIGGS: Yes, thank you, and good afternoon, everybody.

I've been told I speak American, which is not one of our official languages, but hopefully you will be able to follow me.

CITEL has an inter-American proposal. It is built along the lines of method A1, at the CITEL meeting however there were some improvements and clarifications that were done, based on conversations with CITEL administrations and with ICAO. We believe that the result is fully consistent with the ICAO

position, and the idea of separation of duties between the ITU duties to develop the regulatory framework and the ICAO duties to provide the safety of flight.

The other point I'd like to make is that we also believe that if this does not work out, there is going to be a lot of difficulty in accommodating the UAS. We just had a meeting last week, where we talked about the notional requirements for UAS links, and they are on the order of 50 kilobits from the earth to the UAS and 300 kilobits per second from the UAS to the earth. As far as I know, none of the existing AMSRS systems can accommodate that.

If the FSS is not developed as a way to control the UAS, there is going to be difficulty in figuring out an alternative.

I think I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Our next representative is representative of CEPT, Mr. Uwe Schwark, state your position, please.

>> UWE SCHWARK: Thank you very much, good afternoon, everyone. I have to say at the very beginning and we see this on the slides we have on our screens at least here, the CEPT position is not fixed yet on this particular agenda item. The work within CEPT is yet to be finalized. Study results are still controversially discussed. CEPT is of the view that the studies should obviously provide solutions, how the use of the FSS issue is in compliance with the requirements given by ICAO and how they can be implemented in the radio regulations, CEPT is of course supporting these studies in general.

Within the draft European common proposal there are currently two views, for rather generic nature. That was wrong. There are two clear views. One view is a no change and the other view is the use, the FSS. Given the fact that there is these two diverging views, the ECP, so the European view is formulated at this stage in a rather generic way, so it contains two elements. The first elements is that the CEPT supports continuing the necessary studies leading to technical regulatory and operational recommendations enabling the conference to decide on the usage of the FSS for the CMPC links for the safe operation of UAS and nonsegregated airspace. That is the first element. The second element CEPT is of the view that in the absence of information from ICAO as to their requirements and para metric approach to the studies is the best that can be achieved.

This is what is currently contained in the European common proposal. As I said, the work, the discussions within CEPT are still ongoing. There will be one meeting of the conference preparatory group in roughly two weeks from now, which is obviously the last let's say possibility to come to a common view or common solution, I would say in Europe, within CEPT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Now over to the representative of the ATU, your position, please, sir.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you very much, and good afternoon, everyone. Regarding the agenda item 1.5 of the WRC-15 conference, the African group has opted for method B, which regards no change to the radio regulations, and this method has been chosen at the time of the last preparatory work of WRC-15 which took place in Nairobi, from the 20 to 21st of July this year.

This was chosen on the basis of contributions from countries, and on the basis of contributions from the sub regions. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I would now like to invite the representative of APT to state her position.

>> ZHU KEER: I'm pleasure to be here for APT and this agenda item, that at the just completed APT last meeting in Seoul, the beginning of August, we achieved the preliminary APT common proposal with support to the method B of the CPM report, which is no change to the radio regulation. The reason is that APT members are of the view that the current ITU studies are not finished yet, and so that is APT members support no change to the radio regulation.

As explained by our APT Chairman this PACB is currently through the approval, formal approval procedure among the APT members. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Now I would like to invite Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader to introduce the position of ASMG for us. Thank you.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you very much. I would like to say this subject was addressed many times during the Arab meetings. In fact, some members have begun to use the unmanned aircraft systems in different applications. With this in mind, the Arab group has expressed some concerns regarding the clear regulations for such usage. And therefore, we have looked at the studies, looking at the links between the satellite links, have not been well-established. We would like to say there are some questions which remain in limbo regarding their usage. Therefore, the Arab group is choosing method B, which is no changes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So we have heard from the regional organisations with regard to their positions on this issue. Before that, we heard about the ICAO's position on this subject, in greater detail.

I would now like to open up the floor and ask if there are any questions for the participants in this session, or would anyone like to share with us the position of other administrations? Cuba, please.

>> CUBA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As Cuba shares many of the proposals in the regional subgroups, we think that the studies are, there are still questions which remain. Therefore, it is a theme which demands attention. There are some points to be addressed, and this is the compatibility of all the studies, because there is a fundamental point 696 and more specifically the equal access to, especially for equal access to developing countries. I don't know that this has been seen in studies but how this will affect services and fixed satellite services which is being written in some part of the links and the characteristics of the services, and the regulatory points and other fixed satellite services which have the same conditions.

I would also like to stress, if we also take into account in some of the studies the resolution which looks at fundamentally the need to adopt to ease the use of new services for other countries, which also have satellite frequencies assigned, and possibility to facilitate the use of new systems for developing countries, and protect least developed countries and such studies can be undertaken as to how it will affect the allocation and the unmanned aircraft systems on the resolution 2. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Are there any further questions or observations? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Good afternoon, colleagues. We believe that the issue is very complex. We are not dealing with a traditional agenda items. We are dealing with something that one should be very mindful what we are talking about. We are talking about that a pilot on the ground guide several unmanned aircraft in the nonsegregated airspace in which there are also manned aircraft to the signals conveyed by FSS. FSS are traditional telecommunications, means is not benefited from the number 410 of the regulations, urging administration to make every possible efforts to protect the signals, and we cannot upgrade the FSS to have that safety aspects, of safety of life aspects.

On the other hand, the satellite FSS, according to the statistics, most of them or half of them are noncoordinated. When noncoordinated, they are subject to interference. If they are subject to interference, this interference would have direct impact on the command. So you command to this direction, you go to that direction. The first things in the operation of this type of thing, the issue of sense of command will not work anymore.

And even the satellite which has been coordinated, you don't know the degree of the interference that is accepted. Moreover, nothing is there that in future the people would not cause interference to any coordinated satellite, by mispointing, mis-operation and so on, so forth.

So you are guiding tens of airplane by your signal which has the probability of proper operation less than 40 percent or more. So the performance availability and service availability which unfortunately has not yet been defined, will never be obtained. It's a big risk.

The two methods in the CPM, one method is after description is associated with the resolution. Chairman, that resolution has never ever been discussed in ITU-R. It's been submitted to three

meetings, but it was not discussed. As you observe in the report of the CPM, in the result of the studies mentioned, no consensus was reached on the result of the studies.

In the ITU-R unfortunately after many meetings, the document is as stage of, is at the stage of document 2 or preliminary drafting report, and even that document is in some sort of square bracket because the last meeting of working party 5B two conclusions reached. Conclusion one, there is no agreement even on that document to our preliminary draft new report, and the second, there were 20 contributions to the working party 5B. The meeting was not in a position to take any part of those contributions to include in that drafting report due to the complexity, so the study is not completed. Usually community would decide there is something available. The view there is no logical mobile satellite rule to fulfill the needs, this does not mean that we should use something which has serious difficulties. So we have to, the community have to think of something. Maybe establish satellite. Why not? Maybe similar the proposal of the UKE that there should be a specific mobile satellite rule service on the 11 gigahertz band. That was not accepted because it was not in the agenda of the conference so there might be ways and means. But the current system doesn't work. There are a lot of problems. This environment has not been studied. There are many things not studied, not complete. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I stand ready to agree with you. This is a very difficult issue, and we will, we have to work on it at the conference. I see that Mr. Mike Biggs would like to comment in this regard. You have the floor, sir.

>> MIKE BIGGS: Yes, thank you, maybe if I could, brief comments on I guess all three questions that I heard.

Perhaps starting from the end, regarding the studies, we believe the studies are complete. There is a document on the working party 5B website in fact that is a compendium of the document that came into the penultimate so the meeting just before the last working party 5B. In that document, there was a note saying that this document was agreed, if we could fill these holes, and at the final meeting of working party 5B there were contributions that filled the holes. As was pointed out, the documents were not discussed. That was for other reasons.

But the document that is currently on working party 5B website took that almost complete document and filled all the holes with the contributions that came in to the final meeting. So we do believe that there is a completed document that is available if people want to look at studies.

Regarding the use of FSS, all FSS assignments are not created equal, even within the same FSS network. You have FSS that as pointed out perhaps go out 40 percent of the time. But then you have FSS that they are using to carry the finals of the World Cup where if it went out 40 percent of the time, there would be major riots. So every assignment is not created equal.

I believe what ICAO pointed out was that there will be requirements within the ICAO document which would be added on to the requirements that are in the ITU documents, so that if you want to use FSS for your UAS command and control, you have to meet all of those requirements.

So you will not be able to use the assignments that go away 40 percent of the time. You will have to be using the ones that are guaranteed to bring you that final shot of the World Cup.

Regarding radio reg 410, and the coordination requirements, one of the interesting things we have found out is that the folks that are operating these AMSRS networks now, they coordinate all their assignments the same, whether it's a MSS assignment or AMSRS. 410 is really a reactive thing, that if you have interference, you can go back and fix it.

ICAO will take on board what they have, and they will make sure that their system is safe for all time, and it's not just that, if it's not safe, I can go fix it. They need to build the requirements up front to make sure that it's always safe. That is why the safety of flight is handled by ICAO.

Maybe an aside on that, adding an AMSRS allocation to a FSS networks assignments doesn't change anything technically. If you had 40 percent availability when it was FSS, you have 40 percent available when it's AMSRS.

Regarding the other questions, I think that they were along the lines of the studies being available, so hopefully you can take a look at that. That is on working party 5B website to see the studies. Regarding the protection of the existing FSS, if you take a look at the CITELE, IAP, there are a number of resolves in that resolution that point to the fact that the UAS, both the airborne station and the ground stations, have to act just like other FSS stations. They will meet all the requirements of the FSS, and therefore, they will not put additional burden on other use of the FSS.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Germany, you have requested the floor. Please go ahead.

>> Germany: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We heard already that we have obviously on this very delicate topic the views, that one, Germany is more aligned with the views outlined by the U.S. colleague. As everybody knows, who is familiar with the studies going on, on that one, we worked intensively to get the studies done. Unfortunately, this was not completely possible, during the course of the meetings of the ITU-R.

However, there is final document available at 5B, at the 5B folder on that one, containing all relevant answers to the questions outlined by the various delegates of administrations to this meeting here as well. This is contained in document number 5B886. Furthermore, we believe that term the overall subject is something where we have to be mindful what the ITU is responsible for and what is requested here.

We should not take the responsibility of other organisations, which have plead here that the ITU take a decision forward on some modernization and maybe some new systems which are coming up. If the ITU doesn't act responsively to that one, then they will take different ways and means to address their new systems.

At least my administration is concerned about this way forward, because this could end up in a situation where we will have to be reactive, and ensure that the regulations are in place and enforced at a later stage. This will be very difficult. We have here now the task ahead of us that we have a very early stage the possibility to make the things right. We have to take this responsibility seriously and do it that way. For those who are interested in that, please look up at the 5B folder. Maybe also some other administrations have then the possibility to align themselves with us, that would be very much pleased, so they can inform me later on if they would wish to do so. That will be very much appreciated. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I do not see any further requests for the floor.

I think that, oh, I do beg your pardon. ICAO, please. You have the floor.

>> ICAO: Thank you, Chairman. I should perhaps convey to this meeting one bit of useful information, that is last week we had a meeting of the ICAO frequency spectrum management panel. There we had the opportunity to look at the proposal that came out of CITELE the week before.

The consensus within that meeting was that the proposal as drafted during that CITELE meeting is indeed compatible with the ICAO position. I just wanted to convey that information. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I think that with that, we can move on. If you have any questions for our panelists here, after this meeting, you can continue to discuss this off-line.

Now I would like to invite you to turn to the next item that we have in our agenda today, this is an issue, it has a special number, called global flight tracking for civil aviation. This is how it features on the agenda of the conference at the moment. This agenda item was launched by the Plenipotentiary Conference which in 2014 took the decision in Busan, decision number 119. This resolution contains three basic elements. The first of these is to include in its agenda issues linked to global flight tracking in WRC 2015 and to inform ICAO about the adoption of this resolution, so as to draw their attention to this issue, and there is also an instruction to the Director of the BR to prepare a specific report on the matter, and submit it for consideration by WRC.

The work and studies carried out in the ITU on this agenda item have begun. Could you turn to the next slide, please? And firstly, I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that these studies have been carried

out by working party 5B and 4C. In particular working party 5B at the end of its work prepared two reports on these studies.

The first report pertained to general issues of global flight tracking, technical characteristics, description of the systems, including both earth and satellite components of the system, and all issues linked to global flight tracking. That was one of the reports.

The second report which covered specifically research into the possibility of using ADSB systems to ensure satellite link reception, it's a question of joint use and the use of ADSB systems in the specific case of the reception of this frequency band from satellites.

At the moment, these are preliminary reports. They are at the first stage of being developed.

Nevertheless, the results of these studies have been produced, and 5B is looking at results of these studies, and in correspondence with this it's sent in the relevant document to the Director of the BR.

Now turning to working party 4C, they carried out studies too. These focused on questions linked to mobile satellite services, and their use for global flight tracking purposes.

This research was also carried out in order to prepare a report. This report is currently in the preliminary stages in ITU-R and based on the results of the studies which have been carried out up to that point working party 4C sent in its document to the Director of the BR.

As a result of this study work which had been done, as a compilation which was available at the time of the compilation of this report, that it was sent in to the Director of the BR and is already available and in fact available on the website as an input document to the conference.

We need to note that taking into account the different approaches, the different aspects of ways addressing global flight tracking, at the moment the Director's report contains four possible options which might be considered as means to satisfy this agenda item.

These options are different, starting from option 1, which is no change to the radio regulations, right down to taking the, adopting the relevant allocation and technical provisions, the changes in the radio regulations. I'm not going to read out all of the options which are set forth in this report. They are up on the slide. You can read about them in greater detail in the Director's report.

I'd like to remark that this issue, preparation for the conference, was partially looked at during the CPM. A number of contributions were made from various administrations with different opinions on this issue. The greater part of questions to the CPM were how to reflect these results in the report, and when it was not possible to reach agreement, the CPM report in annex 1 to the CPM report contains two opinions reflecting how the CPM viewed the possibility of reflecting the results of the studies in the report itself.

There is also an appendix to the report containing some clarification from some administrations that have made contributions at the CPM meeting and their opinion in this regard. So these are the opinions of separate specific administrations.

But at the moment, I would once again like to highlight what it is that we have. We have the director's report from the BR. It contains proposed options for satisfying the agenda item. But at the moment, we also have a proposal from various regional organisations, and also from ICAO. On the next slide, this is something which I wish to bring your attention to, the Plenipotentiary wished for ICAO to be aware of this. It seems to me that ICAO's position is quite straightforward in this regard. ICAO believes that it's possible for there to be an allocation around about 1090 megahertz, in the interest of aviation en route, with the aim of receiving ADSB signals in accordance with the relevant regulatory and technical provisions for the use of such allocations.

ICAO also believes it might be required to consider -- to continue with studies on a global scale looking at all aspects of global flight tracking at the next conference. That is ICAO's position. Once again, as in the previous case, I would like to invite ICAO to clarify its position in this regard. Thank you.

>> ICAO: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you again for your excellent work in providing our position for everyone here.

One of the reasons why aviation has consistently improved upon its levels of safety and efficiency over the decades habits willingness to invest significant effort and resources to learn important lessons even from rare events. While 2014 represented one of aviation's safest years in terms of the number of accidents, the tragedy of Malaysia airlines flight 370 in March of last year, highlighted vulnerabilities in the global air navigation system required urgent mitigation.

In order to address those vulnerabilities, the aviation community has embarked on a global effort to develop and implement a global aeronautical distress and safety system or GADSS and encompassing all phases of flight under all circumstances including distress.

Global flight tracking is a fundamental component of the GADS and enabling aircraft operators and their navigation service providers to obtain a realtime record of aircraft positions worldwide. One technology enabler for the global flight tracking builds on automatic dependence surveillance broadcast or ADSB, an existing technology already in use, whereby aircraft broadcast their positions twice a second at 1090 megahertz.

ADSB in principle provides all information required for global flight tracking. The only component missing today is the ability to receive those transmissions in remote oceanic and polar regions where those flight tracking needs are most acute.

As I alluded, an important advantage of the satellite reception of ADSB is that it leverages existing aircraft capabilities without requiring any additional transmitters or transmissions even. Another important advantage is that due to already published mandates in Europe, the U.S., Australia and elsewhere, all commercial aircraft will be required to carry the necessary equipment by year 2020. The ICAO high level safety conference which we held in February this year discussed several recent events such as image 370 and so on and improvements in general. One of its recommendations was to, in light of the Plenipotentiary resolution, was to encourage states and the ITU to discuss allocation requirements at WRC-15 to provide the necessary frequencies spectrum allocations to enable global air traffic services surveillance. Hence the ICAO position is as you saw, see on the screen here, and is also in line with option 3, which you saw on one of the previous slides presented to us by the Chairman.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'd like to move on now to the next slide. This slide shows regional positions. At the moment as we understand it, these positions were not connected to specific methods, as is usually done in a CPM report.

However, the regional organisations have expressed their position in one form or another. I would like to invite the representatives of the regional organisations, I think this time we will begin from the right, my right, would like to invite them to express the regional positions and clarify them a little. I would like to begin with Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Arab group is in favor of the improving safety of civil aviation and following incidents and also to improve the possibility of determining position of aircraft. This is the position of the Arab group. You presented a proposal on new resolutions on the PP conference in Busan to this effect. Therefore, this group is in support of studying the requirements of strengthening the global flight tracking within the framework, within the framework and will look at the necessary frequency spectrum allocations required. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Zhu Keer, could you share with us APT's position please?

>> ZHU KEER: Different aspects of the issue were discussed at our last APT meeting. All the APT members fully recognize the importance of this issue. And also, APT members are supportive on the current studies undertaken in ITU-R working parties 5B and 4C, and taking into account the appropriate protection of the existing services. APT members are also of the view that any regulatory provision should not constrain the systems operating in existing aeronautical safety services.

Based on these understandings, PACP was reached and APT members invite the WRC-15 to recognize importance and urgent treatment of GFT for civil aviation and the into account the results of studies available, and the report of the Director of BR in order to respond to the instruction given in the PP 14

resolution 184 -- 5. And as the Chairman mentioned, that there is no specific options discussed and agreed at this stage in APT. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Mouhamadou Awallou, could you share with us ATU's position, please?

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regards to global flight tracking, the African group still has not made a position. At its last meeting which took place in Nairobi, there were some sub regions who presented contributions. And at this time, the BR report was also presented. The contribution from ICAO, all of this was reviewed and taken into account the importance of this issue and its complexity. It was therefore the different sub regions have not yet expressed fully their points of views and will submit these opinions at the latest by the 30th of September, 2015. Therefore on this basis, the African union will reach a position eventually. Therefore, this is an overview of the African position on this question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. CEPT, unfortunately on my slide, we don't have their position. Maybe Uwe Schwark will be able to explain the current position.

>> UWE SCHWARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try my best. I guess discussions, we will figure out when I explain, or perhaps still too complex to fit it into one of your columns in the slide. That is probably the reason why there is nothing there, why there is nothing submitted. It is indeed a rather complex discussion, still going on within the CEPT conference preparatory group, on this particular subject. While of course CEPT members fully recognize the importance of the subject, so the status from the last CEPT conference preparatory meeting is as follows.

The meeting could agree on three elements on which common positions, the meeting agreed on three elements and accordingly common positions could be drafted. But there are also four different views on how to satisfy the agenda item. I will start with a commonalities, among CEPT members.

The first element is that CEPT is of the view that global flight tracking contributes to the concept of operations for a global aeronautical distress and safety system, in short GADSS, currently being developed within ICAO. The second element is CEPT supports future agenda item that is flexible enough to address any required changes to the radio regulations necessary to allow the implementation of the GADSS. The third common element is that CEPT is of the view that any new regulatory provision relative to any system participating to the global flight tracking shall not constrains systems operating in existing allocations complying with article 5 of the radio regulations.

That is the three elements where common agreement has been reached. Coming now to the four different views, the view one is that no regulatory action needs to be taken by WRC-15 in respect of global flight tracking, unless new evidence from ongoing ITU-R studies emerges that clearly identifies a need for WRC-15 to take regulatory action.

The second view is that to support the ICAO recommendation that necessary spectrum allocation should be provided as a matter of urgency, that would enable global air traffic services surveillance and the ICAO global flight tracking position for WRC-15 which supports a new allocation in the earth to space direction for AMSRS at 1090 megahertz for the satellite reception of existing aircraft ASB transmissions provided that it not constrains existing aeronautical safety systems.

So rather complex view 2. View 3 is to propose a two step approach, with the secondary allocation to the mobile satellite service in the earth to space direction, to be decided at WRC-15 for satellite ASB reception and recognition in the radio regulations to take into account its future participation to the global flight tracking function and the completion of the appropriate technical and regulatory studies for a potential primary AMSRS allocation at WRC 19. So this is I believe in line with one of the proposals made by, one of the proposals given in the CPM report.

So a stepwise approach, MSS first and then studying the details ...

(no audio).

>> This was confirmed at the last working party 5B meeting in July and again by ICAO to date. As outlined, the option 3 requests WRC-15 to consider a new primary AMSRS allocation for satellite ADSB in the band 1087.7 to 1092.3 megahertz. That is around 1090. To clarify it has also been confirmed by

ICAO that option 4 in the Director's report that is the consideration of a secondary allocation is not sufficient to support safety and regularity of flight. I feel Mr. Chairman that it may be beneficial for all the delegates present here if ICAO can once again confirm for us how the options outlined in the BR director's report relate to their WRC-15 position on GFT.

With that, I conclude. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Iran, if you have no objections I will allow ICAO to respond to this. ICAO, please.

>> ICAO: Thank you, Chair. To respond to Ireland, yes, I can confirm that out of the, I believe what it was four options presented in the director's report, I think you had it on one of your previous slides.

Yes. Out of those, it's option 3 that is clearly compatible with the ICAO position.

Clearly, to us option 1 would not be favorable. Option 2 would be difficult, because we would need to make sure that the current operation of systems in this band not be constrained in any way, that we do not get any oops moments after the fact. This is very very critical frequency. You have secondary surveillance there. You have A cast or T cast that is the aircraft coalition avoidance systems. They all use the same frequency, which actually also makes it so excellent for use for this purpose.

But those need to be protected. A common way of doing things recently is when we pile aeronautical safety allocations on top of each other, we did this at the last conference, at the conference before, then we rank them against each other. They are all primary. However one ranks lower than the other. And then ICAO starts take care of those.

In any case, yes, to cut it short, option 3 is what is clearly in line with the ICAO position. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I think that we can continue this discussion following this meeting, the issue at hand is well understood. However, I'd like to use the five minutes that we have to touch on other issues that we have on the agenda, if you have no objections.

Could we turn to the next slide, please? The next agenda item which we have in front of us is agenda item 117. It covers issues of spectrum requirements for wireless avionics, intra communications. And on this agenda item, there have been studies carried out and there is almost a single method to satisfy this agenda item in CPM report.

However, the conclusion on a new primary allocation of the AMRS, frequency band 4 to 00420 there is a relevant regulatory text already in the CPM report. At the moment on the next slide we see that the positions of the regional organisations on this question are quite consolidated.

I don't know if there is a need to separately present these positions to representatives of the regional organisations to present their positions. But I think it's a fairly clear picture. At the moment, the regional organisations almost entirely support the method set forth in the CPM report.

Are there any questions with regard to agenda item 117? No? I see none. Thank you.

Then I'd like to turn to the last agenda item on our list, that is radio applications, this agenda item has a special agenda item 1.18. It covers the issue of primary allocation to the radio location services. On this agenda item a relevant report was drawn up which covers studies on this issue. The CPM report contains two methods which are both in support of a primary allocation to the A.L. RS and frequency 77.5 to 78G gigahertz, with one exception. Method A in the CPM report proposes a restriction only on the application of the automotive applications for these radars, but method B also proposes the use of this application for the ALRS but without any limitation, both of them propose an allocation but the difference is that this allocation may be restricted or not restricted to special applications.

As regards the positions of the regional administrations, organisations, rather, I think that here I will still give the floor to the representatives of regional organisations. Why? Because during the development of these proposals, they were not clearly linked to method A or method B. During the meeting, we, I discussed this with the APT and CITEL representatives. The position of the regional organisations appears to be at some stage in between the two methods.

I would like to invite the representatives of the regional organisations to comment on these positions, so that we can have a clear idea of what their positions are. I would like to invite the representatives to be brief given that we only have two minutes left. Mr. Sergey Pastukh.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman. Firstly, the first point that which I would like to point, touch on, is the RCC can be colored entirely green and not hatched green. We fully support this method A, since the limitations are not to be given vis-a-vis the automotive applications. They are to do with limitations such as intensity and other limitations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Mike Biggs, please.

>> MIKE BIGGS: Yes, thank you. The slide here for CITELE is not quite correct, as mentioned we are sort of between A and B. Our approach recognizes that there are some, for example, aviation applications for this type of system, and on advisory basis, but also takes into account that when you start bringing aircraft into the air, they cause problems to the science services so ours talks about limited to short range radar surface applications including automotive applications, and notes the provisions of 410 do not apply. These are for advisory uses in terms of aviation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Uwe Schwark.

>> UWE SCHWARK: Thank you. The current draft common proposal on this agenda item is proposing a primary radio location service allocation with a footnote that limits this allocation to short range radars, and footnote also includes a maximum EIRP peak power limit. However, the discussions, the ECP has not been finalized but it is expected that the remaining issues on the exact wording of the footnote will be finalized during the final conference preparatory meeting of CEPT. The CEPT position as it stands now is that CEPT supports the primary allocation to the radio location service to support short range radar applications in frequency band 77.578 gigahertz in accordance with resolution 456. Allocation of the band 77.5, 78 gigahertz, radio location service to support short range high-resolution radar operations, and the second element is that CEPT is of the opinion that the allocation to the radio location service in the E.R. R shall not be restricted to applications, and that the word automotive as any other undefined terminology in the radio regulations shall not be used. CEPT recognizes that radio astronomy stations are to be protected from future use of the radio location service and radio band 77.5 to 78 gigahertz.

As I indicated two weeks from now there is the last CP G meeting and is expected that the position will be finalized then. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Representative of ATU. You have the floor.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you. The African group has reached a common proposal on this position, which is method A, which regards a allocation to RLS, with regards to automotive applications. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The position of APT, Zhu Keer, please.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you. Chairman, the APT position is also between method A and method B. During our discussion that the members are not supportive of mentioning automotive applications in the footnote, and also some members see the possibilities to have, add applications in the future.

(phone ringing).

And to take into account the compatibility studies taken in their ITU-R, just to use the characteristics provided in the ITU-R recommendation, M.2057, based on these considerations APT proposed that new text for this footnote to limit to the radar applications with technical characteristics given in this recommendation. So this is the position of the APT. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And the representative of ASMG, please.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you, Chairman.

The Arab group working from the studies which have been carried out supports a addition of a primary allocation to the LRS in the band 77.5 gigahertz to 78 gigahertz. We support method A, it being limited to automotive applications. We encourage applications which strengthen security. There is also a need

to mention that there is an allocation in band 76.5, for the RLS service. This means that, this would mean that adding 76.5 to 78 gigahertz to this band would be a good idea. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Colleagues, we have exhausted our agenda. I would like to thank you the panelists, and the participants, in this section. I would also like to thank the interpretation team. And with that, I would like to close this panelist session, and our next session will begin at 15:55. Thank you very much.

(break.)

(standing by).

>> If you could take your seats, we will start in one minute.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, everybody. I'm Christian Rissone from the French administration. I'm very happy to greet you here today to the second session this afternoon.

Firstly, allow me to present our panelists who are with me, Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader, representing ASMG. Mr. John Lewis from APT, Mr. Mouhamadou Awallou from ATU who is now joining us on the podium. Mr. Hans Bondeel Timmermann, from CEPT who is going to present on item 1.4, and myself, and I will introduce items 116 and 115. Mr. Charles Glass from CITELE, Mr. Sergey Pastukh from RCC. The first item on our agenda is agenda item 1.16, on maritime communication. This item is quite simple and complex at the same time. We had to divide it in different areas, the aim of this item is to identify new applications using the A.I.S. technology, in order to improve maritime radio communications. As seems simple, but we have identified various sub subjects on this question. We have identified a terrestrial component, a satellite component, and perhaps also regional component. In order to add this, because the priority which has been given by the IMO is to not create interference with creating the, create interference with existing ESVs. This is the type of transponder which allows you to connect to the position and gives position indications of the vessel's journey, and this will be of interest to our colleagues in a global flight tracking but also look at the AIS because the aim is the same. AIS and GFT, which is to know where the boats are located, where the vessels are located.

Could you perhaps move to the second slide? Thank you. You will see here the four issues which, you will see the four items, and the solutions, which will be supported or not. These are not linked with administration will decide to support issue A on AIS protection, for example, or will support a global contribution, but also a regional contribution, for example. Therefore, we have decided to separate these issues into four separate parts.

With regards to issue 1, with regard to issue 1, the AIS we use at the moment is so good that the industry, and administrations have already developed those applications which use AIS. The problem is that AIS was originally developed for maritime safety, and the problem is that all these small applications which we called ISM in English have led to an overloading of the system in certain areas of the world. Now, we have a 50 percent saturation on these system. The report was submitted to the ITU, and was worked on during the study period, which has shown the situation with all of the, on all of the geographical areas, there is a great deal of sea traffic.

The first thing to do with issue A is to look at these AISs, but perhaps these should be used in other frequencies, other than the AIS frequencies.

So, issue A has the aim of identifying two new channels which could be used for ISM, air ISM. There is also the issue of protection for AIS. The 2012 conference authorized the use of four channels, in order to separate them into four channels. We separated them out into eight simplex channels. For doing this the party used by the coastal station creates interference in the AIS channels, if these new simplex channels are used by boats or vessels. It was decided that under issue A, AIS would be protected. You will see how this is done.

You have the three methods which are identified for subject, issue A rather. The first part of issue A consists of the identification of channels 2027 and 2028 for new ASM and to ensure protection of AIS through banning the transmission on channels which were shared between two channels on the upper channels. These were split at the last conference.

Issue A2 identifies different channels, channels 87 and 88 for ASM channels, and it proposes not preventing the use of the upper channels, blocked by AIS, but it encourages a power limitation instead. Finally, we have issue A3, which seems very similar to A1. It also identifies channels 2027 and 2028 for ASM. But, the proposal which aims to ban the use of upper channels blocking AIS is almost the same as that in the proposal A2, though there be a limitation in power, power limitation.

Now we can perhaps turn to the general positions. As you will see here, as we saw with the previous panel discussion, there are some regional positions which already support this. The ATU does not yet have a position, however on this subject. What I would suggest is that we give the floor quickly to each representative of the regional organisations, so that he or she can clarify this subject.

Let's begin with the RCC, with Mr. Pastukh, please.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

With regard to agenda item 1.16 issue A, well, you showed the preliminary position of the RCC on your slide from April of this year. The final position will be decided on at next week's meeting. I can merely assure you that you correctly reflected the current situation, and the RCC countries support method A2. Since we see that in the first one, there could be an overload of the AIS channels, and we believe that there are problems which need to be addressed. And with corresponding identification of extra channels, will allow us to address this problem.

The second point I wish to touch on is, why we chose method A2. Since we are suggesting that the full forbidding of the channels to ensure protection is too strong a measure, it would lead to reduction in the effectiveness of the use of spectrum. A power limitation would allow for more effective use of the channels which are accessible to the maritime community.

So once again, I would like to say that we will take a final position next week. But the current position is correctly reflected on this slide. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Pastukh. Mr. Glass, for CITEEL, please.

>> CHARLES GLASS: Thank you, and good afternoon to everyone.

In CITEEL, we looked carefully at agenda item 1.16 and with respect to issue A, as you have indicated, we are in support of method A1.

In this particular case, it is important to note that with agenda item 1.16 as with most maritime issues, there are great deal of complexities that have to be taken into account, and in our particular case there is a disparity in the types of usage within CITEEL administrations which we had to look at across all four of the different issues.

In this particular case, we proposed a split for channels 27 and 28, for designation of channel 2027 and 2028 to application specific messages which will help address the AIS loading issues that you identified. We make the four channels recommended under A1 not available for transmission from ships to avoid interference to AIS reception on board ship stations. And in addition, we have included a country footnote for administrations, to use channel 27 and 28 for public correspondence to allow them to continue that usage until such time as that can be addressed in domestic regulations.

I will leave it at that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Glass. As to CEPT, CEPT appears to support method A1 which clearly identifies 2027 and 2028 and also forbids usage on these channels which are shown on the screen. I would like to say something which is true for all the methods. We talk about VHF, the ITU has developed a recommendation which for the moment has been sent to the Radio Assembly since it cannot be approved in Study Group 5. This recommendation fully describes the VDS system. Another document has been developed throughout this study period. It's about a 2371, and it identifies a number of frequency plans which could address this agenda item. All of these four issues, these four frequency plans were analyzed following a list of criteria. Report 2371 provides the conclusion to the study.

The conclusion has four plans, but only one of them appears to have met with approval from a number of countries. This is what we call plan 1. Plan 1 is the transmission which you see in all of these

methods. A1, A2, C1, C2, B1, B2. And the other plans in particular the fourth plan, plan D correspond more to methods A2 and B2 which are in the CPM text.

But I would suggest that you refer to this report later on, and it would explain to you the entire position there.

Now I would like to turn to the ATU for the regional position there.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you, Chair, as regards the Africa group's position, agenda item 1.16 was generally studied and considered at its last meeting, and since we are looking at question A which is one of the four questions, with regard to this question, there were contributions from different administrations, African administrations I mean.

But we have not been able to come up with a common position, because we did not reach the required quota meaning that we could have a position. So that means that Africa has no position on this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. John Lewis, APT, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone.

As we see from the table in your presentation, APT is supporting method A1, and I don't think I need to go into much more detail, but I can mention that if you download the Power Point version of our document number 2, you will find agenda item by agenda item the preliminary APT common proposals embedded, documents embedded in the Power Point presentation, which you can then extract and see the proposals in full detail.

Hopefully, that will make our positions clear to all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Finally, ASMG, Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you, Chairman. The Arab group supports AIS systems, and also supports strengthening these applications. As regards issue A, the Arab group is in favor of method A1. The Arab group believes there is no need to guarantee two channels for AIS applications, and we are in favor of resolution 361.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Are there any questions on issue A? I have one, if you will allow me, as representative of CEPT. It's for CITELE. In CITELE's proposal, there is a note proposing that there continue to be public correspondence on channels 27 and 28. It identifies the upper channels of these channels, of these channels which we call 2027 and 28 for this purpose. If public correspondence is used we can't use the AIS ASM channels as identified. So it's a inconsistency. It could be easily resolved.

The proposal in method 1 is that there is a date of entry into service which is the first of January, 2019, and the proposal of CITELE does not contain a date. I would like to turn it to CITELE and ask whether or not it would be possible for CITELE to consider putting in a date for the cessation of public correspondence, understanding that the licenses submitted, issued by the FCC are going to run out in 2019. So if they are not renewed, then it could be very easy to identify ASM channels as provided for, so there would be no problem on the American side with this resolution. Mr. Glass, please.

>> CHARLES GLASS: Thank you. During the CITELE meeting itself, we did not discuss a specific date, given that that would predispose domestic regulatory actions, which had not been undertaken at that point. Given that, certainly we will take back from this meeting comments that have been received, and at the conference itself, we do have procedures by which CITELE proposals can be modified.

So we will certainly take that information back. But notwithstanding that, at this point there is no mechanism between now and the conference for us to change that proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions on issue A? Mr. Glass. Please.

>> CHARLES GLASS: Just a announcement. All morning, we have had problems with the CITELE website being down. It is now back up. So those of you that were looking to look at the CITELE proposals, you should be able to get to the CITELE website now to see those proposals. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that announcement.

Now let us turn to issue B, new applications for the maritime radio communication terrestrial component. There were two methods which have been identified. The first one, a method B1, identifies four channels for the terrestrial component, and a method B2 identifies six channels. At this point in the discussion, I need to explain to you what happened at the 2012 conference. In 2012 the WRC identified 13 channels which could serve for new applications, maritime applications I mean. Out of these 13 channels, only six are harmonized globally. These six have been recognized by all administrations at the conference, and may be used. The others are affected by notes which were sent in saying, footnotes rather saying that in such and such a region or such an such a country, these cannot be used.

During the study period, we concentrated merely on the six possible channels, in order to ensure that we had a harmonized system. The problem with a ship is the same as with an airplane. It travels all over the world. You need to be sure that the system works everywhere.

Method B1 only identifies four channels. Why? Well, this is because the technology used has demonstrated that if wish to not interfere with AIS there is a need to have two protection channels. That is why channels 26 and 86 are not in there for B1, in order to protect AIS and ASM, which have been identified under 2027 and 2028. They are just beside. All of these protection mechanisms are described in the recommendation which was sent in to the Radio Assembly and which clearly explains the decision which had been made to choose, and the technical solution applied, in order to ensure that the system works.

Method B2, unfortunately, does not refer to any recommendation. So I don't wish to say that the system doesn't work. We don't know anything about B2 at the moment. But there is no technical study which shows that method B2 could work.

There are studies still to be done certainly on method B2. Now, could we move on to the regional table? Here you will see the different proposals. The most simple way of proceeding is to begin with the panelists, and begin with ASMG, Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader, could you explain what the regional position is. Please.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you, Chairman. As regards the terrestrial component of the VDE, in the VHF band, we are in favor of identifying channels 24, 84, 25 and 85, in accordance with -- this would allow us to have a better terrestrial component and sending of data through it. There is a need to add in a footnote in annex 18. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Mr. John Lewis from APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As your table shows, in our discussions which have just finished at the start of August, we support the method B1 for the reasons that you have outlined in terms of the protection of the channels above, and again as I mentioned, the details of this can be found in the Power Point presentation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Mouhamadou Awallou from ATU, please.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you, Chairman. As with the previous agenda item, issue B did not manage to reach the number of countries required for it to become a composition for the African group. So the African group does not have a position on issue B. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. As to CEPT, it supports method B1. It is supported by the recommendation of VDES which is a very thick document. It is more than 150 pages. It describes the entire system, both terrestrial and satellite.

As regards CEPT, it is important for us to protect ASM and AIS channels. We believe that the use of channels 26 and 86 could cause, almost certainly cause a large level of interference to ASM and AIS. Thank you.

Now I suggest we turn to CITEEL, Mr. Glass. Please.

>> CHARLES GLASS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CITEEL does not have an inter-American proposal with respect to method B. However, there were discussions within CITEEL with respect to this. And our procedures do allow for multi country proposal submission with respect to those views.

There is not a whole lot more I can add on that. I will leave that with you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Glass. Mr. Pastukh for the RCC.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you, Chairman. The current position of the RCC countries is method B2. The position will be determined finally next week, when we hold the RCC meeting. The main reason for which we are in favor of B2 is that these six channels at the WRC 12 conference were allocated to the maritime mobile service for digital technologies.

And we understand that with the use of digital technologies all six channels may be used without any interference. Nevertheless I would once again like to highlight that the final position will only be taken next week. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I suggest we move to the next topic. I do beg your pardon. Are there any questions from the floor? In my effort to finish on time I forgot to ask for any questions.

No questions? Everything is clear? Very well then. Let's move on to issue C, the satellite component. This is a little more difficult to explain, a little longer. In the methods, under issue C, there are two main methods which are identified, methods C1 and C2.

On this table, you will see that there is an overview of these methods. I would like to thank the APT because we have copied their table which they put in their proposal. It's easy to understand.

Proposal C1 identifies a number of channels for an up link satellite channel and a downlink channel, in order to be able to carry out data transmission between a ship, or vessel, and the satellite. And of course, the earth will be a stakeholder, coastal stations will also be involved.

So, this satellite component, the uplink component, with regard to this, we also decided, it was also decided that an allocation could be made above the famous channels 2027 and 2028, the AIS channels identified in method A, A1 to A3.

So, it's the third column on the table. You can see this identification. The difference between methods C1A and C1B is in the downlink part. You will see that the uplink channel part is exactly the same in both proposals. But, and the uplink part for the detection, ASM satellite detection is the same thing in the last column.

On the frequency part, methods C1A and C1B are exactly identical. What is different is how they are dealt with under the radio regulations. Methods C1A proposes a secondary allocation to the mobile maritime satellite services with a PFD limit which would be set forth under article 5. There would be no coordination mechanism for this allocation. Method C1B proposes for the downlink part, there is an allocation to be made, but a primary basis in the radio regulations with the introduction in annex 1 to appendix 5 of the APFD limit. And the use of coordination under 914 of the radio regulations, this C1B proposal was drawn up in the light of the report from the Special Committee, which clearly explained that having a secondary allocation with a PFD limit or mask would perhaps create a difficulty, and it should be reviewed or revised. CEPT proposed this mechanism, a primary allocation with a PFD mask under coordination which would accord more protection to earth services.

The two terrestrial services rather, C1A and C1B also propose protecting radio astronomy services. The proposal is the same in both regards. So to recap, C1 is the same proposal as regards frequency, but a different treatment under the radio regulations. It will be up to the conference to decide on which will be the best method.

Method C2 proposes to identify the up link and down link in another part of the spectrum of appendix 18. This proposes to use the existing allocations on the mobile satellite service. You can see this in the up link on the right of the table. We already have a MSS allocation earth to space between 148 and 149 megahertz, and a downlink allocation between 137 and 138 megahertz. The allocations are proposed, so they are primary allocations for the uplink and secondary for the downlink. For the ASM detection part of the third column it's proposed to make ASM also using an existing allocation of 148 to 149 megahertz. So therefore, this is an overview of the C1 and C2 methods, which are quite complex in terms of regulations.

Therefore, I'd like us to move on straight to the positions of the regional organisations who are able to furnish more details on this. Mr. Pastukh, I'd like to give you the floor for RCC. Thank you.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Once again I'd like to highlight that next week, we will have a meeting, and I think everyone is aware that there is going to be an RCC meeting next week. But I do need to say that.

So, our final position will be decided on next week.

Now with regard to the existing position of the RCC, well, here we are in favor of method C2. In this connection, I would like to remark on some points. The first point is the resolution 360, resolution 360 has a decision which determines that for the VDE systems, we need to consider the decision in the framework of the existing allocations for maritime mobile and mobile services.

We believe that this point supported WRC-15 does not need to allocate further frequency for the VDS systems. This is not the same case as what we have with AIS, because for AIS, we have an overload of the channels. In resolution 360 we provided for further frequency bounds. The first point is that we believe that the method C1A, C1B, run counter to resolution 360.

The second point, the next point is that we note that in the VHF range, we already have an allocation both in the space to earth and also in the earth to space directions for one megahertz, which can be hosting applications for VDE which were studied during the interconference study period.

Those are the main reasons why we believe that method C2 is the main method for satisfying this issue. Next week, we will once again carefully discuss this issue, and come to a final decision on it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Pastukh. Mr. Glass, you have the floor.

>> CHARLES GLASS: Thank you. CITELE supports the modification of the radio regulations article 5 to identify maritime mobile satellite service allocation uplink to allow satellite reception and specific frequencies assigned for the application-specific messages or ASM.

However, the proposal to move the footnote 5.226A to the maritime mobile satellite service only is contrary to the method in the CPM text and is where we do diverge. In the footnote, we limit the use of the maritime mobile satellite service to the designated ASM channels identified in note zed A of appendix 18. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Glass. For CEPT we support method C1B for the reason that I have just explained. The VDES system and satellite component is once again, has been described in recommendation VDES which will go to radio regulation. Method C2 is quite attractive for regulators such as myself, the aim would be to use the existing spectrum.

However, the problem is to make a system work, it's not there to make a philosophy of the regulations by using the existing spectrum allocation. The problem is that if we identify this an existing attribution application we would have to make a new antenna. And for those who know how these are made, you can see it's a very important element. By identifying a satellite component, in appendix 18, which is where we already have the equipment, the recommendation explains what are the technical solutions, and it is shown technically that we have to use one, only one antenna. This antenna would be able to do AIS, VHF and VDS, in terrestrial and satellite components.

Therefore, the radio spectrum because it would be using existing VHF spectrum, but also to add a black box that say so that it would work. Therefore in time, we would have an integrated equipment in place. This is the first reply I'd like to make to RCC, and the second is what was said at the allocation is not coherent with the resolution, I during the CPM, I looked at this agenda item. I was the Chair of this. The legal services of ITU have given us an explanatory note that the proposal that was made on method C1, whether it's C1A or C1B was perfectly aligned with the agenda item. Therefore, there is no difficulty to make identification with a new band for the mobile maritime satellite service on this agenda item. This is a position of CEPT. Therefore, I'd like to give the floor to ATU.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the issue agenda item 1.16 in particular, the issue C, which is being taken under review, has taken different, has received

different contributions within the African region. And under this review, we have come to the position of C2, which is the common position of the African group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Mr. John Lewis for APT, you have the floor.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you once again, Mr. Chairman. As your slide shows, in our discussions, we decided to support the methods C1A and we note the point that you made just now, that this does not imply any need for new equipment on board the ships.

We also have felt that the interference that could be caused by transmissions in this space to earth direction to terrestrial activities would be best covered by making that allocation secondary, although we note your point that it could be primary, but have a coordination activity associated with it.

So as summary, we support C1A. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. For ASMG, Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader you have the floor.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Arab group does support C1A method, for the secondary allocations of the satellite component. And this would allow to use the same equipment that we use in the VE DS system. And the Arab group also would like to support the PFD in 26D to protect the protection of both mobile and fixed services, as we can find in the method C1A. We also would like to amend regulation 208A and 208B. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We have concluded issue C. Are there any questions? It's quite a complex subject. I give the floor to Cuba.

>> Cuba:

(receiving no English translation).

In the method C2, I'd like to make an observation. I'm going to look at C2. I think this is the only method which allows the use of mobile maritime satellite allocation on a primary basis.

If band 2027 to 2028 is not allocated to primary basis for mobile service where the allocation is on a primary basis, therefore we could have a, we are quite concerned in selecting the frequency for the use of mobile satellite services on a secondary basis in the frequency bands, which already are already used by land is going to be difficult. I don't think it's going to be easy to give adequate protection which could be, lead to interference. So the frequency bands on a primary basis initially we should take this difference between into consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Cuba. Mr. Pastukh, you have the floor.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman. I'd like to make a comment on the conclusions of the counselor on whether or not there can be an allocation in accordance with this resolution 360, which you mentioned. Here we need to note firstly that no matter what question you are asking me, we will respond to the legal advisor. If you asked me whether or not you could carry out this allocation, I would have said yes, in accordance with decides 1 it may be done.

But for what purpose? It clearly states that it could be for the purposes of AIS. But decides results 2 clearly says that for VDES, existing allocations need to be used. That is what is clearly set forth in the resolution. So when the meeting asked the legal advisor as to whether or not an allocation could be made, then the legal advisor responded yes, and he was quite right, but for the purposes of AIS. That is how we understood the answer that we received from the legal advisor. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any other requests for the floor? Before moving on I'd like to quickly reply, more for information, as what Mr. Pastukh just said is correct. There was no problem on that. However, it must be understood that VDES has it as described in the recommendations which the Russian Federation has opposed, in Study Group 5, it describes completely as an interface with AIS. This is where the difficulty lies, because we could, as it was interfaced with AIS, we have to decide, there has to be a satellite contribution there. Therefore, we are not going to spend any longer on this debate, because I think we need to discuss it in length at the conference.

But it must be understood that VDS is a global system which is completely interfaced with AIS, in order to protect it. We are going to move on to issue D. We are going to move on more quickly. VDS is a

regional solution, which I said the conference of 2012 identified 13 channels. Six have been used. And there are seven which remain, which are on the screen before you.

I would like us to move straight on to the regional position table. We are going to move on quite quickly. I would like to say we give the floor to those who support the proposal, and the other regions, CEPT and RCC don't have a proposal. CEPT, I can say we have not, we do not have opposition or support. We would like to see what is going to be presented at the conference. Therefore, I'd like to give the floor to ASMG, Mr. Mohammed Alabdulqader, you have the floor. Thank you.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Arab group supports the only method which is proposed by providing channels 8021, 2282, 2383, which allows to use the channels 8021, 80 as joint channels. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also support this regional solution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, APT. ATU, you have the floor.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regards to the final issue, item 1.16 issue D, Africa is in favor of the only solution which has been put forward to this issue. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your speed. Are there any other questions on issue D? Any regional contributions? I see none. Therefore we are going to move on to agenda item 1.4 for the amateur radio service.

17 years with ITU, and I see the same difficulties on the amateur radio service each year. Therefore, once again, we will have a very lively conference, which is always a pleasure. I'd like us to move on to the CPM methods, to look at a secondary basis for the ARS, within the range 5275 to 5450 kilohertz, you will see in the methods, A, the allocation or the allocations all begin by 5275, the reason being between 5250 and 5275 we have the radio allocation service. It is shown through the studies that it is not possible to put the ARS in the same area. Therefore, all the proposals, A1, A2, A3, A4 begin at 5275. Therefore, the four methods, the first proposes to identify method A1, which proposes 3075 on a secondary basis and method A2 which reduces, proposes a hundred kilohertz between 5350 and 5450 kilohertz. Method A3 proposes to identify up to either 15 kilohertz or square brackets, kilohertz -- sorry ... method A3 to identify 15 kilohertz, or a portion of in square brackets XX not identified in 5275 and 5450 kilohertz. And finally method A4, which proposes the possibility to identify several channels in the range 5275 to 5450 kilohertz.

This is method A which proposes an allocation, and method B which proposes no changes. I think we can move on to the table. On this table, on the screen, this reflects what I've just said for the amateur radio services, which is shared, which has been very much under discussion. Therefore, we are going to give the floor, I'm going to begin with ASMG. You have the floor. Thank you.

>> MOHAMMED ALABDULQADER: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Arab group does support the possibility to allocate for the radio amateur on a secondary basis, where the Arab group does support this method, method A3. The Arab group has also proposed to have 5435 to 5450 kilohertz as a secondary basis, and adding a new note, on the EI RP, with regards to those stations that are servicing the radio amateurs and also whatever is allocated within these bands. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thanks very much. Mr. John Lewis, APT, you have the floor.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you can see from your table, we were not able to develop a preliminary APT common proposals. We had some of our members supporting method A3, and others supporting the no change method B. We were not able to reach any compromise on this, so it was decided to not have any proposal at all.

However, it was acknowledged that the members fully support the protection of incumbent services within the band that was under consideration. So that will be our position as we go towards the conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. ATU, Mr. Mouhamadou Awallou.

>> MOUHAMADOU AWALLOU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regarding the agenda item 1.4 and the amateur radio service, the African group with regards to the different contributions made by the countries, has finally arrived at a position which supports to secondary allocation. With regards to the option it is not decided. Therefore, we have stated the preliminary position. On the secondary allocation, we still do not have a specific option of the African group. This is our position. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Timmermann.

>> HANS BONDEEL TIMMERMANN: Thank you. CEPT has not decided on position for agenda item 1.4 and will conclude on this agenda item at its Bergen meeting starting two weeks from now, the week after the already mentioned RCC meeting. The draft European position shows a secondary allocation of a hundred kilohertz as mentioned in method A2. Some countries indicated they prefer a allocation smaller than the one mentioned in method A2 corresponding with the XX of method A3. And finally, there are countries not in favor of an amateur allocation in this band. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> CHARLES GLASS: There was lively debate within CITEL but ultimately we ended up with a inter-American proposal supported by many administrations of CITEL to provide some flexibility for administrations, so they support method A1. There is, however, footnote that corresponds with this to give administrations the possibility of applying additional constraints to frequency sub bands, channels, power output, modes of operation, bandwidths, etcetera, where applicable within their administration. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Glass. Mr. Pastukh.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman. Firstly, I would like to say the RCC did determine its position on this issue. Looking at your table, I understand that you could interpret it various, in various ways. We support method B. This might be interpreted as us being opposed to methods A1 to A4. But I'd like to say that we do support no change, method B. In our position, it does not say that we oppose methods A1 to 4. But it's a question of interpretation.

I would like to touch on two reasons why we think that method B is the method which we need to adopt at WRC-15. Firstly, the frequency band 5250 to 5450 kilohertz is very active. It is used actively by fixed services and mobile services. We analyzed this, and there basically are no free channels which could be given over to the use of amateur services.

The second point is connected with the results of the compatibility studies. They demonstrated that is it not possible to ensure it. Correspondingly, avoiding interference for systems which already function in this range is already impossible. So the distance which is required in order for interference not to happen is so huge that using them in countries which live 1,000 miles from each other could cause, could still cause interference to emerge.

So our position in the RCC countries is that there should not be any further allocations here, method B. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Pastukh. Are there any questions on agenda item 1.4? I think all options are on the table, and that we will have a world conference to be quite lively on this agenda item.

Seeing none, ask you to have five more minutes in order to conclude.

>> Yes, Chairman, that is no problem at all.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Therefore, we can move on to the last agenda item, which is agenda item 1.15, moving quite quickly. This is an item which is usually resolved quite quickly at the world conference. Therefore, there are no surprises, that the aim of this is to study whether we need spectrum demands for communication stations onboard vessels. The studies which have been undertaken at ITU during the study period have shown that the use which is made was perhaps not optimal.

Therefore, for the moment, the communications are analogical and unfortunately as well quite cryptic in the communications. There is no harmonization of the use of the frequency bands. Therefore, the logical conclusion has been to suggest a little housekeeping to introduce new digital technologies, and

to look further at the channeling of these frequencies. Therefore, you can see on the slide in front of you, this is the method which is being proposed.

A new technique has been suggested to avoid interference on congestion and to use the CTCSS, and the DCS, and the listen before talk LBT. This is one of the first proposals. In the study period, the recommendation by ITU-R 1174-2 has been revised which has been proposed to introduce channels from 25 kilohertz and 12.5 kilohertz for the analogic tunnel, and 12.5 and 16.5 for the digital.

These were proposed, new table, which clearly explains the channeling of the frequencies. This recommendation was adopted, and therefore, there is nothing left in the method but to look at the footnote which is 5.287.

You can see in the final table, you can see it is listed in green, everyone supports this method.

Therefore, unless there are any questions from the panelists, if there are any questions from the floor, I'm not going to give the floor to the panelists because the situation is clear. Are there any questions from the floor on agenda item 1.15? I call this a lucky agenda item because it finishes first, perhaps winning on this point on the first day of the conference.

With this, we could move on to the last item which is to thank all of you for your attention and the panelists who have been with me today who have explained the points to you, and before concluding, I'd also like to thank the interpreters. I'd also like to give the floor to Philippe Aubineau.

>> PHILIPPE AUBINEAU: Thank you, I will be very brief, to remind everyone that tomorrow we start at 9:00, so please you are welcome to join us again at 9:00 tomorrow morning in this room. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The meeting is adjourned. See you tomorrow morning.

(meeting adjourned at 1704)

This text is being provided in an unedited Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

2 SEPTEMBER 2015

9:02

This text is being provided in an unedited Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> CINDY COOK: Good morning, everyone. If you will grab your seats, we will get started. Welcome to the first session of the day. This morning's panel session number three is on WRC-15 agenda item 1.1. The entire session is devoted to the one agenda item and we will be going through all of the candidate bands. So I think it will take us quite a bit of time and I would certainly encourage active participation from everyone.

I would like, first, to welcome you all and say good morning. And introduce the gentlemen who are up here with me. For those who don't me, I am Cindy Cook. I am from Canada. And have been actively involved in particular in the CPM text for agenda item 1.1. Also with me from the APT is Mr. Alan Jamison. From ASMG, Mr. Sultan Albalooshi. From the ATU, Mr. Silulami Doyi. From the CEPT, Mr. Pasi Toivonen. From CITEL, Mr. Jose Costa, and from the RCC, Mr. Sergey Pastukh. I would like to welcome them and the insight they can bring us of the discussions that took place within their regional organizations on this agenda item.

So we'll start with my deck. For those who aren't aware, 1.1 is to consider additional spectrum allocations to the mobile service on a primary basis and identification of additional frequency bands for IMT, and related regulatory provisions to facilitate the development of terrestrial mobile broadband applications in accordance with resolution 233.

There are three primary methods for this agenda item, method A which is always a method, is the know change method, which may be accompanied by reasons. We have method B which is to make an allocation to the mobile service on a primary basis. There are two ways to do this. There is through the table of allocations, and also through a footnote. And then method C, to identify the frequency band for IMT. So on this slide is what is in the CPM text. For those who have been following, this you will also know that in addition, there can be considers of use associated with either the mobile service allocation or the IMT identification. And there are other considerations as well, which can be made and this is just the continuation from the CPM text of the methods.

The text table, which some of you have seen in presentations by Mr. Obino shows that in addition to these methods, as I said, there are options for conditions of use. These options are many, and are indicated in this slide as the B1, B2, B3, and C1, C2, and C3. They are so numerous and that's I didn't deposit put it in the text. This table is quite useful because it shows for instance, whether our bands that already have a mobile allocation in which case method B would not need to be applied. So it shows all of the options of the different methods and the options that are applicable to each of the individual candidate bands. It gives you all the candidate bands. They are numbered 1 to 19. There are obvious groupings.

In my next slides when we go through the individual candidate bands, and show the positions that have been developed so far, by the individual regional groups, I tried to group some of the bands together, for instance if you look at bands 3 through 6, they are the L band. So together form the larger band. So those will be on one slide. My intention as we go through the slides is to discuss them slide by slide with the panel.

So moving into our next slide, we start with the candidate bands 1 and 2, this is 470 to 698, and the 1400 mega hertz band and this slide indicates the regional positions that have been developed and I will say so far as there are still some regional groups that have one more meeting and you never know what might happen at those meetings. With this slide, I would like to start with our panelists and ask them to perhaps explain how they came at these decisions within their regional groups. If they have anything that in addition that they would like to bring up for our information and, perhaps, for CITEL that does not have any positions, they could explain to us why that is.

So I will start, I think to my left with Sergey, the RC C., please.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Well, the RCC, the regional Commonwealth has determined its position and made proposals regarding two of these frequency bands. As is correctly reflected, we are in favor of no change for these two frequency bands. Turning to the first frequency band, well, the main reason why we suggest taking such a decision is that this band is used for radio broadcasting -- well, broadcasting and the requirements of broadcasting in country of the RCC require further use of this frequency band, ensuring the frequency band as was shown as a results of the studies that's taken in the ITU is very difficult. And it's been demonstrated that administrations will need to choose which service their country will have to use.

One of the services, broadcasting, would not be able to develop in this case. Moreover, we note that for this frequency band, these frequency bands, rather, it's very difficult to ensure a clear border between countries which has chosen one of the other service or broadcasting or IMT. So there will be a need to ensure compatibility. There's a very new -- there's a very large need to have a difference and it's difficult -- as difficult to choose alone. Each country's decision will depend on the neighbors. So what we suggest is that these frequency bands be harmonized for broadcasting across the entire Region 1. There are requirements. There's need to keep it for use by broadcasting services.

As regards the 1350 to 1.400 mega hertz, here our position is also -- due to the fact that we are currently using different systems in in frequency band and they are not compatible with IMT systems. If we look at the results of studies, and taken by the ITU in this area, then there is a lot -- a need for a large distance to be observed. That's on the one hand. And then on the other hand, this is quite close to a passive band used by the radio astronomy service and IMT requirements are very strict vis-a-vis out of band missions. So we suggest that even if this band is dedicated to something else, then really using it for IMT systems would be very complicated if possible at all.

Thank you very much.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CITEL, please. Jose.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. Yeah, in CITEL, first band 470 to 698 has been discussed extensively.]

There have been numerous proposals, and, in fact, there were two proposals, opposite of each other, they had to be canceled according to the resolution 105 that governs the CITEL ways of determining proposals. There were those that want to protect broadcasting fully and they want no changes in the ban. There are many countries in our region that they have not fully converted to digital. They are in the process, maybe in the future, and -- and the priorities for broadcasting.

The countries that proposed the mobile service allocation and identification for IMT, they did that mainly to provide flexibility for the future. Again, they want to protect fully the broadcasting service, but with a view of the future and they made proposals for mobile service allocation and identification for IMT.

One interesting part of this proposals is that they were not only for Region 2, but they were proposed to be global mobile locations. Another peculiarity about this band, 470 to 698, that the band from 608 to 414 is for radio astronomy. This is for allocation and so the bands were 470 to 608 and 614 to 698, and they had different proposals. None has gone through and what is suspected is that the conference there will be multicountry proposals, both with no change, and proposing mobile service allocation and identification for IMT.

Regarding the other band, 1350 to 1400 mega hertz, there was one preliminary proposal of allocation to the mobile service and identification for IMT, but didn't get any for the support. So that didn't go anywhere. So that's about it.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. CEPT, please.

>> PASI TOIVONEN: Thank you. For the television broadcasting, the 470-694, this is based on the current, existing heavy use for this band of broadcasting and also the future requirement for broadcasting in this band. In many European countries, this band is also used for the SAP applications, mainly the radio microphones.

In Europe, we also are going through the -- in many countries, the transition phase from SD to HD television broadcasting. That adds the requirements for using this band for television broadcasting. For the other band, the 1350, 1400 megahertz, I think the reasoning given by Sergey was also partly covering the CEPT condition. In Region 1, we have the fixed mobile radio location, allocation in this band but in Region 2, there is only are radio allocation in this band. So already by this basis, it makes it very difficult to have the global identification for IMT in this band.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. Then moving down we have the ATU, please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Chairperson and good morning, Distinguished Delegates. From the ATU point of view in, terms of band one, we have no change position to the radio regulations, due to the fact that the band is also used in Africa quite intensively for -- by the broadcasting service, and also to have a certainty going forward for the requirements for broadcasting.

With regards to 1350 to 1400, we have a common position from ATU, which is method C1. However, we take being because we have got an outstanding matter of actually coming up with some form of commonality with regard to regulator considerations of unwanted demolition levels that should be separated, for the adjacent band 1400 to 1427 mega hertz band to protect passive services. So that's been delegated to the various regions. They will submit to the ATU Secretariat as to what are their options.

Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. I will move in order down the podium. So we have the APT next.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Madam Chairman and good morning to you and to everybody.

And my suitcase arrived! It looks good, right?

(Laughter).

So I'm a much happier camper today. The story in the APT is very similar to what you heard from the other regions. The UHF band, 470 to 698 or their portion of it, it was primarily protection of broadcasting and was strong position of opposition to identifying that band for IMT. However, I do need to make two observations. The first of which is for region three, the mobile services allocation already exists and has existed for a long time in this portion of the spectrum. So for region three, it would only be a matter of identification. So that sits Region 4 a little bit apart from the other regions. The other point I would make is that while there was strong opposition on the basis of protecting the broadcasting service, there was, indeed, a proposal that was tabled to identify this portion of the UHF band for IMT, however, there was insufficient numbers to justify our proposal on that particular band.

Coming to the second band, the 1350 to 1400 megahertz, this band too was not particularly popular. There were some proposals for the band to identify it for IMT, but it was insufficient to justify a preliminary APT proposal on this band and there were certainly concerns because of radio location, allocations in this band, and quite heavy usage in a number of APT countries. So those proposals just were insufficient to win through. So thank you, Madam Chairman.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much.

And the ASMG, please.

>> SULTAN ALBALOOSHI: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As regards the Arab possession on this candidate band that is band 470 to 694 or 698 megahertz, we are in favor of making no change in Region 1.

This is in line with method A1. This is for the following reasons. This frequency band is used a great deal for broadcasting, sound broadcasting. Now, identification of this band for IMT would involve a new sharing out of terrestrial channels for broadcasting. This would require a great deal of coordination between countries and would also take a great deal of time.

As regards the second frequency band, the Arab countries are also in favor of making to change in this band due to the fact that this band is currently allocated to radio locations and affects services, in addition to mobile services. Sharing has indicated that it's difficult to ensure the coexistence of fixed services with -- with fixed services, rather, especially since there are radars working and operating in the same geographical region.

For this reason, IMT telecommunications -- I beg your pardon, mobile services cannot use these frequencies in a coordinated manner on a global basis. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. I would like to now open to the floor for -- if there are any additional views or if there are any questions for our panelists. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Argentina would like to ask you if regions who opted for no change apart from APT, which was clear on this in the speech, if they could say whether or not in their area they looked at the possibility of making some kind of co-localisation, between mobile IMT services and broadcasting to give some kind of flexibility to this band in the future, and whether or not it was considered and if so, what results they obtained. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Okay. Thank you. Would anybody like to start with that, Sergey?

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much. And thank you for the question, which is very important for this band, these bands in our opinion. As I said, in my intervention, the requirements for ensuring compatibility between two services mean that there are very large distance requirements. And in connection with this, we suggest that the choice of one country, as to which service they will use has a very strong effect on other countries. As a result, we suggest that here a common decision needs to be taken which needs to be coordinated to ensure that the mobile or broadcasting services can function. If I were to sum up, then the situation is that the allocation on a joint basis of bands would lead to big problems during implementation, since we would have a decision taken by countries which is not coordinated across countries, vis-a-vis the services they used and this would lead to huge problems in ensuring compatibility at the border, up to 100 or even 200 kilometers from the border.

So I would like to say that this decision is not acceptable. The joint allocation would not allow both services to develop normally.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. Did anybody else -- oh. APT.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Well, perhaps to provide a contrary view, the experience of the APT was having allocations for the broadcasting service and the mobile service and, indeed the fixed service in these bands has been all good. We have not had any implementation difficulties because it becomes a matter of national policy in terms of how the band is to be used. And it happens that the customary use of this particular part of the UHF band in Region 3 has largely been

for broadcasting. And that is acknowledged and accepted and as a consequence, the broadcasting service has been able to develop as has traditional mobile services.

Admittedly not IMT at this stage, but we had no real difficulties in terms of implementation and as I said before, the allocations in Region 3 do go back a long time, in excess of 30 years, I believe. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CEPT, please.

>> PASI TOIVONEN: Thank you. For CEPT, at this conference, the 1 to 700 megahertz is a key issue and making that available for mobile, let's say is one proposal and we should also view the no change for the 4796 and the 700 megahertz. So we clearly have a clear position on 47694, especially considering also the sharing and the compatibility studies which clearly shows significant separation distances between possible implementation of IMT and the broadcasting.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. Did anybody else want to address? AT U., please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Chairperson. I think from an ATU point of view, it was exactly for this reasons that we made that observation earlier on, for instance when 700 megahertz band was actually allocated to make an observation that will enter into some difficulties if force of 692 would also be suggest to some customary allocation. The governments will actually have to take a decision, a policy decision on a national service and service to actually implement. So it has no effect on neighboring countries which would make coordination difficult are, therefore I think we made that observation and made the request to ITU to actually say earlier on, we would like as a force of 692 to be harmonized exclusively for the broadcasting service. Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you, CITEEL, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairperson. In CITEEL, we have studied the 700 megahertz and there are two recommendations, one on the sharing and the other one on the coordination procedures in both areas. Now, for this, thoughts for the new allocation identifications, the intention was to use 921 for the protection of broadcasting in neighboring countries.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. ASMG, please.

>> SULTAN ALBALOOSHI: Thank you, Mrs. Chair. With regard to the position. Arab group, we believe there are difficulties as seen in certain studies. If a certain country wants to use a band for broadcasting these services, and another neighboring country would like to use it for the IMT and therefore, these countries will find difficulties in coordination between them.

As for internal use of countries, it will be a mere national decision taken by that country. And therefore, the Arab group does support the no change position in this context, thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. I would like to move on to our next slide, recognizing that we have five more to go, and quite a few more bands and limited time, and then would suggest that if there are additional questions or additional comments, if we have time at the end, we can make them at that time. But I noticed that the RCC asked for the floor.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Sorry, Madam Chair, but I would just like to briefly comment on the situation when in Region 3, we have mobile services and broadcasting services allocated together, and this have been no reports of any problems.

I would like to say that there should not be any problems, because the mobile service, in this band uses narrow band and the systems which -- and by systems which are local, they don't cover the whole territory, unlike what we are expecting from rollout of IMT. So here we need to look carefully at the applications in mobile services, which are really different from IMT. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you.

We will move on no our next slide then. So on our next slide, we have the four frequency bands that are candidate bands and are under the L band as a whole. We see a lot more green on this slide. So this time, I think I would like to start at the other end of our podium and we will start with the ASMG, and, again, I would ask if we could also, in this particular case, I know this has been quite a bit of

discussion within the regional groups on some of the conditions of use for the L band. In particular, open the out-of-band emission limits into the 1400, to the 1427 megahertz. So at the same time, if our regional representatives could explain those discussions within their regional groups and what options they might be considering or have decided on for those out-of-band emission limits. ASMG, please.

>> SULTAN ALBALOOSHI: Thank you, Mrs. Chair. With regards to the bands that are indicated on the slide before you, the first band from 1427 to 1452, the position of the Arab Group is no change. Because common studies have indicated with coexistence with the fixed services have proven that the distances have been calculated for operational uses, and the common channels and they are too long. And therefore, it might not be able to use them for fixed services. As for the other bands from 1452 until 1558 megahertz, the Arab Group does support identifying these bands for the IMT, the International Mobile Telecommunications. According to the method, C1 and band 1452 to 1492 megahertz.

As with regards to the last portion of the band which is 1518 to 1525 megahertz, the Arab Administration would prefer not to carry out any change in this band because it is a neighboring band to a band that is currently used for the mobile satellite services.

Thank you, Mrs. Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: APT, please.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Madam Chair. For APT, the two bands which are shown with green are the only two bands which the APT are proposing to be identified for IMT out of all the candidate bands. So we were able to reach agreement on these two bands, 1427 to 1452, 1492 to 1518. Recognizing that there are already allocations to the mobile service in these bands, predominantly on a global basis. So there's the added attraction of there being the possibility of global harmonization in these bands. The segment 1452 to 1492 was certainly proposed but the APT was quite divided on this particular segment and was not able to come to a view, either supporting Oracle opposing the identification of that segment for IMT.

Coming to the point about unwanted emissions, this matter certainly was discussed and has been reflected in the resolution that we are proposing in association with our proposal for the identification of IMT in these bands. The full details of that can be seen in the -- in your document, Madam Chair, in terms of the APT proposals. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. The ATU, please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Madam Chair. From ATU, as well, we have considered the fact that the bands -- some of the bands already are allocated to the mobile service. Now coming to 1427 to 1452, a similar approach would actually apply as in 1350 to 1400 with a view of protecting passive services to 1400 to 1427 megahertz band. It's one issue that the last meeting. ATU was actually explicit on to allocate subregions to seriously consider the adequate protection of massive services in terms of those levels. Band four and five are also fully supported and we do not have a position on the band six. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. CEPT, please.

>> PASI TOIVONEN: Thank you. For the band 1427 to 1518, we propose that behind it, the IMT for one single band as we have already the mobile allocation in this band. For the technical and regulatory conditions in our proposal, I would like to mention four issues. The first one is the proposal to have the mandatory limited for unwanted emissions into the band 1400 to 1427 megahertz, for mobile terminals and base stations and those values, which we propose are in line well report 2336 and the studies are done in that report.

The other issue is since the band is already allocated to mobile, to WRC-15 should not adopt any regulatory constraints for Region 1 regarding the mobile service and the land mobile service.

To protect the -- in countries listed in footnote 5.342, these countries should reach cross bordering agreements with their neighboring countries.

A third point I would like to mention on our proposal is the -- in order it facilitate the coexistence between the IMT and the mobile service and the broadcasting satellite service in the band 1452 to 1492 megahertz proposal is made for PFD limiting in Article 21, applicable to the broadcasting satellite service.

And the third or the fourth item is that we are making a proposal to revise the resolution to three -- with an invitation to ITU-R recommendation providing the technical measure to develop the competing band, above 1518 and IMT below 1518 megahertz. And as necessary, make guidance to facilitate the coordination with the neighboring administration.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CITEL, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. CITEL, similar to CPT also proposes the whole 1427 to 1418 to be identified for IMT since is already has mobile allocation in Region 2. Regarding the emissions below 1427, and about 1518, the CITEL countries have carefully reviewed the report to you-R RS336 and came to the conclusion that the limits could be relaxed by approximately 3DB. So the resulting of wanted emissions, which by the way, would mandatory like in CPT and that would be done through the proper table resolution 750. So these limits would be minus 72, db watts over 700 megahertz.

There is also a note in the proposal that in the case that MSS has a primary allocation in the band from 1518 to 1559 and with the identification for IMT in the band 1427 to 1518 may be necessary to address compatibility with the MSS in the adjacent band.

Another point that I would like to highlight, that I was able in Region 2 to reach this agreement for this band, is a change proposal on footnote 5.434, which gives priority to the mobile service for three in the band from 1435 to 1535.

Another point regarding resolution 223, CITEL is also proposing an amendment, but the type of amendment besides the editorials is to inviting ITU-R to develop harmonized frequency arrangements to 1492 to 1518 megahertz taking in account the results of the sharing of studies. And as I mentioned also proposed amendments to resolution 750 to include the mandatory limits in table 1.1. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. RCC, please.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. The RCC countries with regards to these four frequency bands have a common position, which is no change. The main reason why we opted for this position is that in accordance with Article 5 of the radio regulations and the footnotes there too, a number of countries in the RCC use aeronautical telemetry systems in this frequency band.

Accordingly, in order to ensure compatibility between IMT systems and aeronautical telemetry systems, we carefully looked at the results of the studies which were carried out in the ITU. These clearly showed that ensuring compatibility would be quite difficult. We also noted that aeronautical telemetry systems are also used in other systems, in particular in Region 2.

But the regulatory situation with regard to these countries is different. In this region, aeronautical telemetry has -- is a priority. It has priority over 9 mobile services. And as I understand it, this allows the problem to addressed in these countries. I'm talking about the problem of ensuring compatibility with the very important services connected to security of life and 4.10 of the radio regulations which pertains to aeronautical telemetry systems. That's the main reason why we are in favor of there being no change in this band. And we don't see any other means of ensuring that the aeronautical telemetry systems can work without any harmful interference and this is very important for us.

I would also like to make a few remarks with regard to, frequency bands 3 and 5, which we also took into account. This requirement for out-of-bound emissions, which will be set forth in the IMT system with the aim of ensuring compatibility with services in neighboring frequency bands will -- will we see that these are very strict requirements. 76-decibels was named as a figure and I would simply like to recall in the 700 range for IMT, we have requirements of minus 25. That's almost 45-decibels

difference. So we have some real doubts that given these limitations. The IMT systems may be -- could be created and could really be inexpensive and could really be used.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. In the interest of time, I won't ask for questions from the floor, but I would like to ask if there are any additional view that would like to be made.

Seeing none, we will move on to the next slide and, again, if we have time at the end, we will ask for questions on all the frequency bands. So our next slide, has no green. So maybe this will be a faster discussion. Here we have the frequency band 1695 to 1710, 2700 to 2900, and 3300 to 3400 megahertz. So moving in the opposite direction, again, we will start with the RCC this time, Sergey, please.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. On these frequency bands, the position of the RC C. countries, there's no change. And I will just look at the frequency bands in order quickly. As regards frequency band 7, this is a very narrow frequency band for IMT systems. It's possible that in regions where in neighboring bands used for IMT, this would have some usefulness, but for countries in the region of the RCC, it is a very narrow band and we see that there is no need for it to be allocated to IMT. With regard to frequency band 8, this is a frequency band that is intensively used by radio location services with us, and the results of studies have shown that ensuring -- it's almost impossible to ensure compatibility. Moreover, we have a situation with regard to the borders of two countries. It's quite similar to the situation that we had in the one previous bands. Here a joint decision needs to be taken by all countries, since if one country begins roll out IMT, then the radio location service in another country may encounter great difficulties in further -- in its further development and in further use of these bands.

With regards to frequency band number 9, there is also a similar situation with regard to -- with regard to frequency band A, it's intensively used by other incompatibility systems, incompatibility with IMT, and for these reasons, the RCC countries decision is for no change. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CITELE, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. Regarding the band number 7, there have been no proposals within CITELE. Regarding band number 8, 2700 to 2900 megahertz, similar to RCC, it is noted that the co-frequency sharing is not possible between radio in the same geographical location. So CITELE's position is no change.

Regarding band number 9, from 3300 to 3400 megahertz, there were some proposals, but they didn't receive tough support to become interAmerican proposals N. Region 2, there's a secondary location so it would be necessary to rise that to a primary location and identification for IMT, but there's no interAmerican proposals at this time. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CEPT, please.

>> PASI TOIVONEN: Thank you. For band 7, in Europe, we have a lot of receiving earth station receiving satellite systems and the compatibility studies show that the current usage is not compatible with the typical mobile deployment of IMT, and the addition of this band is very narrow. So those are the two reasons for no change in this band.

Concerning band 8, we have prepared a draft ECP for no change in this band and at the final meeting of CPG, we will see the outcomes of discussions concerning this ECP. So this is the only bending ECP on agenda item 1.1, concerning band number 9, at the moment, the band is heavily used by different radar applications and the compatibility studied clearly indicate that, that the sharing between the radio location and the IMTs is not feasible.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. ATU, please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Madam Chair. We will go straight to band 8. Our position is clear on band 7, in the interest of time. We've got no common position at this stage, and we also recognize that code frequency sharing is not feasible between radars and IMTs but the subregions will definitely

consider in formulating for their final positions on the -- on this frequency band, a possibilities of a frequency segmentation. After individual member states have actually assessed the usage of radars in their respective countries.

Also on band 9, we do not have a common position. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. APT, please.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. In terms of the APT positions, very similar on bands 7 and 8, to what we have heard from others. Band 7, the meteorological satellite service is quite extensive use of that band. And it's a narrowed band so we don't see it as being possible for IMT. Band eight, the radio location, the radars, the radars and IMT do not live happily together. So we opted for no change in that band. Band 9, we opted for proposals but it was insufficient to provide for a preliminary proposal, and it was also noted that radar usage in that band would make it difficult in any event. So the APT opted not to have a band. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. ASMG, please.

>> SULTAN ALBALOOSHI: Thank you, Mrs. Chair. As expressed, the possession of the Arab group is no change with regard to these bands and as for the reasons for each of these bands, the no change, for band 7, we have the same reasons that we have already mentioned previously. As for bands 8 and 9, the reasons are due to the fact that these bands are used by the radar applications. And that coexistence between the IMT applications is not possible in this geographical area. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. Similar to our last slide, I will ask if there are any additional views. All right. Thank you.

Seeing none, we will move on to the C band.

The frequency bands here, number 10, 11, 12, 13 are the 2400 to the 4200 bands, the C bands. Here you will see that we have some green. So there are some proposals for IMT. The reason it says B and C is because in some regions, there is no mobile allocation. So a mobile allocation would have to, done as well as the IMT identification. So with that introduction, we will start again at the right side. So we will start with the ASMG, please.

>> SULTAN ALBALOOSHI: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. With regards to the first band, number 3400 to 3700 megahertz, the Arab group considers that we should take into consideration the IMT and integrate these into this band.

Equally, we also have a requirement to change other bands to dedicate these to the International Mobile Telecommunications services. Without implementing regulation 91, because it would not have an impact on the speed. We would hope nevertheless to maintain a certain coordination.

With regards to regulations 917 and 918 of the radio regulations, 917 and 918, and equally, we would like to maintain the speed as it is indicated in the table for 421. And this is in accordance with methods B and C.

B1 and C1, can regards to the other three frequency bands, the Arab Groups believes we do not have a need to introduce any changes at this current stage. And this is why these bands allow for a large satellite coverage within the framework of these frequency bands. This is because this is part -- this represents an important part of the infrastructure of many countries. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. And you reminded me of one of my questions I wanted to ask those who have identified methods B and C, and that is, again this is one. Bands where we do expect to see some options likely indicated. In particular, there are some existing footnotes. So I would ask those who have indicated methods B and C, what their positions are on the existing footnotes and the PFD levels and, of course, as ASMG noted, the coordination that are indicated within. So thank you, ASMG. APT, please.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Well, the APT has opted for no change in bands, 10, 11, 12 and 13. These particular bands, known as C band, I guess, are extensively used within Region 3 for fixed satellite service, and as such, there is wide support within the APT members for continued access to this spectrum by the FSS and protection of that service.

In addition, in band 10, it should be noted, however, that picking up on your last point, Madam Chairman, the APT members came to an agreed view in regard to the footnotes affecting the 3.4 to 3.6 gigahertz band that for their particular band, that any APT member, may if it so wishes, submit a proposal to WRC-15 to add their name to the existing footnotes, 5.432b and 5.433a. The Proviso is that there is to be no change of the conditions of use that's currently expressed in those footnotes. So with that Madam Chairman, I pass the microphone back to you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. ATU, please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Chairperson. What is reflected on the screen is the outcome of the meeting held in Nairobi in July, by the ATU, but since then, there's been developments. Of course, they held a meeting between 22 and 24 August in Lomed, Togo. Therefore, there's instruction page from the ATU, Madam Chair, to actually change the colors on your screen. The AT U. has a common passion to support 3400 and 3600s. The other are radio regulation number 921 on the second procedure. This is 9.17 and 9.18. And also the issue of the PFD. So those are the issues that will actually resolve later on before the conference actually kicks off.

On the rest of the bands, we maintain a strong no change to support the investment that has been made by the satellite industry.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CEPT, please.

>> PASI TOIVONEN: Thank you. In CEPT, we had the extensive discussion on the entire band 3.4 to 4.2 gigahertz and outcome of this is that we have a proposal for identification of the band 3.4 to 3.8 gigahertz and corresponding mobile allocation in the table of CEPT countries in the radio regulation, and a clear no change to the band 3.8 to 4.2 gigahertz.

Concerning the technical and regulatory conditions on our proposal, we proposed that the coordination between the transmitting stations and the mobile service and FSS receiving earth stations will be applied under the 9.17, 9.18.

Further, in our proposal, we indicate that the mobile stations, all the stations in the mobile service, shall not claim more protection from the space stations than provided in the current table 221-4 in Inter alia regulation.

In addition, we recognize that there may be difficult coexistence situations outside of Europe, where there is a deployment of uncoordinated receiving FSS earth stations.

In some countries and IMT stations in the neighboring countries and I'm referring especially to the band 3.6 to 3.8 gigahertz. For this regions, we recognize that the administration's having these earth stations may includes provisions based on the existing footnotes for this frequency range.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CITEL, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, this range from 3400 to 4200 has been discussed extensively in CITEL, and produced as a result of the last meeting, the final meeting of the CITEL preparations. In Region 2, there is already a primary mobile location from 3500 to 4200. So the B -- the option B is to achieve a primary mobile location from 3400 to 3500, where currently there are only 13 countries, of 5.431A and extend it to the whole region.

And the other part is the identification for IMT. That's from 3400 to 3600. And no change to the remainder of the band. Regarding the limits, that is still being considered. It's noted in the proposal that's necessary to establish guarantee sharing of IMT operating in the band 3400 and 3600 megahertz with FSS operating in 3600 and 4200 megahertz. So more work needs to be done on that.

The other comment I would like to make -- (No audio) for the whole band from 3400 to 4200, the other one was for the mobile location and identification for IMT from 3400 and no change from 3700 to 4200.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. RCC, please.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. The RCC's position with regard to these four frequency bands in the C band downlink range is no change.

I would like to make a remark on frequency band 10 in greater detail and explain the position of the RCC. We believe that this frequency band, at least in Region 1 has already been considered. It was considered at the WRC in 2007, and it was practically identified for IMT and all countries who wish to roll out IMT have the opportunity to do so.

Therefore, in -- being in favor of no change, we are not against the decisions of the conference in 2007. What we are saying here is that this band has already been defined as being for IMT and certain defined conditions and it is being used for IMT. The RCC does oppose something. We don't see the possibility of the globalization of this frequency band. When we say that we do not support IMT, we do not support a global allocation of frequency bands 3400 to 3600 to it.

As regards frequency bands 11 to 14, well, I will not repeat the reasons which were already set forth for this before me. For the very same reasons, we do not support an allocation of IMT to these frequency bands. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you, RCC. Do we have any additional views, comments from the floor? Iran, please?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Good morning to all distinguished colleagues and friends. It was mentioned by Dr. Jamieson, and Mr. Costa, 2.6 megahertz was as result of WRC 7 and based on difficult discussions which resolved finally by having those conditions. Dr. Jamieson mentioned that this condition needs to be maintained, and three conditions, 921 PFT and 917, to be proposed to the first one by Russia. And this was accepted by everybody.

Dr. Jamieson mentioned the view of APT is a very important point. Anyone who wishes to add their name to the footnote, it's free. Currently it's 81 or 82 countries. If it's a reasonable number. It's not appropriate to have 160 countries in the footnote and not in the table. So there is a balance, if we could discuss that.

Now coming to 719 and 718, just regulatory-wise, 917 is dealing with a specific earth station, and typical mobile earth to station. 918 are talking of traditional terrestrial service, fixed and mobile. It doesn't talk about IMT. That's why in WRC 7, 921 was the first conditions that depends on the countries and the PFT is the levels. So breaking this conditions seems to be very, very difficult situation and creates discussions at the WRC and it was not -- it is not possible to protect the earth to stations only by 917 and 918. It is totally insufficient and inadequate.

So we will discuss it at WRC 2015, but I think APT situation was looking into all aspects and tried to provide logic for this no change. Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. Any other views from the floor? All right. Thank you.

Recognizing that there are only two minutes left in this session, first, I would like to ask the interpreters if it might be possible to have an additional five or 10 minutes. We would finish absolutely by 10:30. Interpreters, would that be okay?

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, Madam Chair, that's fine.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. Noting, that I would like the next two slides to do them together. I think that will save us some time. So if we move to the next slide. We see here that we have three bands in the four gigahertz range with the RCC indicating support for IMT in two of those bands. And then if we move to the next slide, we see here quite a bit of red with the RCC indicating support for one of the bands in that slide.

So I would like to ask our regional representatives if they can cover all the bands on both slides in their remarks. And I think it's appropriate that we start with the RCC this time. Sergey, please.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Firstly, I will very quickly try to recap our position, why the RCC countries support frequency bands 14 and 16, asU. see on this slide. We consider these frequency bands as being a possible replacements to some countries where it's not possible to use a C band downlink as a possible solution to meet the requirements the IMT system in these two frequency bands. The frequency bands are close to one another, and the allocation of the two mobile services in this frequency band has already happened on a global level, in all three regions. And in the RCC countries, these bands are used by such -- by those systems with which we can ensure compatibility in all IMT systems.

As regards the frequency bands on the next slide, the one 592, 6945 megahertz, we support this frequency band for meeting the requirements, the IMT systems in high traffic areas. This frequency band can be used within office systems, and under such situations, it can ensure compatibility with FSS uplink systems allowing for this to be achieved under certain circumstances. Therefore, we propose allocating to this frequency band and it's a resolution in which limitations will be set forth for the IMT systems, which will allow us to ensure compatibility of this with FSS systems.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CITEL, please.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. For the sake of time, I will be very brief. CITEL has position of no change from 4500 to 4800 megahertz. From 5350 to 5470 megahertz and from 5925 to 6425 megahertz. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. CEPT, please.

>> PASI TOIVONEN: Thank you. Yes, I will try to be also brief for all of these six bands on the screen, or the previous slide, we have no change, proposal and most of the bands that there is an existing heavy use of the current systems and also forcing existing heavy use and in addition, the sharing studies have indicated most of these bands that the sharing is not feasible. For the all in band, I think there was a clear indication from the studies and I refer to band 17, no compatibility and no mitigation techniques have been discovered so far, and also for band 18, I think this was only one method in the CPM text, and no change.

Thank you.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. ATU, please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Madam Chair. For the remaining bands, it's a no change for ATU, with the exception of band 16. The last African preparatory meeting, the way views for support for individual subregions of Member States, but that unfortunately did not run in the African common position at the time. So this is one of the outstanding issues that would be addressed by this subregion and they will communicate their decision directly to the ATU.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. APT, please.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. For bands 14 and 16, the APT does not have a stated view. The band certainly would discuss there were some proposals but insufficient to carry through to a proposal.

Also in terms of the remaining bands, throughout this area, where APT is very conscious of the are FSS usage in these bands and also the work concerns regarding sharing, and we make reference to particular sections of the CPM report, which indicate that sharing is difficult to being nonfeasible.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you. ASMG, please.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Madam Chair. Regarding the frequency bands, we would not like to or introduce any changes to these. This is because we have implemented services, particularly in the

bands 14 and 16 and 19. With regards to the frequency bands 17, 18, today we only have one option, which is not to introduce any changes here.

Concerning band 15, we have already adopted the principle of not making any changes because appendix 30b of radio regulations shows that there is a global plan. Therefore, this frequency band is not compatibility and would not allow us to use telecommunication, International Mobile Telecommunications.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CINDY COOK: Thank you very much. Do we have any additional views in the room?

All right. Seeing none, I had said if we had time for questions, I would give the opportunity to ask them. We don't really. So I apologize for that. But if you do have any questions, I'm sure the representatives from the regions would be happy to meet with you during the break to discuss those. I want to take the opportunity to thank everyone that is up here, and for their input and their insights, and with that, I will say that the next session will start at 10:50 for panel number 4, and thank you very much. This meeting is adjourned.

(Break).

(A CART Captioner is present and standing by.)

>> MARTIN FENTON: Ladies and gentlemen, if you will take your seats, we will start presently. Thank you.

Thank you and good morning, welcome to the 4 panel session. Including 1.2, and 1.3, and issue 9.1, 9.1.7, time permitting, which I hope we will have. My name is Martin Fenton. I'm from the UK, from the regulators of the UK and I will be chairing it panel session.

With me on the podium, from the ASMG, we have Abdulhadi AbuAlmal, and from APT, we have Zhu Keer, and from ATU, we have Silulami Doyi, and from CEPT, we have Steve green, and from CITEL, we have Jose Costa and from RCC, we have Sergey Pastukh.

We move on to the first slide, agenda item 1.2. This is to examine the results of ITU-R studies in accordance with resolution 232, on 694-790 megahertz, by the mobile, except aeronautical mobile, service in Region 1 and take appropriate measures.

This is specific to a single region. So when we come through to get the views of the regional groups, I will first come to the regional groups, within Region 1, but I will give the other regional groups to express any issues they may have as a consequence of what happens in -- as a result of this agenda item in Region 1.

So if we move on to the next slide, so preparation work has identified a number of -- or the agenda item is split into a number of issues, four issues, A, B, C and D. And there are a number of methods associated which have been identified for each of these issues. For issue A which is refinement of the lower band edge, we had essentially a single method, which is to set the lower edge to -- of the band to 694 megahertz, modify the radio regulations, Article 5 to add a primary mobile allocation, and identification for IMT for the band 692 -- sorry, 694 to 790 megahertz, and for modification of numbers 5.317a and 5.312a, there are two options. Option one is modification of resolution 232 by the WRC and option two is addition of a new resolution XXX.

Issue B is technical in regulatory conditions applicable to the mobile service concerning the compatibility between the mobile service and the broadcasting service. We have four methods, method B1 is no change. Method B2 is a reference in footnote to Recommendation 1036 or a revision of 1036, and a new recommendation for out of band limits, which would set the technical conditions. Method B3 GE06 applies to regulatory mechanisms in a new or revised WRC15 resolution, a method B4, again, GE06 applies and 921 also applies for the operation of MSS -- sorry MS in relation to protection of the broadcasting service.

For issue C, which is technical and regulatory conditions applicable to the mobile service concerning the compatibility between the mobile service and the ARNS for countries listed in footnote 5.312, there

are six methods. I won't go through all of those methods here right now, but there are six methods in relation to solutions and all based on results of various different studies that were conducted within JTG 4567. So if we move to issue D, this is solutions for accommodating the requirements for applications ancillary to broadcasting. Three methods are given, all include modification of the existing upper limit of the frequency band mentioned in number 5.296 for the secondary allocation to 694 megahertz, and extension of that use to applications ancillary to program making.

Method D1 also includes identification of 6942 to 790 megahertz via a new footnote for applications ancillary to broadcasting and program making. Method D2 includes a new WRC resolution to accommodate the operability of the frequency band 694 to 790 megahertz for applications ancillary to broadcasting and program making, taking into account the progress described in resolution 59 and method D3, which is no additional provisions.

So moving on to the regional positions in relation to issues A and B, I have indicated them in the table here. I will go along the regional groups and ask them to explain their positions. Perhaps they could start with issue A and then we'll move on to issue B afterwards. So perhaps RCC, you could go first, thank you.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

With regards to issue A, the countries of the RCC, define the current position as the lower edge of allocation for mobile services needs to be at 694 megahertz. And secondly, we prefer using resolution two and not the new resolution. That's option one in which it indicates all of the necessary conditions for allocation.

Moreover, I would like to note that the RCC has not yet defined a final position, and at our next meeting, which will take place next week, the RCC's countries will consider this issue, and we'll adopt a common position on this issue.

Turning to issue B, should I also explain that?

>> MARTIN FENTON: Perhaps we could get the -- all the regional groups to explain issue A first and then we'll come to issue B afterwards. So if you have finished, Sergey, CEPT.

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In CEPT's preparation for this agenda item, we did consider the two options, whether it's to start off with resolution 323, which effectively sets out the studies that are required under this agenda item and whether we should try to adapt that to become a new resolution that would set out technical conditions for the band, or if we should start fresh from a new resolution, and develop that explicitly for the purpose of setting out technical conditions.

The decision in CEPT was we wanted to start off with a new resolution, rather than adapt one that was focused on studies that were carried out in this study period and that's why we are supporting option two in that. So we've got to -- a European common proposal which sets out a proposal for a new resolution that would cover all the necessary elements for that.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you, Steve. So ATU.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, chairman. The ATU supports 694 megahertz and would also like to associate ourselves with the option one, the modification of the -- of the resolution 232, specifying all necessary conditions related to the allocation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. And ASMG.

>> ABDULHADI ABOUALMAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Arab Administrations and with regards to item 8, with regards to improving the lower edge of the band to identify the lower edge to 694 megahertz. While supporting the second choice, which requires a new resolution, are and to delete resolution 232.

And the reason behind this, is that resolution 232 does include a number of conditions or items that will be amended according to the methods that will be adopted at the WRC with regards to questions B, C and D.

The Arab Administrations also support identifying the OOBE for the IMT equipment to a value of minus 25 DBM for every 8 megahertz in order to protect the broadcasting services in the band, which is less than 694 megahertz.

While I take into consideration that the Arab Administrations do support the common document, with the other regional groups, and which will be sent to the radio assembly, with regards to the common solution, with regards to the recommendation related to the OOBE.

Also agreement has been reached to send out a common document from the group of Arab administrations to support the procedures of the channel 700, which is indicated in the amended version of the recommendation, 1036 fourth version.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that.

Before I turn to the floor for any other views, I would just give the opportunity for either CITEL or APT to say anything if they wish to. Yes, CITEL.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. Well, in general 1.2, not specifically on this issue A, but, of course it doesn't apply to Region 2, but we have some preliminary views and we have been watching so that there would be no regulatory implications on Region 2 on any of this work, and also we see the work on agenda item 1.1 as distinct, even if it deals with some of the same bands.

And finally, even this is for Region 1, it would be nice to have harmonization of frequencies globally, as far as possible. Thank you, Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. APT.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to explain how agenda item, and the situation in APT is that most of the APT members believe that this is a Region 1 issue and any possible regulatory and all technical decisions on this agenda item should be limited to Region 1 and Islamic Republic of Iran, which is party to GE06 agreement and such decisions should not include future services in Region 3 administrations that have not seen to the GE06 agreement. So therefore we agreed on the position. There's no need to develop any preliminary APT common proposal for this agenda item.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that. On issue A, are there any other views from the floor that people would like to express? I see no one asking for the floor. So perhaps we could now move on to issue B, and perhaps I will start at the other end of the table. ASMG on issue B.

>> ABDULHADI ABOUALMAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. With regards to question B, and with the technical and regulatory conditions that are applied to the IMT, and with regards with compatibility with broadcasting services, the group of the Arab administrations believe that we have to support method B1, which requires no change on the radio regulations because there's no deed for new provisions in view of the fact that the Geneva Convention of 2006, does include the necessary provisions to provide protection. So the broadcasting services in neighboring countries.

And the Arab group does emphasize the nonsupport of any new additional restrictions, including the application of number 694.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. ATU.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: The ATU also supports B1, which is no change to regulatory regulations and ATU countries are part of a GE06 and therefore, the existing procedures of that apply to the coordination of mobile and broadcasting services. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. CEPT.

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CEPT also supports method B1, which means no new provisions for dealing with compatibility between mobile and broadcasting. We believe all the necessary requirements are dealt with by the Geneva 06 agreement. Method B1 foresees that there is a recommendation on out of band limits for the mobile use of the band 69479C and a large number of CEPT countries have been supporting the draft recommendations that has been it's been making its way through the ITU and was recently sent by the Study Group 52, right communication assembly.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. RCC?

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

The RCC has a preliminary position on this issue, which will be clarified at next week's meeting. And this position consists of us supporting method B3, which provides for technical conditions in the radio regulations, in order to ensure protection of broadcast services in the frequency bands under 694, megahertz and within the frequency band 694 to 790.

The reason why we are in favor of this solution is that we analyzed the results of compatibility studies between mobile services and broadcast services. And firstly, we noticed that Geneva 06 does not take into account when determining an edge of threshold determined that the cumulative or the aggregate interference effect from IMT systems was not taken into account, and this was about 20-decibels, all told and this effect of aggregate interference should be compliance with the resolution -- the resolution under 1.2 and should be considered by the conference. The necessary decision needs to be taken in this regard at the conference.

Secondly, we noticed that studies on influence on a neighboring bands, both by the broadcast service and mobile service were not set forth in the form of an ITU-R document. We do not have full agreement. We have three figures for restrictions of out of band emissions for mobile services. Therefore, we suggest that on this parameter, the conference should also take a decision. And it should decide on how to ensure protection of broadcast services in neighboring frequency bands. The final aspect which we noted is that the frequency plans for antisystems, all regional organizations agreed that it should -- there should be nine gigahertz of protection band, and the frequency bands for mobile services begin from 703 megahertz.

This is a necessary figure to ensure compatibility with broadcast services. Since it is necessary, what we would suggest is that it should be obligatory and correspondingly reflected in the radio regulations. Those are the reasons why 9 countries of the RCC believe that the necessary technical parameters, which will ensure compatibility, between the mobile services and radio -- broadcasting services, rather, should be included in the radio regulations.

Thank you very much.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that. Just quickly coming to CITELE and APT, any further comments to make? Yes, ASMG.

>> ABDULHADI ABOUALMAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I might switch to English here. Just a comment, with regards to the discussion that we had in the JTG and the previous meetings, I think we could not reach any conclusion regarding the issue, especially that there are no studies have been addressed the guard band, in particular. And that's, why Mr. Chairman, we believe that the current sharing arrange of A7, A8, A9, A10, including 2 by 5, starting from 698, and then 2 by 30 starting from 703, and then 2 by 3 starting from 733, and then additional as well in the remaining decibels can be the single for the whole region.

Just to clarify this issue, there's no agreement about the guard band. This is a pure national issue that can be implemented by one of our administration would like to do. So whether it's 7 or 9 or 10 or 4, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for those views. I think ATU would like to make additional views. Thank you.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Just one point I have overlooked in my presentation on issue B, the ATU supports the band of 6944, the equipment of operating in the new 33 megahertz and this value should be contained in a new non-mandatory recommendation. And accordingly, the ATU would be making a submission to the assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that.

Are there any other views that would like to be made known from the floor?

I see no one. So in general, on issues A and B, are there any questions anyone would like to make to the -- to the members of the panel? I see. So thank you very much. Moving on to issue C. Here, I

think issue C is largely an issue between RCC and CPT countries. So perhaps I will come first to RCC, and then CEPT, and then I will ask for additional views. RCC. Thank you.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

On issue C, the protection of ARNS, we will also take up a final position on this issue at our meeting next week. So we will talk about our preliminary position. Our position moment is that we consider this issue merely insofar as the conditions for MS have been set by the conference in 2012.

The only question is a certain coordination threshold limit. There are six methods in the CPM report on the figure for this threshold. Well, we looked at them carefully, and we suggest that method C4 is the most appropriate one at the moment.

Between the RCC and CEPT, we do have a process on coordination levels so that they can be set bilaterally on the two sides between countries. We suggest that the radio regulations which cover all possible events or cases should have stricter coordination levels.

However, based on our bilateral talks, countries may, based on specific situations on their borders, achieve much more flexible threshold limits. And we would suggest that this process might allow us to find a common means of resolving issue C at the conference this year.

Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that, and my apologies for referring to you as RRC, and not RCC, which includes the slides. My apologies for that. So CEPT.

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Similar to RCC, CEPT doesn't have a final position on issue C at this point. We are hoping to have that final position at our meeting of CPG which is in two weeks time. So at the moment, we have two options. One of those is based on method C1 and the other one is based on C4, and as Sergey mentions, there's an ongoing process now of some negotiations between individual RCC countries and CEPT countries on coordination agreements. So as I say, we are still -- still considering those two options and we are hoping to have that at ECP, which will be proposing a particular option at our CPG meeting in two weeks' time. Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that. And would any other panel members wish to make any observations?

I see no one. And from the floor, any other views want to be expressed from the floor? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you for that. And moving on to issue D. And issue D is in relation to program making. So I will start this time with ASMG. And issue D.

>> ABDULHADI ABOUALMAL: Thank you.

With regards to issue D, with regards to solutions for accommodating applications ancillary to broadcasting requirements, the group of the Arab Administrations believes that we should support method D3, which requires a modification of the upper limits, the current upper limit for the frequency bands that are indicated in 5.296, footnote 5.296.

Based on an ancillary band. So with a value of 694 megahertz, and to extend such a use for ancillary applications. Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: ATU.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU does not have a common position on the ASB applications at this particular time. But in our previous meetings, the discussions have been around D2, D3, but in all single method actually emerged as a common proposal. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. CPT?

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you. For issue D, the first action is to change the upper limit in the footnote that provides the additional secondary allocation so that it moves down to 694 megahertz. Now, we also realize that something extra needs to be done. So we want to -- in the resolution that we provided, as part of issues A and D, we highlight the fact that the band 694 to 790 or parts of it will continue to be used in a number of countries for these applications ancillary to broadcast, for example, in the center gaps or the band gap. The other thing we need to highlight is the need for ongoing studies on spectrum 4 applications ancillary to broadcasting.

So we have acknowledged that in our proposed resolution, and pointed to resolution 59, which has a framework for ongoing studies on that subject. Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. And RCC?

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman. Once again, I do need to point out that we do need to have a preliminary position on this part at the moment, and the final decision will be made next week. Our position at the moment is method D2, and we note that firstly, there's an element in this method, which we might say are editorial to do with the allocation of bands for mobile services. And as a result, in order to avoid regulatory issues with regulations, we need to make changes to the footnotes.

Secondly, we also suggest that there is a need to point out that SAB and SAP will continue to use different parts which are determined for the mobile service on a primary basis.

And we also suggest that there needs to be a signal sent out that resolution 59 needs to be implemented, ensuring harmonization of frequencies for the application of SAB and SAP Times.

Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that. So are there any other views from the floor or questions from the floor on issue D?

I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. And obviously, if you have any questions for anything you have heard on agenda 1.2 from any of the panel members, then I'm sure they will make themselves available later today and in the breaks. So thank you for that.

So if we could now move on to agenda item 1.3, this is to review and revise, 646 for broadband protection and disaster protect in accordance with resolution 646.

The CPM text contains four methods, A, B, C and D. Method A is editorial updating of resolution 646 and under this method, no change will be made to 646, other than editorial amendments to footnote 1 of resolution 646, and the text Sergey Pastukh rounding it and updating -- and updated reference to ITU-R reports. The broadband PDR requirements will be addressed through ITU studies appropriately. Method B, modification of 646 to include spectrum for broadband PPDR and frequency bands ranges to facilitate harmonization, and under this method, the requirements of broadband PPDR, would be addressed in the revision of resolution 646 method C is to modify resolution 646, excluding PPDR frequencies from the resolution and the addition of a non-mandatory reference to Recommendation 2015 and under this method the requirements of broadband PPDR would be addressed in the revision of the resolution 646.

Method D is modifying suitable global and regional tuning ranges for PPDR operations with their specific frequency arrangements and any national use covered through a non-mandatory reference to -- to Recommendation M2015 and under this method, the proposed revision of 646 would address the requirements of PPDR operations as invited by resolution 648.

So if we could move on to the regional positions, perhaps we can start with RCC this time. So Sergey?

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

On this issue, we also have a preliminary position, and our final position will be adopted next week. Our preliminary position consists of supporting method C. The main reasoning behind this choice of this method is that firstly, the question of PPDR systems is one which we consider to be in the main A national issue, addressed on a national level by national administrations. Therefore, administrations need to have enough flexibility and freedom to select a band frequency for the PPDR system, which corresponds to their national specificities. Moreover, we understand that it is also very important to ensure harmonization of frequency bands so as to ensure that the PPDR systems are inexpensive enough for administrations.

For these purposes, we suggest a recommendation, the ITU-R which will -- which might serve these purposes, and would also create a flexible enough mechanism to ensure that it could be the requirements of PPDR could be reviewed if required.

The third point which I wished to make is that the PPDR system is quite a broad term. And resolution 646 at the moment only provides for PPDR systems in the framework of mobile services. However, in the RCC countries, satellite systems are also used for PPDR purposes. There are also broadcasting services which used these bands, indicating all possible options for frequency use in one resolution for the PPDR is not the right approach. So we will create a separate or regulation. Radio regulations for the PPDR.

Therefore, the mechanism set forth under mechanism method C is the one which seems to us to be the most appropriate in order to achieve two purposes to the goals, firstly, to harmonize frequency to PPDR and ensure that administrations have the necessary flexibility in selecting frequencies taking into being their national situation.

Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. CITELE.

>> JOSE COSTA: Yes, thank you Chairman. CITELE, the American proposal at the meeting just a couple of weeks ago, and in that, there is a proposed revision of resolution 646. I will give some of the highlights, and I would like to go straight to the results part, which is the more important, and we added the new resolved, just to -- well, maybe first I should say why we chose method D is proposes a compromise on specifying something in the resolution, or nothing. It gives us the flexibility in 464, and then they can specify whatever frequencies they wish to use in the recommendation in ITU-R which is much more flexible to update us as required, even for regions, countries, as appropriate.

So with that in mind, there is a new resolves in the proposal from CITELE which is to encourage administrations to consider the frequency in 698 and 869 megahertz or parts thereof as described in the most recent version of 2014 for the provisions of PPDR solutions in order to achieve global harmonization. 698 to 869 is a global range, but you can choose whatever part is intended to be used for PPDR.

And then regarding the existing recognized -- no, the existing resolves on the regional ranges, Region 2 decided to remove the ranges, and instead, there is a new resolve that indicates specific indication, for public protection and disaster relieve, as well as the regions and/or administrations be included in ITU-R 2015. So CITELE decided not to include any specific frequency ranges for Region 2 in that respect. And finally, as a commence of these changes to resolution 646, the proposal is to suppress resolution 648, because the work has already been completed.

Thank you, Chair.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. CEPT.

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CEPT has not yet finalized its positions on gender item 1.3, and that's another item that will be finalized at our final preparation meeting in two weeks' time. Preliminary view, as I have shown on the slide. So CEPT view is that there's no need to direct references to frequency bands oranges for PPDR in resolution 646 and that aligns with method C, however, in order to reach consensus, we have been discussing at CPM and internally at CEPT on the new method D. And so while method C is our primary solution, our preliminary position is that we could also support method D as a way of reaching consensus.

Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. ATU.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU does not have a common position, but our discussions have been around method B and method D, with strong views on both sides. With regards to method D, the views will actually around the fact that some administrations at the moment do not have an assessment or an understanding from the PPDR agencies in terms of the requirements at the national level.

Therefore, going forward, method D would give you flexibility in the future, if those kind of requirements actually arise. However, there was also a strong view to actually supporting method B by some other administrations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that. APT.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman. And APT reached a preliminary common proposal and this slide shows method D, but if I can explain that this is a compromised outcome from APT, this is actually some integration of some aspects of method B and method D.

So in our preliminary common proposal, and if I can introduce the most important resolves section that we have the resolve two, to encourage the global harmonization on the frequency tuning range of 698, to 984 megahertz or parts thereof, and also in resolve 3, we encourage administrations to consider the regional harmonization and the frequency tuning range, and -- and on these Region 2 and Region 3, we have the footnotes which indicates some frequency range, which already used in the different -- some member countries in these regions.

And also the resolves 4, the information on the frequency arrangements for PPDR in this range, as well as further details be described in recommendation ITU M .2015. So this is a compromised outcome from the APT. Thank you, Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. ASMG.

>> ABDULHADI ABOUALMAL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With regards to the use -- the growing use of telecommunications, and mobile telecommunications, today we have a need for an additional spectrum for broadband mobile which would allow us to protect the people and to assure safety services in case there were a disaster, the PPDR.

For this reason, the Arab Group has supported method B. We need to change resolution 646 to include spectrum for broadband applications, which are the PPDR applications. And these applications will meet this aim.

In order to facilitate the regional coordination, and international coordination within these important fora at all levels. The Arab Group has also considered the other proposals to guarantee a certain level of flexibility for methods C and D.

And despite taking this into consideration, we would like to reconfirm the importance of both the regional and international coordination, with a view to develop appropriate and solutions which are less -- not too expensive for all.

These objectives can be reached through method B. Thank you very much.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you very much for that. Are there any other views from the floor? Or anyone wishing to ask a question of the panel members?

I see no one. So thank you very much for -- for that.

So we have about 13 minutes left. So hopefully we can get through the final issue, before us today in this session in that time. This is agenda item 9.1, issue 9.1.7, resolution 647 spectrum management guidelines for emergency service -- I'm sorry, for emergency and disaster relief radio communications. Regulatory and procedural considerations to satisfy this issue are option A, modification of 647 and consequential suppression of 644, option B modification of resolution 647 only, and option C which is suppression of resolution 647 and the consequential modification of 644.

The views of regional groups are in the table. So I will start this time with ASMG.

>> ABDULHADI ABOUALMAL: Thank you, Chairman.

The Arab Group in this case supports method A. To modify resolution 647, followed by the consequential suppression of 644. Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you for that. APT.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman. And APT supports option B as described in the CPM report for this issue and this agenda item 9.1, due to the fact that this encourages administrations to provide the relevant up-to-date information to be included in the database and it maintains internal and external references for the resolution, 647, and also that the resolution 944 is expressly referenced in the convention and should be maintained.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. ATU.

>> SILULAMI DOYI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU is assessing all the options through the various subregions. All the options are being assessed in 697. We don't have a common position at the moment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you, CEPT.

>> STEVE GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, CEPT has looked at combining the necessary elements from the two resolutions, and the method that we have chosen has been based on modification of resolution 644 and putting the essential parts of 647 into that, in particular. And we do see the need to maintain the list of focal points at the ITU.

So I'm hoping that we'll be able to reach some compromise at the WRC on how -- just exactly how to combine the necessary elements from the two resolutions. Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you. CITEL.

>> JOSE COSTA: Thank you, Chairman. Well, CITEL's position is for option A and after that, resolution 647 is used and outside ITU-R in the website and UN specialized agencies and so on, and it's much better known for 644. So it should be retained and updated. Similarly, we do combine the main elements of resolution 644 into 647, including important aspects of early warning and so on.

The results of the proposed revised 647 is strengthened in terms of indicating the ITU-R agencies and regarding the database and their recommendation here is to include the minimum, the focal point on tact information. We don't put the emphasis on the frequencies available. That has been hard to obtain and the more important part is the focal point on the information.

So, yeah, update 647 and suppress 644. Thank you, Chairman.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Thank you.

And our RCC.

>> SERGEY PASTUKH: Thank you very much, Chairman.

On this issue, the RCC countries have not yet made a final decision, and we hope that we will be able to pick one of the options next week. However, we have a position, preliminary position, which is reflected on your slide, in order to save time. I will not read it out, and repeat it, but I -- I can if there are any questions.

Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Well, thank you for that. Any other views from the floor? Yes, Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you Chairman. I think everybody is correct, however, ITU is part of the work. So if you could have one singular resolution, it would be more beneficial to the entire world. It might be good that we reduce the number of resolution to one and make necessary elements of all resolutions and put them to be used internally, between ITU and externally outside the ITU, because we are dealing with an issue which belongs to everybody.

Thank you.

>> MARTIN FENTON: Yes, thank you for that.

Any other views? I see no one asking for the floor. So if there's no other comments to make, I would just like to thank all the panel members for their -- for their time and expressing the positions of their regional groups on these three agenda items, and I think we're finishing five minutes early. The next session starts at 2 p.m. So thank you very much, and have a good lunch. Meeting adjourned.

(End of session).

2 SEPTEMBER 2015
14:00

This is being provided in an unedited 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.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: So, Ladies and Gentlemen, please have your seats. We'll start our meeting soon.

[Gavel.]

Okay. Let's start our meeting. And welcome, delegates to this afternoon session, Session 5 on satellite allocation issues including the Agenda Item 1.8. And we're very happy to see all of your friends and new colleagues. And the panelist I am Zach.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: From China and I will chair this and also represent APT. And on my right side, it's Mr. Nayef Shahin from ASMG and Mr. Mr. Kouame Bini from ATU. And on my left is Mr. Victor Glushko from CEPT and Mr. Jerry Conner to represent CITELE and Mr. Nikolay Varlamov to represent RCC. Welcome have and I believe the translation channels are working well as in the morning. If there are some troubles, please raise your flag.

So we will consider two subagenda items and agenda items 1 through 6 there are five issues we will discuss in the first session this afternoon. The first agenda -- no, okay. As Mr. Philip introduced yesterday morning and in this interregional workshop, we will focus on the -- next page, yes. The group considerations and the refer to relevant parts of the report. I think by the end of the I think 10 to 25th June is the Working Group. And by the end of the meeting the process of the technical studies were completed. And the SG4 approved the reports for a number of agenda items except for the Agenda Item 1.9.1. And the Working Party 4A did not agree that report. So it was not submitted to the SG-4. And that report is retained in the Working Party 4A report.

So for the first Agenda Item 1.6.1 and this Agenda Item is considered the possible FSS primary allocations in region 1, both uplink and downlink in the free consider ranges 17 GHz band. And in that case from A to K ranges is considered and the CPM reports focus on the three conditions or near conditions subfrequency ranges that is E, F, G and uplink and also EE, FF, GG in the downlink. And only the possibilities for the GSO satellite networks is considered. And for the band AA, land II both uplink and downlink, Ain downlink, no change is proposed. And no specific methods are proposed for the other subfrequency bands. Let's have a quick look at the 2 which means make the primary allocation. The single letter means in the uplink the S2 specific direction, let's have a quick look for the subfrequency band. Maybe it's too small? Just have a quick look. To give an example for the frequency band F and for region 1 it's proposed in the uplink 14.5 to 14.75 GHz range because it's 250 MHz is proposed based on the resolution 151. And in this band, it's proposed globally allocation in the uplink for the additional FSS allocation. And for this additional allocation number 7 is applied for this upland band. And also the modification is proposed to modify the articles 4 and 7 of appendix 30 A to effect the -- between the upland FSS and also the assignment or proposed notification 2 of A plan or list. And the annexes 1 and 4 that are the limits or sharing area is also proposed to amended. And in the annex 1 when to consider

the -- the interference from this additional FSS allocation is considered. Regarding the -- with MS. The current two options, the current provisions or by a new resolution to define the procedures. And it's also proposed the -- by upgrading the existing SRS as two space. With respect to the upland FSS. That means 9.7 applies to this band. That's a quick look of this band just as an example and for the frequency band E and G, it's similar or the regulatory provisions to the GSO FSS potential allocation are also proposed. And for the space-to-earth direction, it's also focused on the conditions band in the downlink and when we have a quick look for the frequency band EE, it's proposed in the region 1, 7.4 to 13.65 250 MHz is proposed. And because it's downlink in the Article 25 proposed to add the PFD limits to the space stations, and the agreement and the 9.9.21 is required with respect to existing for the DRS space to space, the GSO/non-GSO systems back to the FSS. And primary SRS is limited to the active space boom sensors as well as the grandfathered SRS/DRS space-to-space and space-to-earth. And 9.7 applies to the colonization from the downlink from the GSO space station to the associated earth stations. And this allocations are not preclude the development and operation of the transmitting stations in the SFT/SSS which is under secondary allocation. And no protection for this FSS is claimed from the ESS active.

And No. 5.4 3A and 22.2 do not apply.

And for the colonnation of FS and MS services to modify the table HC over appendix 7 to trigger this colonnation. It's a quick look just as an example of the frequency band EE and the other frequency band are also proposed with the listed regulatory provisions. That's a quick look of the current CPM methods for the method 2 for both space and space-to-earth.

Now let's tend to our group considerations. Firstly for the APT, I will introduce the PSAP from the APT. And for APT, we consider that this potential FSS allocation shall not cause to be substantial constraints to region 3 primary allocations and no change is proposed for the frequency band from 10 to 13.4 in both uplink/downlink and also from 14.8 to 17 in both uplink and downlink. And we do not support the uplink for the frequency band E. And no allocation to the band FFand diverging views exist for the 14.5 to 14.8 in uplink and we support the downlink allocation in the 13.4 to 75 for the -- 1 is to the 13.65 GHz. And if you rate further in the APT's PSAP, you can note that there is a note for this downlink PSAP. That means the limitation I remember is -122 for the consideration and if this band is considered in the conference and it will be finalised by the conference. And that means the downlink PFD limitation to the space station. That's the main consideration from APT on the PSAP.

And the chairman of APG, Allen Jamison introduced the procedure. And I believe it's the 18 September it's requested to feedback from APT administration to the Secretariat of APT. And then the PSAP will pass down the openings from -- to see if it will become to the ACP. That's the APT's major situation.

Now I will give the floor to the ASMG, yes, Mr. Nayef.

>> MR. NAYEF SHAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. After having reviewed the studies of the bands proposed under this item, the Arab group does support the identification of band 13.4 to 13.65 GHz for the downlink which is the EE method or EE2 for region 1 to 250 MHz. The Arab group would also like to have the rest of the bands that have been proposed with regard to both downlinks and uplinks. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Okay. Thank you, ASMG. It's clear now. Let's go to ATU. Mr. Bini.

>> MR. KOUAME BINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, everybody. At the last meeting of the ATU, the position on the screen is the common position. Mr. Kezi spoke yesterday about the Africa common proposals. To this moment, afterry would not like to see any changes. However, this position might change because we have a deadline of the 30th September for some subregional groups might like to share their points of view by then. And this could change Africa's position on band Eor a change might be submitted on EE2. But this is yet to be confirmed. And the African position will then be confirmed. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you. It's very good. Now, it's victor, CEPT?

>> MR. VICTOR GLUSHKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Preparation of the European proposal on 161 is still ongoing and we hope to finalise this preparatory process in two weeks.

So far, we are almost close to having an agreement with respect to space-to-earth proposal for allocation in 13.4 to 13.65 GHz band for FSS downlink. With respect to uplink we still have several options how to proceed further because the issue of protection is the main point of concern to agree on the uplink allocation. So far we are discussing only frequency band 14.5 to 14.75 GHz but for this frequency band so far we have developed several options and it might be proposal for an allocation with set of limitations., for example, there is the proposal to limit the diameter to 6 meters for countries and 2.4 for countries outside Europe. There might be also an option that would be a proposal for no change. And there is an option that would be no ECP on uplink at all. So for the time being, with certain respect to downlink and have several options for uplink. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CEPT. And I understand that downlink is the common frequency band and also just confirm the 2.4 and 6-meter is only in the uplink, not downlink. Okay. Thank you. Now let's go to the RCC first. Yes?

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was a surprise for me because I thought the next speaker would be Jerry. But I'm still ready. And when we respond to the next question, we will change places and respond that way. On this Agenda Item, we support the allocation of 250 megahertz to both directions in the downlink we have two frequency bands which we have chosen. 13.4 to 13.65 gigahertz. 14.85 to 15.1 GHz. That's methods EE2 or GG2. In the uplink we've only identified one band. That is method F2 using 14.5 to 14.75 Ghz. We plan to take decision on which would be the preferred band at the RCC next week. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, RCC. Thank you very much for your understanding. Now CTU.

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: Thank you. For 1.6.1, the for CTEL is relatively simple. From methods G1 to K-1 were no change. And this is mostly due to the incompatibility with existing services this starts from the 1325 band and goes all the way to the 17.1 GHz band. For the downlink bands, we don't have a position on this. So right now for CTEL, we only consider for no change. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, Jerry, in that case if there is allocation, for example, in this meeting, no objection from the downlink for CITEL.

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: That's for CITEL, but there are countries that will definitely say no.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Just joking. Now let's go to this metrics. I think it's just brief for the current situation. Maybe we can confirm that no change for other subfrequency bands and to focus on this -- subfrequency ranges. So I've opened the floor to our delegates, some comments, views, questions? I understand it's a big Agenda Item and so many subfrequency bands need to be examined. And it's complex. If you do not have questions, I suggest the offline discussions and I believe our regional group experts will be happy to answer your questions. So Mr. Rusty is happy to my suggestion. So we will go to next Agenda Item. Okay. I will go to next Agenda Item, I confirmed. Okay.

So for the next Agenda Item 1.6.2 I think it's simple because it's only has uplink the potential FSS allocation. And 250 MHz in region 2 and 300 MHz in region 3. And the CPM report also focuses on these three contiguous bands and only the GSO satellite networks for the potential allocation. And for the other subbands because the 1521 from 13 to 17. So it's from the D to K. Of the subfrequency ranges. So no changes proposed for the subfrequency ranges B, H, I, J and K. And it's the similar regulatory provisions proposed, except the 200 megahertz in region 2 and 300 MHz in region 3. Now it's for our regional group considerations, for APT, diverting views exist for the frequency band E and F. And for other subfrequency ranges, no changes proposed. That's the APT's PSAP.

Now I've given the floor to ASMG, Mr. Nayef, please.

>> MR. NAYEF SHAHIN, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. This item has to do with region 2 and therefore the method that has been proposed by the Arab countries is not to put any restrictions on the services within this band on region 1. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Okay. Now it's ATU, yes, go ahead, please.

>> MR. KOUAME BINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This issue is to do with region 2. Africa has not really looked at this; however, we share the point of view of ASMG. Thank you very much.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you. When I prepare this PP document, the RCC's information is very quick and it's the first one I acquired, so I put it in advance of CPT and CTU. But victor sit behind me, so you are both my friends. Now I give the floor to you, Mr. Varlamov.

>> MR. NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, chairman. Despite the fact that this is an issue that pertains to regions 2 and 3, we do understand that satellite links do not have any borders and region 1 may use satellites in regions 2 and 3 for providing services. So we have no opposition to new allocation of radio frequency bands 14.5 to 14.75 of region 2, 14.5 to 14.8 for region 3. And this corresponds to method F2 of the CPM report. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, RCC. Now CEPT.

>> MR. VICTOR GLUSHKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And in general, CEPT would be happy to support worldwide allocation for FSS, keeping in mind that this Agenda Item corresponds also to the discussions and studies made on this Agenda Item 1 to 6.1. And if one if, if suitable frequency band is found and this is a problem because the only bandied for the time being is 14.5-14.8 and the same concerns raised for this frequency band with respect to protection of -- service also valid for this Agenda Item. So we have, again, several options have to address this issue. If we have found sufficient technical and regulatory provisions to support allocation 14.5-14.8, that would be an option for allocation; otherwise, position would be to object to allocation in this band or do not have ACP proposal at all for this band. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CEPT. So your next meeting maybe it may be much more clear. Thank you. Jerry, CITEL.

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: Thank you. 1.6.2 similar to the 1.6.1 position in that there were no change for all the bands with one exception and that's the 14.5-14.8 band where we are unable to reach consensus in CITEL, so we have no proposal for that band. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CITEL, now let's have a look at the metrics of that regional group considerations.

So I think except for the SMG and ATU to their positions, I think other regional groups maybe it's clear for no change for other frequency band. And for this potential FSS and planned allocation, it's not clear. And so I have opened the floor to our delegates with some questions, views or comments on this Agenda Item. Yes, Shantal.

>> Thank you, chairman. Actually what I wanted to comment on is the item on 1.6.1 earlier just to clarify because when you asked the question about the CITEL position on the downlink, it kind of caused me to look at how it was formulated the actual proposal. There is no band that we say there is no objection. There is no changes for the uplink and downlink except for the -- if you can go back. There is one band where we have no objection or no position to a downlink allocation. But you would need to go back to maybe the CITEL page. No, that's not my page, sorry. Really, it is 13.4-13.75. So I wanted to clarify that, that there is no band where we have no objection. But in reality the no change proposals apply to all the other plans for uplink and downlink for 1.6.1, that's the IEP. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, Canada. And other comments? Yes, rusty.

>> Thank you, chairman. The issue was very simple at WRC. Just asking 300 MHz in one part because complicated totally putting big band with many, many services. Now we are in the middle of problems. We have something about 500, 600 pages of reports on that. 600 pages. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, Mr. Rusty. Yeah, it's a very big Agenda Item and very thick report and the CPM report. And this metrics, if the ITU agree the downLynn allocation if CTU no objections for the objection for 13.4 to 13.65 maybe there is some possibility for region 1 to have this allocation in the downlink and planned band and for the uplink band, it's an issue how to solve that issue globally we will see. And, yes, we just hope the further discussions, you know, regional groups, hope

there is some common consideration of the subfrequency ranges just like the CEPT, even though there is three options, but there are common in the downlink of that band. But maybe there is still the uncertainty so far but hopefully the next meeting we have a clear picture.

Okay. Any other comments on Agenda Item 1.6.1 including 1.6.1 because it is sister agenda items. I know the major issue, for example, for the planned band is to insure the integrate full protection of the full link plan and also the -- exist maybe in future for the sharing between this additional FSS and AMS. It's still the complex issue. Yes, Canada.

>> CANADA Thank you, chairman. I guess to again clarify because on this chart, the way the no IEP shows from 14.5 to 15.4 GHz. And it's really only the 14.5 to 14.8 GHz where we don't have an IEP. For the other two subbands that follow, it's no change proposal IEP that we have.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Yes. So the third bullet, I mentioned that. It's assumed no change. Okay. I understand that. Yes, Canada.

>> Thank you and good afternoon to everybody. I think if we come back to 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 would be the same for CITELE. So we do understand that there's some concern for the protection of the AMS. But my understanding that the issue is mainly relevant to the Europe and USA or maybe we can say American.

So allocation could be then like a regional basis in these cases. I don't think that we have to execute the possibility for administration outside of Europe and USA, just to get the possibility just to have the new allocation. This is very important frequency. Even for existing, the administration would like really the opportunity or the chance even to have it with this frequency. We.

We know that the study that has been done for the last four years, and maybe in the last one year because it was almost considered in the feasibility between the like FSS and uplink and the AMS, it was showing that there is a feasibility to coexist of course based on some conditions which we have to meet. I mean there is a continue with the antenna size to be 6-meter in Europe, 2.4 outside. There is a condition with the density and the uplink to protect like the existing with managed 193.9. There is a lot of conditions. There is the annex 1 for the coordination regardless what will be the separation distance. But it is feasibility. If there is a request -- station whatever is the distance but still be okay if the admin, which they have to give you the right the station agree with this one.

So I'm really well aware of this kind of pressure which is putting. We do respect and accept that AMS has to be protected. But, I mean, I think it might be more looking for overprotected which has been discussed. I think this is an issue important to the conference and we have to consider this with one with a careful understanding. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you very much, Kata, valuable comments. And currently the proposal -- yes, just a moment. And currently I think the proposal is proposed and pending for minimum, that is still in the brackets. Yes, CITELE.

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: I want to make a correction. It is not just USA or American or European system. It is also used throughout the globe. There's many countries in almost all the countries that use this system. So it is something that has to be considered globally. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CITELE. Other comments? Okay thank you very much. Now let's go next Agenda Item, 1.8, the review on the provisions. And currently in the CPM reports there are five methods. The first method is noted to read the regulations because any change that has potential to cause any change decreased the antenna or the off shore protection distance will cause potential interference adversely to the backbone terrestrial services. And for the method B is to considering the increased frequency in the C band is to protect the offshore protection distance from 300 -- to 345 distance. And for the method C is establishment of different protection distance for different maximum ERP density levels with shorter protection distances for levels other than those country can't afford it for revolution 2. So this method I believe the terrestrial services will be continuously adequately protected and that increased frequency of the C band passes is also considered. And for the method D, it also proposed to set up a function between the off shore protection distance and the maximum ERP density

levels considering the increased passes in the C and -- bands. And these methods believe the fundamental rules are still valid and also those shorter protection distance could be derived based on that function.

And the method E is to review the regulatory governing the provisions to conform to the principles and objectives of the -- and that's the four methods. I give a brief introduction. And now let's go to the original considerations on this issue and for APT, some considerations support method C; however, after lengthy discussion -- well, some administrations for method A and method Band method D, also. And after lengthy discussion the change is proposed to be considered for PACP. That is the consideration of APT. Now I will give the floor to ASMG, Mr. Nayef.

>> MR. NAYEF SHAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The heir April group approves method A, which is no change. Thank you very much.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, ASMG. ATU.

>> MR. KOUAME BINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The African Groups approve method A, also no change. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, Bini. Now I will give the floor to victor.

>> MR. VICTOR GLUSHKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding CEPT position on this Agenda Item, yes, you are absolutely correctly reflected it in your slide that CEPT have developed a position based on method D of CPM report. We're almost close to finalise the preparation of this issue with respect to preparation specific proposal to the conference. And we have discovered recently some issues with regard to some specific issues on this Agenda Item of protection of off shore stations and within preparatory process we are trying to find a solution for this issue. And this green light which is reflected on your side need to be confirmed at our next meeting at CPG. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: And Mr. Varlamov, I give the floor to you because you also -- thank you.

>> MR. NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, chairman. We had quite a lot of compilations. And we submitted them at the relevant study groups and so on. And we thought that we could in fact look at reducing the change in the distance criteria here and therefore we support method D, thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, RCC. And CITEL. Jerry.

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: For CITEL it was pretty easy. We never got beyond the plenary proposal stage so we have no proposal for this issue. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Okay, thank you. Now some views from delegates. Yes, Iran.

>> IRANJust a short intervention. The report of ITU-R in this mentioned there was no agreement on these studies.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Yes, correct. Different views are expressed in the reports. There is some different with respect to Agenda Item 1.8.1 because for this there is approved from 4 report but there is diverting views in the report.

And now the comments, questions? Okay. No comments if you have comments to discuss with our regional groups experts delegates to exchange more views. Thank you very much. Now let's go to next Agenda Item 1.9.1. This Agenda Item is to consider the possible 100 MHz in the X band 8 and 7 GHz in both uplink and downlink. And for the primary FSS. And currently there are three methods. The method A is to propose worldwide primary allocation to the GSO FSS. And also the space stations to protect the -- deep space operations, there is ERP spectral distance mass in the frequency band 150 -- to 7275 megahertz. If this is not sufficient to protect the nearest operations of SRS, a resolution is set up to provide a consultation procedures for the involved FSS and SRS parties. And in the uplink, the earth stations is proposed to be specific and the minimum antenna damage is rated at 4-meter. And the procedure 17, 17 A and also the provision 11.2 apply. And the 17-point A is considered the ESS primary for the Agenda Item 1.11 in the 8 GHz band. And also Article 21 and appendics 4, 7 also amended to include these frequency bands.

And FSS the to be allocated shall not protect from SOS and no constrained the use and

development of SRS and SOS stations and 5.4 3A and 22.2 do not apply. That is for subA and B is same as sub A except for the downlink frequency ranges to protect the SRS is proposed from the 71.90 to 72.50 MHz band and also wanted emissions from FSS space stations should also be controlled in order to protect the SRS operations in the frequency band 71.45 to 71.90. And the protection criteria is defined in the recommendation ITU-R SA1157, I think. So that's method B.

Method C is noted for this frequency ranges.

Now let's go to our region group considerations for APT, the PACP is no change considering the change for the incumbent services. And now the ASMG?

>> MR. NAYEF SHAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. These bands are using different waves and therefore we have different protection applications. The Arab countries therefore approve method C, which is no change. Thank you very much.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you. Mr. Bini, ATU.

>> MR. KOUAME BINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As with the ASMG, African Group approves method C, which is no change. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, Bini. CEPT, Mr. Victor.

>> MR. VICTOR GLUSHKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a bit disappointing picture for CEPT. But, anyway, CEPT is supporting method A. And this proposal is ready. And it will be sent to the conference.

And I would like to draw the attention that one of the issues which was identified as a problem for the allocation was based on the problems on protection of SRS deep space mission systems and based on the proposal discussed at CPM and developed within CEPT process, we have proposed operational resolution to cover issues of potential incompatibility between potential FSS allocation and the SRS missions.

And the latest development of this position based on our discussions with other administrations and regional organizations is that actually CEPT's open for other alternative proposals to protect this specific SRS systems and to consider them in order to make this allocation possible. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, victor. Yes, I think this -- that's why you come to this meeting and why Jerry Conner just sit next to you.

[Laughter]

And also I will give the floor to CITEL.

>> MR. JERRY CONNER: Thank you, that's a good comment, except for that one green spot. No. CITEL is also no change because of the incompatibility with the space science services as well as other services, thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CITEL. RCC,.

>> MR. NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, Chairman.

We are also one of the five supporting methods C in connection with problems of existing and planned space services. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, RCC. Well, I believe all the delegates hope we should discuss in detail and hope if there is difficulty, we solve at once, we have more discussions can, that is expected. Do not clearly in this meeting. How many especially in the conference and that is not what we expected. Remember that. Okay. So now I think there is no compliment, I will give the floor to our delegates. Russia, please.

>> Russia: Thank you, chairman. I would merely like to add one comment to that of CEPT. Another problem, together with the issues of compatibility with space research services, there is also a problem of ensuring compatibility with space operations services. And this was noted at the last meeting of Working Party 4A. These two problems mean that the studies were not repeated and the report was not adopted. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you very much. I think the current CPM report considered that

kind of SOS protection requirement. That is why the FSS shall not claim protection from SRS/SOS. Shall not constrain the development of SRS/SOS stations. However, 5.4 3A and 22.2 do not apply. That's the current methods I remember. Any other comments? No comments. Okay.

Then well go to the next Agenda Item 1.7. I think for this Agenda Item, maybe you will also keep silence because currently there is only one method report in the CPM report. And for this Agenda Item is to consider if we should retain the primary FSS allocation which is used for the link to the non-- systems in the non-GSO in the mobile satellite service. And the current method is proposed to eliminate each of the term limits on this hallowcation and also to modify resolution and to add the reference to the footnote 444 A. And also to set up colonnation between FSS stations and ARNS ground stations when they the condition is executed with this 440-kilometers around border if there is ARNS ground stations. Ground station and also the flexibility for MRS improved while insuring the protection of the FSS. Currently all regional groups support the single methods and in the APT's PACP, it's proposed to view the latest version of the recommendation ITU-R P. Is the latest wording. Is incorporated by reference in No. 5.444 B where revision of revolution 748. And that's the current situation. Any comments? I will just open the floor to all regional groups and the delegates. You have some comments? Questions or views? The coffee break time is not near you. All delegates like coffee break, I think. So, okay. So if you have comments, just have your offline discussions, and our original group experts are happy to discuss with you further if you do not have further comments, we just close this session and thank you very much for the interpreters. That compensated to this morning's more time. Thank you very much. This session is closed. Thank you.

(study group 6 will meet shortly).

[Gavel.]

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Ladies and Gentlemen, please have a seat. We will start our next session.

Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope you enjoyed the break with extra time. And in this session we have three agenda items need to be discussed. And hope it's not difficult. The first Agenda Item is Agenda Item 1.9.2. This Agenda Item is considering the primary possible MMS allocations in the 8 and 7 GHz band listed in the --

[Gavel.]

Sorry, Ladies and Gentlemen, please have a seat. So for this Agenda Item, currently CPM reported there are three methods. The method A is no change to the current allocation in the 8 and 7 GHz. And the method B is to make allocation to the GSO MMSS. And in the downlink in this method B is proposed to add PFD limitation to the space station and also the agreement seeking procedure, 9.21 is firstly applied. And also because in the sharing report, some sharing between the FSS and the map set is not performed, however, if this band -- if these bands are finally considered, agreed, the 9.7 to coordinate between themselves and with the FSS or with the mat set can be performed.

And considering the coordination of MMSS stations also the 9.21 agreement-seeking procedure is applied. And also the specific colonnation provisions with respect to the earth stations with stations or terrestrial stations. If you are going to the specific regulatory provisions, there is the limitation for the MSS station station and also what shell is used. But also the condition is also used, consideration the different or the specific coordination cases. And also the option B for the MMSS stations the coordination is also to set up resolution to stipulate the implementation of exclusive use around the FS station or ESS and SIS deep space stations.

For the method C, it's noting the difficulties of the object allocation as proposed only the downlink allocation. And Article 21, even though it's not listed here, Article 21 and Article 9 is proposed for the coordination. And no claim protection from terrestrial services and no constrain the use and development of this terrestrial services. In 5.4 3A does not apply. That's the brief of the methods A, B and C.

Now, we will go to the regional group considerations. For the APT, the PACP is not the same like those in the customer rend CPM report. The PACP from APT is to oppose the uplink allocation in the 8 GHz band. Now I will give the floor to ASMG.

>> MR. AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Arab administration would like to support the non-allocation in 7.3, 7.5 to 7.50 and 8.02 to 8.400 Mhz, Mr. Chairman.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, ASMG. Now ATU.

>> MR. KOUAME BINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The ATU will keep the status quo. There is no change. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, ATU. Now the RCC.

>> MR. NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, chairman. On generation 1.92 we have not concluded development of our common position. At the moment, we are opposing the allocation but we did look carefully at the 7 gigahertz Hertz band and we have some positive ideas about this band. But I'd once again like to say that we will come to a final decision next week during our meeting then. But for the moment, that is what the situation is. And it is as it is shown on the screen. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, RCC. I hope the updated information from your group. Now CEPT Mr. Victor.

>> MR. VICTOR GLUSHKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Current status of development is that we have developed ECPs on this particular Agenda Item and it's based on method C as correctly reflected on your slide. And this ECPs are under the signature process and will be submitted to the Conference. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CEPT. Now Mr. Glass, CITEL.

>> MR. CHARLES GLASS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon to everyone. Due to the potential for interference in existing services both inband and in adjacent bands, CITEL has taken a position of no change per the CPM text. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CITEL. Now let's go to the metrics of the regional groups tables. So for the uplink allocation and ACT support the change and other groups not of change of Article 5. And any comments, questions from our delegates? So in this case we formed a clear situation and no comments from delegates. If you have issues, questions, encourage you have the offline discussion to extend views.

Now let's go to the Agenda Item 1.10. And this the agenda item is to consider the spectrum requirements and also the potential MSS allocation in frequency range 22 to 26 Mhz. There is methods A, B and C. For method B and C, there are different options. The method A is no change to that. And for method B, there are B1, B2. For B1, it's allocated to these two uplink and downLynn frequency bands. To the MSS. And in the downlink it's similar to other agenda items to add pfd limits to Article 21 in the downlink bands. And also to apply the, i.e, rp density limits in the downlink bands to protect the non-GSO space station links, between non-GSO space stations. And also the coordination provision 9.7 as applied for the coordination between MSS and ISS. That is from GSOs space station and the non-GSO space stations in the uplink and downlink. And also the 9.17 is applied to the coordination with respect to FS and MS.

For the method B2, I think it's similar. Just I think it's uplink frequency ranges is 1 GHz below the method B1. And even though -- there is no, the uplink coordination and the provision 9.7 if you're going into the detailed regulatory considerations, the uplink frequency range is also there. So it's the regulatory considerations is similar for the B1 and B2. Only the uplink frequency range.

And for the uplink C, there are two 7 A and 7 B. For the 71 A it proposes the GSA limitation. Because it's both for downlink and the pfd limitation is the proposed added in the uplink 21 and also the coordination.

And in B it's different frequency range. And the specifications and also the pfd limits in Article 21 and also the coordination of MSS with ISS based on 9.7. And also there is constraints on the MSS in the space 2 earth direction that of the angle erp limitations for this method C1. And for method C2, it means

uplink allocation and also to the GSO solar systems and also the coordination is based on 9.7 to apply to the MSS space stations. And also I think the 9.17 is also applied to protect the terrestrial services for the option C2b is to allocate the 25 gigs range for the MSS in the uplink and also the similar provision to the GSO solar systems or satellite network. And also the coordination of 9.7 applied. And when you go to the detailed regulatory provisions, I think the second bullet, the C2a and b, the a MSS 9.7 applied some MSS is also applied to the ISS. And for C2b 9.7 applied to ISS, it also applied to MSS.

And the 9.17, same to be applied to protect the terrestrial services. That's the brief of the current methods in the CPM report. And now let's go to our regional group considerations. Our view is currently it is difficult, if not impossible, to ensure the protection of various incumbent services considering the mobility nature of the MSS stations. And also the spectrum requirements need further studies. So in this case, we support Method A.

Now, let me give the floor to ASMG.

>> MR. AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Arab administrations and during the study of this question did not want to support an allocation in the band frequency from 22 GHz to 26 GHz for the mobile satellite services due to the intense use of other services that are in this band. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, ASMG. Now ATU.

>> MR. KOUAME BINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The ATU's administration regarding Agenda Item 1.10 support method A, which is no change. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, Mr. Bini, now RCC's position.

>> MR. NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We may be the only regional organisation supporting a further allocation of 250 MHz for MSS in the frequency bands which you can see on the screen. I'm not going to red them out. But I'd like to say this was quite a difficult decision for us to take, but we saw there was a possible conjunction. But these are the frequency bands which are preferable for us. We will make a decision on this next week when we have our next meeting of the Working Group, we will select a frequency band and then we will develop an RCC proposal on Agenda Item 1.10. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, RCC. If you have updated information, share with us.

Now, the floor to the CEPT?

>> MR. VICTOR GLUSHKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CEPT position also based on method A, no change. However, you should emphasize that CEPT notes the development of key satellite applications in this band, in K band. And there are concerns and the proposal for no change is based on some incompatibility and performed within this Agenda Item and at the same time CEPT notes that there is a frequency, the band between 24, 25 and 24.55 where such studies have not been completed and there is probably some potential for sharing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CEPT. Note there is difficulties from your position on this issue.

Yes, the CITELE, Mr. Glass.

>> MR. CHARLES GLASS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CITELE is of the view that sharing with incumbent services in all cases is either not feasible or will require technical and operational constraints that will be impractical for use by the MSS. Additionally, we took into account the atmospheric propagation conditions around 24 GHz, which create additional sharing difficulties leading CITELE to support no change method, which is Method A. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: Thank you, CITELE. Now let's go to the metrics table. Yes, as Mr. Victor mentioned, currently except RCC of the regional groups support the Method A, no change. And for the RCC's position, I put the first, the C1 part is 24.25-24.55 or 23.15-23.55. The second frequency, subfrequency band I listed, I put there. But that does not mean if the second subfrequency band is chosen the same regulatory provisions of C1a, because that band is not the same as b1, b2. But the regulatory provisions are quite possible to be same or similar to the method B1, B2. So that's the

explanation.

So I'm opened the floor to our delegates. Some questions, some comments on this Agenda Item?

We know we all have satellite issues and satellite applications. And even though it's easier Agenda Item 1.1, but it's -- there is too difficulty to make these kind of allocations. So no comments, no questions, it is quite clear on the current situation?

I also encourage the offline exchange of views and discussions on this issue.

Now let's go to the next Agenda Item. It's the Agenda Item 9.1, the issue 9.1.1 currently after the CPM meeting there is only one method in the CPM report. All regional groups support the regulatory and considerations which is contained in CPM report to 15 and that method is to protect the systems in the 4.6 and 4.6.1 mixed band. And all regional groups support the modification of the resolution 2.05 with the view of having an adequate protection of the MSS in this frequency range due to detect and process successfully the distress signals taking into account the current and future deployment of services in adjacent frequency bands.

And we will go into the detailed proposal in the revision of the resolution 2.05. You can see there's some proposals, for example, do not assign new summit in the band. And when you deploy the -- above the frequencies 05 megahertz to consider the frequency drift, to avoid the interference in this 4.6 MHz band and also others.

So questions, comments? Or burden to the current services?

So it's also quite clear situation of delegates. And I noted that our original groups expert also do not have compliment on this issue. And also no difficulties for our delegates?

Okay. So in this case, we have -- we can close our meeting and hope -- we know you want to have more offline discussions. So thank you very much.

And thank you the interpreters. Also I will give the floor to Philip.

>> Philip: We will start tomorrow at 9:00 with the regular satellite services so Agenda Item 7 and the other parts of 9.1 related to satellite. Thank you.

>> MR. XIAOYANG GAO: So thank you very much. The meeting, this session, is closed. Thank you.

* * *

This is being provided in an unedited 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.

* * *

3 SEPTEMBER 2015

9:00

This text is being provided in an unedited format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Ladies and gentlemen, if you take your seats, please, we will start in one minute. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. And welcome to panel session number 7 of this workshop, which is going to be agenda item 7 and 9.1, issues 9.1.2, 9.1.3, 9.1.5, and 9.1.8, of WRC-15.

In this session, and the session after, we are going to talk about these agenda items regarding satellite regulatory issues of the WRC.

First of all, I would like to welcome the panel, the representatives of the regional groups. I will start with APT, Mr. John Lewis, from ASMG, Mr. noiseair AlDeiri, from ATU, Amir Ashour, from CEPT, Ms. Anna Marklund, and from CITEL, Mr. Juan. From the RCC, Mr. Nikolay.

So, if we can start, let's start with agenda item 7, and my plan is to work on agenda item 7, issue by issue. So we'll go to each issue, we'll introduce the issue, and we'll introduce the current methods that are proposed in the CPM reports and then we'll present or we'll have an overview of the regional positions for each issue.

So if we can move on to the first issue, which is issue A of agenda item 7 of WRC-15. Issue A is about informing the Bureau of a suspension under number 11.49 of the regulatory regulations beyond six months. As you are aware, the radio regulation now guides administrations to notify the bureau if there happens to be a suspension of a satellite network that lasts for more than six months. And this notification has to be done within six months from the date of the suspension.

So this issue is actually addressing the case where administrations fail to notify the bureau of the suspension within the six months, the initial six months period.

Currently in the CPM report, we have two methods to satisfy this issue. The first method is method A1, which is basically proposing no change. The second method which is A2 has two options. So A2 is the modification of 11.49 of the Radio Regulations to provide a regulatory mechanism to clarify the issue with two options, option A is day for day reduction in the suspension period after six months. So if an administration notified the Bureau of a, it's three years minus a month.

Option B is day for day reduction after the suspension up to 12 months followed by two times reduction thereafter.

So from six months of the initial notification period, and up to 12 months, the day for day reduction will be similar to option A, but after 12 months, there will be twice the reduction in the suspension period. There is a note here that the 12th month is not fixed, and there might be some proposals to modify the 12th month to anything else within the WRC.

So basically, these are the methods that are proposed in the CPM report.

We can move on to the regional positions and you can see in the slide in front of you the positions of the regional groups and you can notice that all regional groups have specific positions with regards to this issue. So maybe we can start from the right, ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: It's day by day reduction after the six month period. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. As you can see from the table in your document, we support method A2 also, and we also positively do not support A2 option B. It was an issue of quite some involved discussion at our most recent meeting. So it's quite an important meeting for many administrations. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone.

ATU, its position is to adopt method A2 option A, noting that the board recommends WRC-15 to consider the clarification of 11.49, with respect to the action to be taken by the Bureau, of six months from the date of which it was suspended. Method A2, option A would provide an incentive for such a right to register the suspension to grant the full three years suspension and this may affect the increased of reliability of the information in the MIFR, and reduce the uncertainties associated with the coordination process. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. Let's move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all.

CEPT, as many other region supports method A2 option A, we think it provides a balanced, and avoiding longer delays to inform the BR and also to clarify the regulatory situation. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. We move to CITEL, please.

>> JUAN MASCIOTRA: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning, everyone. Well, as you can see on the board, it is CITEL against the world! And I'm going to try to explain to you why CITEL has taken this position.

As regards notification of suspension until 11.49, and beyond six months, CITEL opted for method A1, however, I would like to clarify that two proposals were tabled in CITEL, method number 1, and A2, option 1, which is the adoption of three years day for day, and we had an intense debate in CITEL about these options.

Firstly, we would like to recall that WRC too established the -- the suspension period from two to three years. And it established that administrations had to inform within six months of the suspension at the time there was no time frame established. We would also like to recall that WRC-12 made -- the procedure under 36 more nimble and reduced the time frame in which administrations held with the office -- the Bureau, and when a notified position has been brought -- or it had been brought into use or not in line with those noted under appendix 4. The majority of administrations under CITEL adopted A1, believing there's no need to make changes or put in new requirements further than those already under 11.49, since the existing procedures established under 13.6 are sufficient in order to ensure that's compliance with the provisions of number 11.49.

The administrations who supported no change thought that reducing the time frame of three years was not an incentive as it is expressed in the CPM report. It rather represents a penalty, and these administrations thought that it might be a real problem for putting -- for bringing into use again, given the problems with construction, launch, and bringing into use of new satellites they also observed that the only alternative which was provided for to resolve this problem was reducing the time frame of three years, and this is precisely what the administrations do not agree with, who supported the no change in CITEL. Beyond this procedure established under 13.6, at the last meeting of two weeks ago, some administrations expressed a desire to carry out a -- to look at a provision, which does not provide for a reduction in the time frame of three years.

So a multicountry proposal might be submitted in this regard to WRC-15.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for this clarification on the position.

Let's move to RCC, and hear the position of the RCC as well, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Chairman and good morning, colleagues.

As you can see on the slide, we do support method A2, but we do suggest that the changes, the modifications which will be made to 11.49 should be applied only to positions which are set up after the

entry into force of these provisions. So if there's been a suspension or a notify to the Bureau before this comes into force, then the old procedure should apply. That's first point I want to make.

The second point, we should think about modifications to the provisions of 13 and 13a and -- pardon. To appendix 30, 30 and 30A and B to ensure that we have this covered in the frequency plans. That is our position. Unfortunately, we have not yet drawn up a common proposal on this issue, and next week, at our next meeting, we will make some final decision on this. This does not just pertain to issue A but also to the entire agenda item 7. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, RCC. And for my turn, I also forgot to apologize from the beginning if the positions that are shown on the tables are not as accurate as they should be. I tried my best to follow the records I could receive for the positions of the regional groups and please accept my apology if any position is not as clear as it should be.

So I would like to open the floor for any clarifications. Are there any clarifications with regard to this issue?

There are none. Then I would like to thank you and probably we can move to the next issue which is item B of WRC-15.

This issue is regarding the publication of information on bringing into use of satellite networks at the ITU website. Basically, it is regarding the clarification of the ITU -- of the Bureau's actions with regard to publication 69 bringing into use information of satellite networks.

Currently, there are three methods to satisfy this issue and two of these methods have two options. So basically in total, there are five different alternatives. So method B1, option A is regarding implementing amendments to 11.44B, 11.49, and 11.49.1 of the Radio regulations.

In order to clarify the Bureau's action.

Method B -- option B is similar to option A with the addition of stating that the Bureau publishes the information as received.

Method B2, option A, is implementing amendments to 11.44. B, 11.49 and 11.49.1 of the Radio Regulations. In addition to that a veiling of bringing into use information at the ITU-R website, at the Bureau's website and including the information in a special section of resolution 49, which is resolution 49.

Method B2, option B is similar as option A, in addition to stating that the bureau publishes the information as received. Then we have method B3, which is identifying all the requirements or all the actions from the bureau with this regard and including all of these clarifications in the minutes of the WRC-15.

So these are basically the proposed methods in the CPM. We can move on to the current positions given by the regional groups with regard to this issue, and probably this time we can start with RCC, if you could clarify, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Chairman. We believe that there is a need to make clarifications under 11.44B and 11.49 of the Radio Regulations. If you modify in order to ensure that all information published on suspension of frequency assignments or -- or bringing into use is accessible to -- for administrations. I would just like to correct something which you see on the screen, not all of the positions of the regional organizations were available at this time. So perhaps some of the information may be a little preliminary.

We support method B1, option A, but in addition to this method, we would still like to recall that bringing into use and suspension or cancellation are also not just covered in these Radio Regulations but also in frequency plans. So the necessary modifications need to be made to -- feed to be made to the frequency plans if changes are made to Radio Regulations 11. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Yes, thank you very much, RCC, for this clarification.

We can move to CITELE, please. Thank you.

>> JUAN MASCIOTRA: Yes. Thank you very much, Chairman.

Well, CITELE also supports a method B1, option A, amending, provisions 11.44B, and 11.49, and 11.49.1. In all of these cases, to indicate that the information will be provided on the ITU website as soon as possible and that it will be published in the BIFIC. These should be modified in appendices 30, 30A and 30B, making amendments to the relevant numbers of these appendices.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Okay. Thank you very much. We move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, CEPT supports full clarity to the Radio Regs, regarding the bureau's procedure for publishing and making available regarding bringing to use and suspension. So as you can see, we also support method B1, option A, and that's based on the same thing as CITELE's understanding that this includes publishing on the ITU website as well.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I would like to move to ATU, although I did not see a clear position from the documents I received, but probably the representative of ATU can give us some clarifications, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are correct. There's no common position, however, there's some consideration about the sensitivity to the accessibility of -- to the information of suspension and putting into use and brought back into use and the coordination of the right networks. Meanwhile, it's nearly to clearly identify adequate timing for the availability of the suspension and brought back into use requests and Mr. Chairman, the African Member States considered different methods adopted in the CPM text, but no common position until now.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. Let's move to ASMG, please. I apologize, we can move to the same order, APT, I apologize for that.

>> JOHN LEWIS: No problems, Mr. Chairman.

Again, similar to other views, we are of the view that it's necessary to make available information on bringing into use and suspension of satellite networks. On the ITU website, and to publish it in the international frequency information circular, we had a concern about information about bringing into use and information supplied under resolution 49, and we would like to ensure that there's not a linkage between these two because it can have unintended adverse impacts. And for this reason, we support method B1, option B, but we have proposed a modification to making it similar to method B2 but not having any resolution of 49. The details you can find in the PAP, in our presentation.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that.

We move to ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: So we agree with our previous colleague, but, however, we think due to a lot of the conference, if we are just going to, you know, amend the existing articles, that the reason we are going with B3 in order to include whatever that mission think that they need as a clarity just to be published so we can include this one and be included in the report of the plenary meeting to be taken by action by the bureau.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for the representatives for these clarifications.

Are there any additional comments or requests for clarifications from the floor?

Yes, Iran.

>> IRAN: Yes. Good morning. No change. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you.

Any other comments? Well, thank you very much. I think we can move to our next issue, which is issue C.

Issue C of agenda item 7 of WRC-15, which is about the review or the possible cancellation of the advanced publication mechanism for satellite networks subject to coordination under Section 2 of Article 9 of the Radio Regulations. Basically, it's about the revision of API or the cancellation of the API stage for satellite networks.

A lot of discussions in this place took part in the Working Party, as a result of the CPM meeting, we now have three methods. Two of these methods are basically having two options. So practically, we have five different alternatives to tackle this issue. Method C1 is proposing no change. Method C2 is the cancellation of the current API mechanism. This has two options. The first option is the suppression of the API stage as a whole. So there will not be an API stage for these specific cases of satellite networks. Option B would be automatically generating the API by the bureau, as soon as the CRC is received. So the administrations who wish to have a satellite network filing, they would immediately submit a CRC to the Bureau and the Bureau from its side will automatically generate the API which is corresponding to this CRC.

Method C3 is the revision of the API mechanism. We have two options in this method. The first option is to reduce the two years validity period of an API. As you are aware, the API has two years validity until -- there is a two-year window for a CRC to be committed according to this API. If a CRC is not submitted after two years, the API is getting canceled.

The second option which is option B is the suppression of the minimum period of six months between the API and the CRC. As you are away, the API is submitted. You have to wait for six months until you submit the corresponding CRC for this API. And one proposal is to suppress this six months period between the two stages.

So these are the methods which are proposed in the CPM report. We can go to the table of positions of the regional groups. We can see almost all the regional groups, except one have clear positions with regards to this issue.

Let's start with ASMG, if you can kindly clarify. Thank you.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So we are supporting what is C3, option B, which will give the flexibility to the administration, if they would like to submit the CRC directly to the administration or if they would like to wait until they have cleared like status, then they can split later on. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. APT, I could not see a position, but probably if you can provide us clarifications.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This is one of the issues where we were not able to come to a conclusion on it, come to the position, so there's no preliminary position on it. So you put the right blank box, thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you. I'm glad I did the right thing.

So ATU.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU position on this agenda item is support method C3, option B by removal of the six month period. Also adopted as an ATU common position. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. We move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As you can see, our position deviates from the other -- majority of the other regions.

Well, the base line for our position is that we consider that there is no reason to maintain the API anymore. I mean, we think that the original merits of the API has disappeared. So we would support a cancellation. Current API mechanism.

But we even go further than that and think that the API could constitute a motivating element to worsen the problem with multiple number of filings and picosatellites. With the full suppression of the API and it's being mentioned everywhere in the Radio regs, so we think it's a safer version to create an automatic generation of the API.

So method C2, option B as you can see.

But I would also like to point out that even though our proposed method is based on that CPM method, we still have made some minor amendments to it. Since method C2 option B is suppressing, well, position 9.5B we have made some clarification that potentially affected satellite networks that are not subject to coordination can still comment. So there are some slight deviations from the CPM report, but you can find more information on our position in input to the CEPT position.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for this clarification.

We go to CITELE, please.

>> JUAN MASCIOTRA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to clarify that on the table, which shows the regional positions, there is a mistake. CITELE has not managed to formulate an interAmerican proposal in this regard, and I would just like to make some comments on it.

So they were two proposals submitted at our meeting, and they were broadly debated. One of them was removing the six months between API and coordination and the other proposal was to keep the API and the CRC. Those who supported the removal of the six-month period did this in order to reduce the time frame for the beginning of the coordination process. Those who wished to uphold the six months between API and coordination thought that this is a necessary period of time in order to prepare the complete information required for coordination, once they have identified a possible orbital position, and it allows them to send in the advanced publication to the bureau.

While keeping the six month period between API and CRC was possibly -- was possible follow the IAP, more more than 50% -- many countries, in fact, did not support in, therefore we actually did not come up with an interAmerican proposal in this regard.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. Again, I apologize for this unintended mistake, although it looks nice that all the regional groups --

(Laughter).

-- but I apologize, actually.

RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the the views we have, but I think the period which now exists should be maintained for applying for modifications to the satellite network, and the period of effect and we think that keeping possibilities for submitting comments to the administration about the satellite network and the system and the procedure for coordination involve frequency assignment matters which are not a matter of coordination, and we think that we should keep the mechanism for advanced publication and we're looking at the various options with the exception of possibilities of maintain advanced publication with C1. And the final choice will be made next week at our meeting, but I can tell you right away that we shall be based on the ideas which have been put forward and we have already heard.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, RCC, for this clarification.

I would like to open the floor for any clarifications or questions.

Yes, please. Representative of CEPT.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify the CEPT position, even though we go further with an automatic generation that would mean the suppression of the six months. So we are sort of more aligned that way. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for your support.

So if there are not any questions, I propose we move on to the next issue.

So issue D of item 7 is the general use of modern electronic means for communications and coordination and notification procedures. Basically, in the CPM report that we have now, the final version, we have only one method to satisfy this issue which is towards amendments to resolution 907 of WRC-12 and 908

of WRC 12. So the modifications to 907 WRC 12 is to include the use of modern electronic means, and the modifications and resolution 908 of WRC-12 is to expand its scope to all satellite network filings and whether it's possible to have a single consolidated interface for the consolidated of satellite network filings and the related correspondences.

As you can see, all regional groups have expressed their support for this single method which existing in the CPM report. If you would allow me, I think I will just request the representatives of the regional groups if they have any additional clarifications that they would like to make so -- is there any additional clarifications from the representatives?

Yes, APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Certainly, we support the use of modern electronic means, but we still have a concern that we should keep mention of telegram, telex or fax, especially since it's still used, due to the fact in some -- in some developing countries, the Internet may not always be available. We wish to make mention of that concern.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that additional clarification.

Is there any other clarifications? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. A clear example, Mr. Lewis mentioned, we sent several requests to the Bureau to exclude certain satellites, they have not been received. We have send it and where is this? This is the email. So electronic, we might have some difficulties and that's a very important issue. Exclusion of the country from the service area is an important issue. The country could decide in one way or the other, but that is that. We do not criticize anybody, but this is -- this is the electronics. Sometimes this system suppress the attachment as spam. Sometimes there's no communications. Sometimes it's 24 hours, because we are talking of the time limit. A few days is important, and other areas, Chairman, we have the problem that we send comments because of these problems, they have not been received. Then we consider as having no comment and then we have to do interference. That's a situation that Mr. Lewis mentioned. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you for that comment. I also understand that there might sometimes be difficulties in the communication between the administrations and the bureau and between administrations themselves. However, I hope that this proposal that is being made is going to positively affect this issue by having a mean to have some sort of an acknowledgment for all correspondences being made.

So I wish this would even resolve this or have some sort of resolution for this issue.

Any other comments in this regard?

I see none. Thank you very much. So if you allow me, we can move to the next issue, which is issue E of agenda item 7 which is titled failures of a satellite during the bringing into use period. As you are aware, we have now 90 days bringing to use period for satellite networks and there has been concerns raised regarding if the satellite occurs failure during this bringing to use period. So in this case, what should the Bureau do. So basically for the time being we have six different methods to tackle this issue in the CPM reports.

Method E1 is proposing adding a footnote to number 11.44B of the Radio Regulations. This footnote states if a failure occurs during the bringing into use, the frequency assignments are automatically brought into use.

Method E2 is similar to method E1, but in addition to that, adding a footnote to 11.49 of the Radio Regulations stating that if a failure occurs during the bringing back of the -- bringing back into use period, frequency assignments are considered automatically as brought into use.

Method E3 is proposing so change. Method E4 is proposing additional provisions. Number 11.44.3 of the Radio Regulations allowing an extension of three years for the date of bringing it to use for the date -- from the date of the failure. So if the failure happens, then you have three years extension of validity of the failure.

Then you have method E5, which is consideration by the RRB on a case-by-case basis. So if a failure happens, then this case has to be considered by the RRB.

Method E6 is giving the Bureau the right to make a decision based on the information received, however, if the Bureau could not or is not in a position to make a decision in this regard, within three months, then the issue is submitted to the RRB by a Bureau's report and the RRB has to make a decision in this regard.

So these are the six methods proposed in the CPM report. I would like to move to the table of the current positions of the regional groups with regard to this issue. So as you can see, all regional groups have made their -- or at least what I could find, is that -- so the regional groups have put their positions with regards no issue. I would like to obtain some clarifications from the representatives and I would like to start from RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Yes, indeed, we have a position which is for method E4 and I will try to explain what this was based on. We're talking about a failure of the satellite during bringing into use and practically all the methods being proposed say that if such a failure comes about, still they should be bringing into use. So what happens is that an investigation is being carried out to see why. In this case, we think it would be right, simply to consider the period, to use up the time that remains. Let's say three years from the time of failure, it took place two years before the end of a seven-year period, so there would need to be an addition of one year, if it took place, of course in the seventh year, when the period is coming to an end, then the promulgation would be for three years and we wanted to inform you about our position on that.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, sir, for the clarifications. CITEL, please.

>> JUAN MASCIOTRA: Thank you, Chairman.

CITEL is in favor of method E3, no change. Considering that there have not been any demonstrable events of satellite failure during the bringing into use period. So we believe that it was premature to modify the regulatory procedures which we currently have. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, sir, for the clarification.

CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Like most regions we also support no change to the Radio Regulations meth order E3 and we have also noted that there has not been any such events since the last conference and we also note that administrations already have the possibility of raising this to the RB and if not successful there, maybe to the WRC. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, ma'am. ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the same reasons as indicated by our colleagues here from the CEPT and CITEL, ATU was of the position for no change for this method. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, sir. APT, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. We have the similar view to those that have just been expressed, thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. The ASMG.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ASMG position, is E5, we think that each case it has to be discussed and evaluated in case by cases, you know, by the BR and based on this one, they could submit like the RRB on this one. Thank you, sir.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for the clarification of there are any questions or comments from the floor this this regard.

Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Chairman, simply, just we should avoid over regulations. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much.

Is there any other comments?

If there are no other comments or requests, then I would like to thank you and propose to move on to the next issue, please.

So the next issue is issue F of agenda item 7. So this issue is about the modifications of appendix 30B of the Radio Regulations in relation to the suspension of use of frequency assignments recorded in the MIFR.

So this -- this issue is about the alignment of appendix 30B with -- with appendix 30 and 30A and Article 11 Forton planned networks with regard to the suspension period of satellite networks and extending the suspension period for three years. There's only one solution which is proposed in the CPM report, which is towards aligning provisions of appendix 30B with Article 11, appendix 30, and 30A, by extending the use of a frequency assignment to space station to three years, similar to the other appendices and Article 11.

I can see that all regional groups have the same position in this regard which is supporting this single conclusion regarding this method.

So if I may invite the representatives of the regional groups if they have any other additional comments that they would like to make with regards to this issue. So is there anything?

If not, then I think we could -- this is a very straightforward issue. I think we can thank you very much, and then we can carry on to the next issue, please.

That brings us to issue G of agenda item 7, which is about clarification of bringing it to use information provided under numbers 11.44 and 11.44B of the Radio Regulations.

So there is one regulatory proposal that is proposed in order to resolve this issue. It has different elements. It enables the bureau to seek clarifications from the notifying administration under 11.44 and 11.44B of the Radio Regulations. This proposal allows the Bureau to validate the information provided under 11.44, and for stationary satellites ensure that the information provided under 11.44B, correspond to the deployed space station with the transmission capabilities.

So it's one single regulatory proposal and all the regional groups have the same position, which is to support the proposal in order to tackle this issue as explained in the CPM reports.

Again, for this issue, it's straightforward issue. It's straightforward changes proposed. I would like to invite the representatives if they have any comments.

Yes, RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

This point was just a change, which we looked at the meeting on the Radio Regulations Committee. We have tried within the framework of the RCC to look at changes not only to specific paragraphs, but to look at changes in the way we're working together to see how it's going to work and to analyze the changes which will be made at the 2020 conference so that we can work jointly.

We have seen that some of the changes that were adopted in 2012 raised many difficulties that we did try to deal with during the three-year period after that conference. Peculiarly, one of those difficulties was 11.4B. So, actually, we're working on additional amendments to paragraph 11.4BG. One of the ideas that we looked at were transferring period of 90 days from 11.40B, to 11.49 so that this may avoid the difficulties which came up during the conference in 2012.

We're looking not only at what's being proposed, but also other points such as 13.6, because it partially happens that when an administration goes into frequency assignments, 13.6, this procedure takes a long time.

And similarly, when it's being proposed, that question J, we're proposing to add that the administration should add explanations to the Bureau.

And other amendments that I can talk about when we come to the next question.

Thank you, sir.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, RCC for this clarification.

So I think as I understand, we will be -- we will be having some modifications to these even proposed methods to satisfy these issues in the CPM report. So even for this specific issue, issue G, is it going to

be -- you are proposing to change the method to solve this specific issue or it will be a new issue under agenda item 7?

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, it would rather be raising several questions. We are proposing amendments to 11.44B to 11.49, and we are proposing changes to 9.6, and it's difficult to look at those separately, and I think general comments concerning the paragraphs issues that we have identified under item 7 on the agenda are now being looked at very separately, but there are links between them. So when we identify them, we should look at the -- what they have in common. So we have to look at these issues that we have been trying now for three years to solve and see where they are similar.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that clarification.

Is there any other comments with regards to issue? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, indent 1 and 2 or indicate, but I have doubt about indent 3. Who ensure that? How this is insured? What is the corresponding specification transmission capacity? This is something very, very weak, and may be considered or deleted, thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that comment.

Actually, I know that this reflects the -- the proposals that we have, but I don't have the information on how they are going to resolve that matter, actually. But any other comments in this regards?

If none, then thank you very much, and I suggest that we move to the next issue, please.

Issue H is about using one space station it bring frequency assignment at different orbital locations and use within a short period of time which is called -- please don't quote me -- frequency hopping.

And basically, this issue has been discussed a lot during the Working Party and different ideas were brought in order to resolve this matter. There are, if I'm not mistaken six methods to resolve this issue, and let's go into them one by one. So the first method is method H1. H1 is proposing no change to the Radio Regulations, however, there will be an inquiry by the Bureau from -- to the administrations about the bringing into use and some information will be requested from the -- from the administrations, and these information will be publicly available.

The information are the previous orbital position of the satellite, and the satellite network, which has been brought into use by the specific satellites at the previous location where the satellite was existing, and then the reason for the relocation of the satellites. So these information would be requested from the administration in case the bringing into use was -- in case the satellite was moved from one position to another.

There are two options to resolve this matter. It's either to include this -- this proposal into the minutes of WRC-15 plenary, or these -- this proposal is to be included in the resolution of the WRC, which will be detailing all of these requested information and the procedures. So this is the first method. Method H2 is basically proposing no change. We can go to method H3, as the extension of the bringing into use period from 90 days to 12 months. In addition to that, using a space monitoring facilities in order to verify the bringing into use information.

Method H4 is to reduce the time available for suspension to the cumulative number of days that the satellite network has been in use, up to a limit of three years. So if the satellite network was the adoptable portion for one year and then they requested for suspension, the suspension is going to be only for one year, instead of three years.

Method H5 is that administrations include the following information as part of the confirmation -- as part of the confirmation of the bringing into use -- of the frequency assignments that is sent to the Bureau. This information are, first, previous orbital position of the satellite, then the date the satellite left the previous orbital position. So in order to identify exactly what is the suspension period of that previous orbital position. Then the name of the ITU filings that are used by the in-orbit satellite at the previous orbital positions. So what are the specific network filings that will be suspended because the satellite has been moved.

These are the information that will be requested from the administration to be provided as the -- in the confirmation of the bringing into use. So that's method H5. Then we go to method H6 which is basically proposing a new resolution in order to tackle this issue.

This new resolution it to be drafted in the conference. It stands on five main elements. The first one is to indicate if the satellite is -- in the case of bringing into use, first, you have to indicate if the satellite is a newly launched satellite or it's an in-orbit satellite.

It also -- this resolution will have an explanation on what do we mean by satellite hopping? If the satellites, based on the first element of the satellite is in-orbit satellite, the bureau will request for clarifications with regards to this satellite.

Based on the information received from the administration, it's either the Bureau accepts the bringing into use information -- or sorry, the Bureau accepts the bringing into use of the satellite filing or if many bureau is not in a position to make a decision, it will refer the issue to the RRB, where the RRB is going to make the decision.

So basically this is the resolutions being proposed in H6. These are the methods proposed. If you can have a look at the table of the regional groups, you don't see a lot of clear positions that have taken place with regards to issue, however, let's start with the representatives in order to clarify further the positions that they have with regards to issue.

So ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. ASMG's position is H1, option A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, APT.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had quite some discussion on these different methods at our recent meeting, but we were unable to come to the point where we had a preliminary common proposal. So that's why nothing is being proposed at this point.
Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. The ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU in its last meeting has considered this issue, and it has been agreed that the principles in method H6 may resolve this issue, considering that method H6 is differentiating between the newly launched satellite and what is currently used and provides some clarity about that. So however, Mr. Chairman, ATU method adoptions H6. There is some -- also Member States in the African country considering somewhat amendments to H6, but it's not yet stated to the Secretary General. So Mr. Chairman, at this stage, the ATU is adopting H6 to resolve this agenda item.
Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for these clarifications. Let's move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, like most regional groups, we have no common position to address this regulatory issue. And this is the only agenda item 7 issue included in the CPM report where we have not been able to find a common ground looking at the methods being proposed, despite extensive discussions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. CITEC, please.

>> JUAN MASCIOTRA: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

Well, unfortunately, CITEC was not able to come to consensus on a proposal on this topic either.
Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. We can move to RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Chairman. We also could not select a specific method, but our general feeling is that the provisions, which have been formulated, which we will consider, maybe adopt, should not restrict the normal functioning of work of operators and administrators -- administrations, rather, when they are controlling their spacecraft constellations. They should be able to move their satellites around, or to improve their coverage zone. And that opportunity should be provided to them. However, some restrictions on the number of such redeployments might facilitate increased efficiency and frequency and spectrum use, and so -- and orbit use too. However, we do not want to create an

impression that a decision has been taken at the headquarters of the ITU, because the selection of methods that we have here is something which might be covered by another UN organization, because the ITU's work is on a frequency assignments and regulation and not taking into account what spacecraft is in what orbital position and when they have abandoned it. That's not our job.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much to the RCC for these clarifications on the concerns that the group has.

Is there any comments with regards to this issue?

Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Just to elaborate a little bit more on the CITELE non-position, and the panelist was absolutely correct that CITELE doesn't have a common position, but there are two positions -- it may be useful for the group to know, that there were two options submitted. One of those proposals was for the no change method, and the other one was for method H5. So thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that. Of course, I would like to remind everyone that we have these methods in the CPM, but that does not mean that these are the only solutions that we have.

As you know usually when we go to the conference, a lot of times the final solution of an agenda item is a compromise between different methods and probably there would be some -- may be some ideas that will be presented even in the conference in order to tackle some of the issues and I can see this issue as one of the issues that is broadly open for a lot of different ideas. That even makes it, I think, a bit difficult because it will be difficult for all administrations to agree on a certain way of resolving the issue, since it is very broad, and you have to look into different -- a lot of different aspects with regards to this matter.

So let's see. Let's wait for the conference and I think we will have a very nice discussion and very long discussions with regards to issue in the conference.

Any other comments? Please, Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Whether or not we find a solution, we are of a strong belief that this is an ITU issue. You will be placing the satellite, positioning the satellite, the suspension. If it's an ITU issue, total ITU issue. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, Iran, for that. Representative of the ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a clarification, so the method H6, has resolved 2 has indicated the number of time which you can move the satellites. I don't know if like the ATEL are supporting this one or they have some modification to the resolution itself. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you. I'm not sure if the proposed resolution and method H6 has clear identification of the number of times. Maybe someone can clarify it, if that is the case. Representative of ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would clarify some points here. The first one is that for the H6 and the ATU position, there was some proposal in the ITU discussion to remove the number of hopping and the limitation to the number of hopping, however, it was not -- we have not reached the full consideration of that. So we don't have the ITU common position on that, however, it's currently considered by several administrations.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to elaborate on what was said by Mr. Rustic, the -- that bringing into use issues and the satellite issues, it is an ITU issue. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the ITU is -- shall consider the efficiency of the use of the spectrum and the associated orbital sources or otherwise, why do we have regulations? Why do we have to amend these regulations?

So Mr. Chairman, I do share the point that this is a very important, sensitive issue, related to how we can use the spectrum efficiency, without causing any limitation for satellite operators to move their satellites between their orbital position based on their markets or whatever the situation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I understand that there are a lot of different international organizations concerned with the space industry as a whole. There are organizations that are concerned with the satellites as physical bodies and they are following up a lot of different matters regarding the satellites themselves, the collision of the satellites. There are lots of different treaties and the United Nations Office.

The ITU as I understand is responsible for the record and the registration of the communication part of the -- of the satellite, and this communication part is including, as well, the orbital position because the orbital position relates directly to the communication and the coordination between different satellites. So my understanding is that the ITU is really administrating the frequency assignments of the satellite networks, of the satellites. This includes the orbital positions and the position of each satellite and how it is going to transmit and how it's going to receive the signals.

So that is -- these are the concerns that we have, with regards no this issue, I'm not sure if you have any other comments?

Yes, please, CEPT.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, I was just thinking that I could provide some clarification on method H6 that you asked regarding the number in the CPM method. They are presented in round brackets and there's a note saying that they are indicative and subject to further discussion. So they are not explicit at the moment.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much.

With that, may I propose to move to the next issue, please? Thank you very much.

So the next issue is issue I of agenda item 7, which is about the possible methods to mitigate excessive satellite network filings. This issue is divided into two different elements. The first one is regarding the excessive filing in the CRC stage, the CRC filings.

The second element is the excessive API satellite network filings, the API stage. So the two stages have been tackled differently in this issue of agenda item 7, and we have different methods to tackle each element of 9 matter -- of the issue.

So with regards to the CRC, we have four different methods to tackle this issue. Method I1 is initial notification. We are proposing a new stage which is called the initial notification stage, which comes before 9 final notification, the usual notification that we have for satellite networks.

So method I1 provides the initial notification stage and due diligence information without Bureau's examination. So the Bureau does not go and examine this information being received.

The second method is method I-1.1, which is the same initial notification, and the same new stage being introduced but at the same time proposing that Bureau examines the information being provided in this new stage.

The second -- the third method is method I-3, which is a method merging the first two methods, I-1 and I-2 which is an optional submission to initial notification.

So you either submit them from -- it's either you submit the information and request the Bureau for examination or you submit the information and you say I don't want the Bureau to examine this information. I hope my understanding is correct.

The fourth method is no change for this -- for this specific CRC element.

Then we move to the second element, which is the API excessive filings. There are three methods that are proposed to resolve this issue. The first method is I 2.1 is for no change. And the second method is I2.2, which is the suppression of the current API mechanism and the third is method I 2.3, removal of the six month requirement between I'm and CRC. Necessary exactly what we have in issue C, which is proposing also these two proposals in order to tackle the API issue.

So this is basically reflecting what we have in issue C.

If we go to the table of positions, regional positions with regards to issue, we can see that there are a lot of positions that took already the decision that are already taken and the regional groups. Maybe we

can turn to the regional groups in order to clarify their positions with regards to the two elements of this issue. Let's start with the RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps I haven't looked through the CPM report correctly. It seems to me on the second issue and API, we have a few more methods, perhaps something has happened. But with regards to removing the notifications -- well, reducing the number of notifications and coordination, well, we support the no change method, because we believe that it's quite a poorly worked out proposal and at the moment, we cannot assess what the consequences might be of the adoption of these proposals. So I do fear that we will might have a situation where in four years time, we would have to adopt new Rules of Procedure or look at this issue again at the conference then.

And I think we do need to think about and work on these proposals.

As regards excessive API filing, we also have the same stance as on issue C. There are various options, which can be considered but we would like to propose the no change option. We would particularly like to draw attention to item 9.5B on geostationary and stationary notifications. Administrations can make remarks with regard to GSO and non-GSO networks.

Finally, we will actually take a final decision on this issue next week at our next meeting.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, RCC, for these clarifications and the details about the different options for the methods.

Can we move to the CITES, please?

>> JUAN MASCIOTRA: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

Unfortunately, as you can see on the screen, on the table, with did not come up with a proposal on possible considerations and methods under this topic.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, sir. Let's move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In general, CEPT supports the principle of limiting the practice of excessive filing, but we still regarding the CRC's as most regions proposed no change to the Radio Regs supporting I 4. With regards to the API, was, as you said, note that any preferred method addressing it should be taking into being the solution for issue C. So we there support method I 2.2, option B, actually, because they have options and that corresponds to the automatic generation of the API when the CRC is submitted.

Thank you.

Oh, if I may take up one more minute of your time, Mr. Chairman. I would like to inform you about the CEPT preparatory process, as you heard the last CEPT meeting will take place the week after next. So at this meeting, we will finalize the remaining draft European common proposals that the project team has developed, and on agenda item 7, we have managed to adopt the ECP until this issue or the first seven issues. Those are already adopted by CEPT, but with this issue, and going forward, I mean, issue actually also issue H, I, J, K and L, they are still in a draft stage. So I hope that they will be adopted at CPG in two weeks. I want to underline that this is draft position still.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, CEPT.

With regards to the options of these methods, my understanding is that the -- the decision that is going to be made in issue C of agenda item 7 is going to automatically be reflected in element of the API mechanism. So whatever decision we take with the different options that are available there, in issue C, I think it's going to be automatically addressing this element, because basically, the two issues addressing the same more or less the same concerns.

So that comment that I had to say, then I suggest that we move to ATU, with any other clarification of the position, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU position for this agenda item, regarding the CRC issues, the filing the CRC, they have come to have no common position until now, however, there's extensive discussion took place about this issue. And the definition of the no change part that -- whether this no change means that we need to further define the solution for the CRC or keep it as it is now in the situation. So this is currently considered by the African Member States and we hope that we could have a common position afterwards.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. We move to APT, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, once again, Mr. Chairman. In our consideration of this issue, there was certainly support, mitigating excessive filings but there were a number of concerns expressed and if you look at the PACP embedded in our PowerPoint document number 2 here, you will find those explained in detail.

So at the moment, we are supporting no change, because we had concerns about the other methods, I 1.1, to I 1.3, if they would be a successful way to move forward on this mitigation issue.

With respect to excessive API filings we didn't develop a view that we could express as a common proposal, but we would understand that some Member States may be submitting information on this topic.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you for the clarification. I would like to move to ASMG.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you very much, we share the same views with our previous colleagues it regards to find the solution to the excessive number of the CRC, but however, we don't find that this will be a solution to this issue due to the difficulties of the number of that issue. And in this case, the ASMG like having the position of I 1.4, and they have like I 2.3 for the excessive.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir for these clarifications.

Is there any other comments from the floor with regards to this issue?

UK, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everybody. Just a comment on the excessive API filings. I wanted to share with you one thing that we noticed is that unless we are wrong, in the briefings published since 1st of July, 2015, we noted that there have been around 600 -- I repeat 600 APIs filed. So I guess that the issues there, I hope that the conference will find a solution to this issue.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Yes, I think the administrations are very happy with the new interface that the bureau is submitting.

Well, everyone is trying to test, you know?

So any other comments?

I see none, so I suggest that we already passed the session time. I suggest we start our break now. And we come back by 10:40 in order to have our second session. We are going to continue on agenda item 7, and continue with the rest of the issues under agenda item 9.1.

So thank you very much. Yes, sorry Avanti.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, sorry to take up your time. Just a brief announcement for the delegations here. At 12:00, or shortly after 12:00, there will be a session in the room opposite, a presentation by the European satellite operators on agenda number 10, there will be some snacks and drinks outside for those who are interested.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I would like to also invite all delegates to download the new version of the presentation that we're having. We had some small amendments on the presentation. And I would like to invite everyone to download the new version that is already posted on the website.

Thank you very much.

(Break)

(A CART Captioner is present and standing by.)

(Gavel).

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to start our session in one minute. If you can please get seated. Thank you.

And I would like to ask the representatives of the regional groups if they can come to the podium. Thank you very much.

Okay. I suggest we start our panel. Panel number 8. We will continue on agenda item 7, the remaining issues under agenda 7 and then go to agenda item 9.1, the issues related to space regulatory issues. So the next issue is issue J of agenda item 7 of WRC-15. This issue about the removal of the link between the date of receipt of the notification of information and the date of bringing into use of 11.44 of the Radio Regulations. Basically, some administrations had the concern regarding this link between the date of bringing into use and the. Currently in the CPM, there's two method. Method J1 is the conclusion towards eliminating from 11.44B of the Radio Regulations. The only instance with the notification and information for a frequency assignment to a space station in the geostationary satellite orbit is not in conformity with Radio Regulations 11.44 because of the requirement to confirm the notified date of bringing into use within 120 days of this date.

So the proposal is to remove this link. Then there's the other method, which is J2, which is basically no change. And from the information I could receive, I found four regional groups have clear positions with regards no this matter. Let's start with from my right, with the ASMG. The ASMG, if you could clarify matter.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, ASMG supports J1, just remove the link between the brought into use and the 120 days, you know, to confirm the brought into use. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I could not find a position for the APT with regards to issue, but if I can ask the representative of APT to clarify, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. APT could not find a position either.

(Laughter).

No, we were unable to find a consensus on what to present. So there's no proposal. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you. Glad we are on the same page.

So ASMG representative, please. I apologize. ATU representative.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Same same. ATU is in the position of adopting method J1 for this issue. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support method J1, removing the link as we note that WRC-12 didn't intend to have such a link in the first place. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, CEPT, and I could see that CITEL did not have a clear position, but before I give the floor, I would like to welcome Mr. Jerry Conner to the podium, who will be our representative for the CITEL region. So Mr. Conner, if you would like to clarify, please.

>> JERRY CONNER: Thank you, Chairman. That is correct. We did have proposals for method J1, but we were unable to get the number of supports necessary to have a numeric proposal.

One thing I want to clear up, for CITEL, I'm the coordinator for agenda item 7, space related and Michele Idell will be the spokesperson at the conference. So they will be the ones primarily dealing with discussing the issues and coming up with any compromises. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, Jerry, although I know you are very good in reaching compromises as well.

I give the RCC, please, if you could explain, thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, yes, we have also been looking at method J1, but at the same time with method J1, we have also been looking at alternative regulatory solutions to this matter. The thing is, what we have looked at is, as I have already said earlier, we were proposing to remove from 11.44 the 120 days and we would rather have 949, and by doing that, we couldn't -- if the administration orbit doesn't have a position for less than 90 days, we won't be able to do that. So we are removing the link between the date of receiving the filing on the information, and the BIU, as in 11.44. Now we see we need to make changes also to the issue of the application of 13.6. We have seen that in many cases, what happens is that for the administration, there is certain deadlines whereas for the Bureau, those -- there are no such limits.

For the administration of 13.6 for the bureau, we need a lot more time than the administration has to answer, and furthermore, we would like clarity and transparency in the procedure for introducing the international frequency register and, therefore, we are proposing to examine certain alternative possibilities for 13.6, so that the bureau can provide information to the administration on the basis of which it would initiate 13.6.

We are discussing this proposal in our regional organization next year, and I will -- next week, and I will inform you about the results of that, when they are ready. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir.

So, again, if my understanding is correct, then there are other measures that the RCC are proposing in order to tackle this issue. However, these additional measures will have other consequences that -- that the conference has to look at cumulatively. I mean, this issue, in addition to these other measures, because they are all linked together, right?

So thank you very much for this clarification.

And is there any other requests or comments from the floor?

If there are none, then I would like to thank you very much, and I propose to move to the next issue that we have.

Which is issue K of agenda item 7 of the WRC. Issue K is about additional regulatory provision in the Radio Regulations, in Article 11 of the Radio Regulations for the case of launch failure. Basically, there were some concerns that in the case of launch failure of a satellite, this might have negative consequences, negative effects on the filing, the satellite network filing and probably it might jeopardize the filing, and then might reach the deadline of the regulatory period without having the launch, because of a launch failure.

So this issue has been discussed in the study cycle and basically for the time being, we have three methods in the CPM reports tackling this issue. Method K1 is conclusion towards an additional provision to the Radio Regulations to regulate any launch failure of a satellite, that such failure makes the satellite unable to start bringing into use or bringing back too use of a notified frequency assignment.

Method K2 is an alteration of this proposed regulatory provisions proposed in method K1, however, method K2 is to make the issue or to tackle the issue on a case-by-case basis, by the RRB. So in the case of a launch failure, there will be regulatory provisions in the Radio Regulations, but addressing the matter by referring it to the RRB on a case by case basis.

Method K3 is basically no change to the Radio Regulations.

If we have a look at the table of positions of the regional groups, we can see that, well, most of the regional groups have specified, have indicated their positions with regards to this issue. I would like to start from my left with the RCC representative, please, if you could clarify the position of RCC.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We do support the prolongation of the regulatory period and when there has been launch failure, and in accordance with the provisions of 11.44 of radio communications we think that if we need such a prolongation of launch failure, we should at least have four years after receipt of information, depending on which are the cases that are being examined.

So we think that the period of prolongation, we should not increase the difference to more than three years from the date of the launch failure. We think that this prolongation should be a result of a decision by the committee on the basis of the report from the Bureau and this will provide an analysis of all the information concerning the launch failure.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for this clarification. So the position will be to have the case being referred back to the RRB, right? At the end, the RRB has to make the decision. It's different than K2 that's proposed in the CPM reports because K2 also refers -- it's additional regulatory provisions and referring the case to the RRB to take the decision. Maybe you can clarify the difference between the two.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Well, it's very close to the method of K2, but we haven't defined the specific text, which will make it possible to deal with this issue, and at this point, I can't tell you which will be the K2 method, and we -- we will decide on a method. It may be an amended one next week during our meeting.

Thank you, sir.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you, sir, for the clarification.

Okay. I would like to move to CITEL. I see that there's no defined position in this regard, but perhaps the representative can give us more comments.

>> JERRY CONNER: Thank you. CITEL, we did have a proposal for no change, but we were not able to get enough support for an interAmerican proposal.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. Let's move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As ASMG and ATU and CEPT supports the current practice of referring launch failures to the RRB so that the most appropriate regulatory actions can be taken on the case-by-case basis. So we support no change to the Radio Regulations. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I would like to move to ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you. Mr., we are in the same position of ASMG and CEPT, supporting no change to the regulatory regulation as the current practices are sufficient to address this issue, and studies to have to -- the studies that have not addressed all potential issues.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, the APT, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, agency you see from your table, our position is supportive of method K2. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir.

I would like to move to ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ASMG supports method K3, no change for the existing procedure.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. So is there any other comments or clarifications from the floor?

If not, then thank you very much.

Let's move to the next issue that we have, which is issue L. Issue L is modification of certain provisions of appendices 30 and 30A of the radio regulation. Namely the replace. Of Tass Seth agreement with explicit agreement or alignment of those provisions of appendices 30 and 30A for regions 1 and 3, with those of appendix 30B. So basically replacing the tacit agreement for explicit agreement for 30, and 30A, for regions 1 and 3. There are three -- currently three methods in the report. Method L1 is to todayify the corresponding provisions of appendices 30 and 30A of the regulatory regulations. That tacit be replaced by ex police it agreement.

The second method, method L2 is basically harmonizing appendices, Article 4 of appendices of 30 and 30A with Article 6 of appendix 30B and that would basically replace the tacit agreement with explicit agreement. The third is no change.

So these are the three methods that are currently in the CPM report. If we move to the table of positions of the regional groups, we see that there are some positions, and would like to request the regional representatives to give us further clarifications. So we start with ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. ASMG support method L2, just to harmonize like the existing procedure for 30B.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, for that.

We move to APT, I see that there's no position that can be found which I received but probably further clarifications.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We were not able to develop a view which would lead to a common proposal on this issue.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. Let's move to ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU supports L1, considering the low APM values resulted from the current procedures of the tacit agreement, however, Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate that during discussing this issue in the AT U., it has been common decision that no change would not resolve this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for these comments. Let's move to CEPT, please.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see that we will have inning discussions on this topic. CEPT supports no change to the radio regs method. We know that it was with coordination triggers and changing such a regulatory procedure that's proposed, we don't think it can be done without considering different technical coordination triggers as well.

So also from a broader perspective, we also know that there may be other preferable methods to achieve harmonization between the different appendices. So -- and though methods may not be included in the CPM report.

And finally, we also note that a requirement of explicit agreement would make it more difficult for newcomers to enter into the list of appendices 30 and 30A. This will be an interesting debate for sure.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, CEPT for these comments. I have think this is going to be a very interesting topic that we will be having in the conference.

So I would like to move to CITELE. I also see that I could not find a clear position in this regard, but, please.

>> JERRY CONNER: Well, thank you, Chairman. That's pretty easy because for us we don't consider that this issue impacts Region 2. So we had no input contribution on this issue and therefore no corresponding position. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. That makes sense.

Move to RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Chairman. Well, we have a similar position of CEPT, we support L3, that is to keep everything unchanged because we cannot fully define what all the consequences might be after the entry into force of these proposals, and in connection with this, we believe it is too early to make modifications at this stage. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir, for these clarifications.

I would like to open the floor for the discussion. Please. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The issue of these three methods stems from the information that we received based on the request, automatically to the Bureau providing the reference situation. We found

in many countries, particularly developing country because of lack of reply, the reference situation is below certain levels, sometimes up to minus 25-decibel, and those people who are familiar with appendices, 30, 30A, we are talking 1 and 3, if it's below a certain level, they would not be identified in subsequent applications. So they are penalized forever and you have the information perhaps, perhaps it would not be any difficulty to table this or provide it to WRC-12 could be updated by the Bureau to indicate what are the situations. Those people who propose no change, they should find a solution for those countries whose reference situation now is minus 30-decibel.

That is the situation. They should reply to that. And tacit agreement is something taken from the very old provisions of the terrestrial. And in the terrestrial, in Geneva 06, we have the same issues. Some did not reply and they lose all the rights. They lose the rights with respect to 200, 250 assignments because of one-day delay or not reply.

This is not a good thing. So we have to work together. We have to find solutions.

Number two, I appendices 30B is not complying. If you don't reply, it means have you not agreed, however, there are administrations who come to the Bureau and ask assistance of the Bureau. The Bureau send the message. If there's no reply, it's considered agreed. Perhaps there should be something that adding to that, sending a message from the Bureau to that country reply should be accompanied by the value of the reduction of the either preference situation, we don't have a representative situation but maxim C over I to tell this administration in you don't reply, your maximum, which is now 32-decibels becomes 20-decibel. So he would be aware of how much he loses. That's also something -- we have to find solutions for many countries.

I look at the table of WRC-12 and hopefully that will be updated for WRC. You see how many countries that are affected. Mostly development companies. And I think working together as the motion of universality, we have to assist each other.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir. I think, yes, we as administrations, members in the ITU, I think it is our role to find an appropriate solution for this matter, however, I think the thing that is already done, I'm not really sure how this can be actually undone. The effected administrations, they are already affected and I'm not really sure. I think this concern has been raised even in WRC-12. And they were administrations who were showing the concern that their plans were badly affected and I'm not sure if something could be done for -- in this regard.

However, we need to find some sort of solution. Maybe this is only one proposal to have a solution for this, but probably there are some other proposals like you rightfully indicated. There might be some other solutions for this issue.

So, yes, any other comments in this regards?

If not, then thank you very much.

With issue L, we have finished the issues that are included in the CPM report for agenda item 7. I basically took all the issues that are in the CPM report currently, so the official issues under agenda item 7, and we reflected these issues in this presentation and we had the regional positions, but I understand that there are other issues that are being proposed, and off record being discussed even with regards to agenda 7, some additional issues.

So I will give the floor for the last intervention with regards to agenda item 7. Are there any other comments with regard to agenda item 7. APT, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to point out we have three issues that we have identified in addition to those we have been discussing. There's some details on these on slides 50 and 51 of our presentation, our PowerPoint presentation. Those who are interested could go and look at that material.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I think, yes, we could have a look at these proposed issues. Yes, CEPT?

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have the same. I also want to highlight that in CEPT, we have five still draft CEPT positions, but we have established five additional issues. So they are also captured in our input to this workshop, document 10, and if the attendees would like to have a look at them.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. Any other concerns?

Okay. Thank you. I really suggest that for the people who would be following agenda 7 to carefully look at the input contributions from all administrations and regional groups because I understand that it's not going to be only these issues that are in the CPM report, there are -- as was indicated just now, there are other issues that are going to be introduced in the conference, and I think we will be having some fun time trying to tackle these issues.

So thank you very much. We are going to move to our next issue, which is 9.1.2, before that I think our representative in the CEPT is going to switch placed with another representative, which is Mr. Mario Neri from the UK. So just one minute to change the seats. Thank you very much, madam, miss, for your contribution on this podium.

>> ANNA MARKLUND: Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: So, again, I would like to welcome Mr. Mario Neri, to this podium to continue with the issues under our concern.

So the next issue is issue 9.1.2 of agenda item 9.1 of the WRC. This issue is about studies on possible reduction of the coordination arc, and technical criteria used in application of number 9.41 of the Radio Regulations, and respect of coordination under 9.7 of the Radio Regulations.

So basically, this issue is split into two parts. The first part is -- resolves one which is about the technical criteria of application 9.41, with respect to coordination under 9.7. And this issue has had a lot of discussions and a lot of different proposals. I recall that we had long discussions and different ways to mitigate or to find alternative solutions to the technical criteria that are currently being used in the radio regulations.

Finally, we have four different methods to satisfy this part of issue 9.1.2. We have these four methods, option 1A, which is to retain 9.7, 9.41, and 11.42A of the radio regulations essentially unchanged.

We will change the criteria to C over I, which is C over n plus X, where X is less than 12.2db which this value corresponds to 6% delta T over T.

Then are 11.32A of the Radio Regulations would use the same C over I criteria which is indicated above. This is option 1A. Option 1B is no change to appendix A. Change threshold levels for application of 9.41 for some frequency bands. Replace C/I and 11.32A of with uplink/downlink PFD masks for some frequency bands. Then we have option 1C which is the same as option 1B, however PFD thresholds will be used outside the coordination arc and then you have the fourth option which is no change to the technical criteria.

Then we -- we see the second part of this issue, which is the reduction of the coordination arc. Currently there are three methods or three options to resolve this matter. The first option is option 2A, is to reduce the coordination arc as follows: For the C band, the reduction from plus and minus a degree to plus and minus 6 degrees. For the KU band, the reduction from 7 -- plus or minus 7 degrees to plus or minus 5 degrees and there will be no change to the plus and minus 8 degrees coordination arc for the KA band.

For option 2B, the proposal is to reduce the coordination arc as follows, for the C band, there will be a reduction from the plus and minus 8 degrees coordination arc to plus or minus 6 degrees. For the KU band there will be a reduction from plus and minus 7 degrees to plus and minus 5 degrees and there is also a reyou can doion of coordination arc for the KA band from plus or minus 8 degrees to plus or minus 6 degrees.

The third method to resolve this matter is option 2C, which option -- yes, 2C which is no change.

So these are basically the two parts of issue 912, and the different options to resolve the two concerns that we have. We can move immediately to the table of positions. So we see some positions that have been taken from the regional groups with regards to these -- to this issue and the different parts of it. We can start discussing these and getting clarifications from the regional groups. We can start from the left side, from the representative of the RCC, please.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Chairman. With regards to the issues under the first group, we support changing -- replacing, delta T over T with C/I in order to ensure that the methods which are applied in Article 9 and 11 are based on the application of the very same criteria.

We are not ready to agree on the use of masks and the application of masks as it's set out in the CPM report at the moment. So we do not support the application of PFD masks here.

As regards coordination arcs, the second group of questions and issues, we support reducing the coordination arc on all three bands a little different from the methods which are set forth in the CPM report. That's our approach. It means that the -- in the 20 to 30 gigahertz band, we have -- we have a slightly different proposal for the degree of reduction.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I think these -- the details of the reduction proposals and the RCC position can be found in the RCC contribution to the conference as well. I understand this is a bit different than the reductions that are proposed by the CPM report.

So we move to the CITEL region, please.

>> JERRY CONNER: Thank you, Chairman. CITEL has a position of reducing the coordination arc for the C and KU bands but we do not have a position on the KA band. Also, we do not have a position on the coordination or the coordination trigger.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you. So it's not actually 2A. The position on KA band is not decided yesterday.

>> JERRY CONNER: Well, it is for the C and the KU, but the KA, we do not have a position.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for the position. We move to CEPT.

>> MARIO NERI: Let me start with the easier one, the reduction of the coordination arc. First of all, on the 9.1.2 issue, the CEPT has almost finished its works as far as the adoption of the ECP, the preliminary CPS being sent to the final CPT, as you show on this slide option 2A, so we support the reduction of the coordination arc by 2 degrees in the C ending the KU band but we support no change for the KA band, and the reason for this is that we think that the networks that are currently working today are not ready enough for advocating a reduction of the coordination arc.

Going back to results one, as far as the technical criteria to be adopted, as you correctly show in this slide, that the CEPT has adopted -- is suggesting a method which is different from the options currently contained in the CPM report. So let me explain what this is about. First of all, the CEPT does not support the proposal to include a criterion of delta T/T because we think that this is different from the spirit of the analysis carried out under 11.32A. Further more, CEPT proposes no changes to Article 9 or appendix A, but we propose some changes as far as Article 11. In fact, we propose that in carrying out the analysis under 11.32A, we go from the application of a C/I criterion, to a criterion that it is actually the choice between a criterion-based on C/I and one based on PFD. The PFD thresholds, the PFD levels based on a 6% of delta T/T increase and we also advocate that when the administration is notifying their network to the ITU, it takes -- it makes the choice of which criterion should be used vis-a-vis each of the networks identified under 9.36.2. So the administration has the choice of which criterion should be used under the analyses carried out under 11.32A.

And finally, the approach that we suggest, we should be applied for networks, whose notification request is received by the Bureau after the date of entering into force of the final acts of the conference.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for these clarifications. And perhaps maybe the comments on these concerns or these proposals will be at the end of the presentation for this issue.

So we move to ATU, please, if you can explain.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the ATU position in results 2 related to the coordination arc, ATU has CPT and the coordination arc. For result one, the ITU is in the position of adopting 1B, however, there is an extensive discussion took place in the ATU meeting and that was several proposals to have different position, and still it is under consideration by Member States and I think it would be submitted to the diversity.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I would like to move to APT, although I could not find a clear position with regards to this issue, however, I would like to ask for any clarification from the representative of AP T., please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We were unable to come to any agreement on developing a common proposal 9.1.2. It doesn't inhibit that some Member States may submit material but at this point, we don't have anything from the regional groups. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: All right, thank you PAX.

We move to ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the ASMG's with regard to the criteria to be used and the coordination. So we have the method 1D, option 1D with no change to the existing practice by the validity of 6%. With regard to reduction, the coordination arc, we are supporting too further apply the reduction for the KA band.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

While I'm taking the floor, I don't know I shouldn't mind, I think there's one agenda item before, which is 9.1.1. I'm sure that -- okay. Thank you Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir, for these clarifications. For the 9.1.1, it was already discussed yesterday in one of the panels, which included also 1.6, and 1.7, and 1.8.

So looking at all of these positions, I would like to open the floor for any concerns or comments or clarification requests from the floor.

Any concerns? Please, Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Simply, we repeat what we said in working party 4A, these issues should not be treated separately. They are interconnected with ex-other. It would have some consequences if you treat them separately.

9.4.1, reduction of coordination arc, delta T/T, all are connected to ex-other. So we should have a decision which cover everything. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much.

Any other comments? Thank you very much.

This this case, I propose we move to the next issue we have on our session, which is issue 9.1.3. This issue is about the use of satellite orbital positions and associated frequency spectrum to deliver international public telecommunication services in developing countries. The current CPM report has two possible conclusions for this issue. Basically, as a summary of the report, option A is for no change. Option B is to revise resolution 11 of WRC-12 which is calling for this issue, in order to continue with the studies as it may be required for the studies of resolve 2 of WRC-12 to continue even after WRC-15. So basically continuing the studies after the conference.

We can see the table of regional positions that some of the regions have already taken some positions with regard to this issue, and I would like to request the representatives to kindly clarify further the positions that these regions have. So I would like to start from the right, ASMG, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ASMG studied the cases and, you know, go through all the -- I mean, maybe studies going through the last cycle of the Working Party, and they found that no change for the, like, existing practice and, you know, we agree to suppress the resolution for this issue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that. APT, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: We developed the view that all satellite network filings should be treated in the same manner and on an equal basis, and hence that took us towards the no change and we also support no change to the -- we retained the resolution 11, thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that.

The ATU, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ATU supports option B of the revision to this edition, in order to tip the studies as required for resolution 11 to continue even after the WRC-15. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that.

CPT, if you could please kindly explain your position.

>> MARIO NERI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So the discussion in the CEPT about this issue is still ongoing. It is almost concluded. We think we will take a new conclusion at the C. EPT in two weeks. I expect a large majority of countries agree that we recognize there are some challenges sometimes for developing countries to access the resources, we think the current regulatory procedures and framework are adequate. So we advocate for no changes to articles 9 and 11.

Furthermore, on the fate of resolution 11, there's been quite an intense discussion in the CEPT, and although as anticipated, no final decision has been taken, I can tell you that there is a slight majority of administrations who support 9 -- the suppression of resolution 11. Again, this is not our final decision yet, and keep an eye on the outcome of the CPG to see what it will be.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir, for this clarification. CITEL, if you could kindly give us some explanation on your position.

>> JERRY CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had no input contributions and so we have no proposals for this.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much.

I would like to turn to RCC, please. Nacioni thank you, Chairman. We have the same situation at CITEL.

At the moment, we have no position on this agenda item, I think that our next meeting we will be able to adopt something and develop something, thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for this explanation.

So now, I would like to open the floor for any comments or concerns. Are there any comments? Yes, Sweden. Oh, SCS, sorry.

>> SCS: I have a question for -- to increase my own understanding on this issue. I mean, a no change of the resolution 11, maybe I should direct this question to APT, what does that really mean? It's then not valid anymore because it's not modified to be continued? So the -- the consequence of a no change resolution 11, I would like to have that clarified, thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. So the floor is given to APT. Yes, please.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you for the question. The explanation I see in our document that we are preparing is that option A which is described in the CPM report does not refer to option 11. So if we don't support that resolution, how can we talk about option 11? That was the point. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. So choosing the option as per the CPM report, this is what I understand. So any other comments or concerns?

If not, thank you very much. This case, I would like to move to our next issue, which is 9.1.5 of the conference under agenda item 9.1. This issue is about consideration of technical and regulatory actions, in order to support existing and future operations of the fixed satellite earth service stations within the band 3.400 to 4200 megahertz, as an aid to the safe operation of aircraft and reliable distribution of message logical information in some countries in Region 1.

There was one decision or one conclusion with regards to issue and it is as explained in the -- in the slide, conclusion towards modification to resolution, 152 WRC-12, to use the special care in the coordination

assignment and management of the frequencies taking into consideration the potential impact on the FSS earth stations used for satellite communications related to safe operation of aircraft and the reliable distribution of my row logical information and the frequency band 3400 to 4200 megahertz.

Also, there is a possible of consideration that may be given to modifying number 5.430A to include a reference to the modified Roe solution.

So that is basically the proposal that is proposed in the CPM report. If we can have a look at the table of positions of the regional groups, you see that some regional groups has expressed their positions with regards no this issue. Let's start this time from ASMG if you could kindly clarify the position, please.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ASMG supports the modification of resolution 1.5.4 to meet the requirement of the safety in this cooperation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. We will go to the APT. Although I see there's no clear position given so far, but, please, if you can explain.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we booked at this, it's restricted to many countries in Region 1 and their concern and we do not support any aspects of this issue being applied to Region 3. So we have that position. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much.

I would like to move to ATU and clarify the position, please.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the ATU is in the position of supporting the option proposed under this item. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, let's move to CEPT, if you can explain, please.

>> MARIO NERI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the CEPT coordinator for this agenda item is Mr. Mingagus Rogers who could not attend this meeting I will do my best to explain the CEPT position. As far as 9.1.5, the CEPT is of the view that there's no additional technical regulatory measures required for the operation of these FSS earth stations of 3.2 to 4.2 gigahertz and we think that the procedures in the Radio Regulations address the issues raised by resolution 1.5.4. And all the -- all these procedures can ensure the compliance with the footnote 5.430A.

CEPT is also of the view that this agenda item should not be used to obtain additional protection, compares to the one currently provided by the application of the existing regulatory procedures. And CPT also considered that these kind of FS S. applications should not be considered as falling within the scope of Article 4.10 of the Radio Regulations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that. So basically, the CEPT proposal is for no change? Okay. Thank you.

Let's move to CITEL, and I see that there's no position clearly given by 9 contributions from CITEL, but, please, if you can explain.

>> JERRY CONNER: It's the same as the other ones, we received no input contributions on this. So CITEL has no contribution. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that. If I move to RCC, please, if you can explain.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: , thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support this. It's in our report, and I have nothing to add.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. I would like to open the floor for any concerns or clarifications.

Yes, Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just one question for clarification to CEPT representatives. In the position on this agenda, we see that CEPT suggested and the guess and the belief that existing provision in the radio regulation clearly protects and responds to this concern which is the rise on this agenda item.

At the same time, if we look at what the CEPT position on C band on the agenda item 1.1, they suggest to withdraw some elements, some regulatory and technical provision from the Radio Regulations. So it looks for me that there is some -- some contradiction in this position. Maybe some more clarification from CEPT, we can hear on this topic. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much. The floor is for CEPT, please.

>> MARIO NERI: Thank you very much, Russia, for the interesting question.

I think that when we developed our -- and actually, this is the approach that we use in the CEPT, when we developed our positions on the different issue, we tend to consider and concentrate on the different agenda item taken singularly. As far as the particular issue raised by 9.1.5, we think that for addressing the issues of -- the issues raised in resolution 1.5.4, you can use the notification procedures and the coordination according to the ITU-R methodologies for protecting those stations, but that's limited to the issue analyzed under this agenda item. We have expect then, of course the conference taking into being all the other issues discussed will be taking a decision, which encompasses different agenda items without contradicting each other, and I hope I clarified the position as much as I could.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for that clarification. Any other comments or concerns? Okay. If not, then thank you very much. I would like to move to the next issue that we have, which is going to be issue 9.1.8, under agenda item 9.1 of the WRC.

This issue is basically about the regulatory aspects of nano and pico satellites, and the studies in this regards have led to a single conclusion with regards to issue. The conclusion is that the ITU Study Groups has indicated aadditional efforts should be undertaken by the Bureau, administrations and others to help increase knowledge and raise awareness about the applicable regulatory procedures for satellite networks, among thosenities, like universities and others involved in developing launching of nano and pico satellites. This' another alteration, which could be to consider modifications to the regulatory procedures for identifying satellite networks to accommodate nano satellite and pico satellite. This is included in the CPM report as an alternative conclusion to this -- to this issue.

So if we go to the table of positions, of the regional groups, although there's no clear conclusion for this issue in the CPM report, so the different regional groups had their comments and their concerns expressed and their contributions with regards to this position. So that's why I would like to ask the regional groups to provide us with their concerns or their positions with regard to this issue.

I forgot where I started but this time I think I will start from the left. RCC, please. Thank you.

>> NIKOLAY VARLAMOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We think that the'lls which may be made in the filing procedure for coordinating satellite networks, for nano and pico satellites should not lead to any complications or overloading the procedure with respect to what I would call normal satellites rather than nano and pico satellites.

We think if any amendments are needed or any research is needed, that should go into the radiocommunications network at the conference to take this after 2015, and this should go on to the agenda. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for this clarification. Let's move to CITELE, if you can please provide us with your comments.

>> JERRY CONNER: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, CITELE, we support the expression of res for athe agenda item 19 to address this issue. In addition we support no change to the current Radio Regulations. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for this clarification.

CEPT.

>> MARIO NERI: The coordinator for this item is in the room. With your indulgence, I would like to give him the floor.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Yes, please.

>> Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mario, for allowing me to represent the CEPT position on agenda item 9, issue 9.1.8. So the CEPT position is that articles 9 and 11 remain unchanged. So that's no change. However, CEPT supports the development of an ITU-R resolution to develop material containing detailed information that would help to improve the awareness of the applicable procedures for submitting filings of satellite networks.

In particular, among new entrants among the space sector. So that's in line with the conclusion of the company. Furthermore, ITU-R does recognize the need to address the expected growing number of nano and pico satellites launched.

Thank you, chair.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, CEPT for this clarification.

Then let's move to ATU, if you could kindly clarify.

>> AMR ASHOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the ATU is at the position of simplify the regulatory procedures for nano and pico satellites. Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much.

Let's move to APT, please, if you can explain your position.

>> JOHN LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support studies to examine the necessary procedures for notifying nano and pico satellites which take into account the unique characteristics while we want to ensure there's no unacceptable impact on existing services and stations operating or planned that are in conformity with the radio regulations.

We support that the issue associated with the satellite should be reviewed under an agenda item that deals with satellite regulatory issues as the future conference so that we can focus on how best to develop regulatory procedures for the notification of these satellite networks.

And we have support the retention of resolution 7.5.7 with modifications to indicate that we need to continue work on this with a view to doing something at WRC-19.

Thank you.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much, sir. So we move to ASMG, if you could kindly clarify your position.

>> NIZAR ALDEIRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we have the same views. We recognize that any number that has been used, we think there is a need to have some regulation, maybe simple regulation, but clearly, and how the administration would apply this on these cases. ASMG would like to be on the agenda item of 2019, like this issue, to review and have maybe additional regulation for this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> KHALID AL-AWADHI: Thank you very much for these clarifications.

Are there any other comments from the floor, please? Or concerns regarding this issue?

Thank you very much. If not, then this is basically, the last issue that we had in our panel. So with that, we conclude all the issues and agenda items that we had for the satellite regulatory issues.

I would like to thank all the panelists on the podium and previous panelists for participating in this panel and the previous panel in order to discuss the regional positions of the subject agenda items and issues.

And thank you very much for all of these clarifications, and I would like to thank all the participants to these sessions and the previous session for their very nice contributions and very nice comments and the collaboration which was shown, and last but not least, I would like to thank Mr. Filipe for the huge efforts that were made in order to arrange for this panel and the previous panel and all the panels before that.

So thank you very much, Mr. Filipe.

With that, I announce that we have concluded our session. I see that we have an early lunch break. So congratulations to everyone!

So thank you very much, and we'll see you soon in the conference. Thank you very much.

(end of session)

This text is being provided in an unedited 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.

**3 September 2015.
1400 CET.**

This text is being provided in an unedited 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.

>> Good afternoon, everyone. We would like to get started with panel 9. I hope you all had a nice lunch, hopefully not too nice of a lunch that you fall asleep during the panel.

Panel 9 deals with agenda items that I like to call related to the science services. My name is John Zuzek from the United States. I work for the national aeronautics and space administration in the United States, NASA. I am also a vice-chairman of Study Group 7 here in the ITU.

I have the privilege of having a panel here of very distinguished experts. On my left, Mr. Alexander Vassiliev from the RCC, also a vice-chairman of Study Group 7, I might add. He was also the Rapporteur for chapter 2 of the CPM which contained these items. Miss Chantal Beaumier from Canada, CEPT, I mean CITEU. I knew that was going to happen one of these times. (chuckles).

She goes to CEPT meetings too sometimes. But no, CITEU. Mr. Hanspeter Kuhlen from CEPT. Mr. Abdou Ndiaye from ATU, Miss Zhu Keer from APT, and Mr. Ahmad Amin from ASMG. So we will work through all of the items we have, and actually we only have three agenda items that we will discuss in detail, at least theoretically.

We do have information on items 1.13, 9.2.1 and 9.2.2. But I suspect that we will have some time here, so if we can provide additional information on any of these items, we will try to do so, and also seek any views from the room that might not be represented here by the regional groups.

Let's move to agenda item 1.11. This agenda item is to consider a primary allocation for the Earth exploration-satellite service in the earth to space direction, in the 7 to 8 gigahertz range in accordance with resolution 650, which called for the study of the spectrum requirements and compatibility studies in this range for the EESS telecommand operations, in order to complement the telemetry operations that currently exist in the space to earth direction in the 8025 to 8400 megahertz band.

It is also notable that agenda item 1.9.1 that we talked about yesterday afternoon also deals with possible new, allocations to the FSS in the 7150 to 7250 frequency band. It would be useful to note that.

There are three methods in the CPM, to satisfy this agenda item. Method A proposes to add a global primary allocation to the EESS in the earth to space direction in the band 7190 to 7250 megahertz, with different conditions established to protect the currently allocated services.

Method B is similar to method A, except the operation of the EESS systems is subject to obtaining agreement under radio regulation number 9.2.1 with regard to the space operation service. Then method C is the no change option.

The regional positions as I understand them, and I'm sure my colleagues will correct me if I have made errors in interpreting what I have seen, but I have used green to indicate a proposal or very definitive common position, and I used yellow to indicate that I haven't seen an actual final proposal yet, so for example in the APT on this, it's a preliminary A CP, I believe and therefore, I put it in yellow. But it seems to be very clear what option is being considered.

So, with that, why don't we start with the ASMG, and can tell us your views on this topic. Thank you.

>> AHMAD AMIN: Thank you, Chair. Firstly I would like to welcome all colleagues. With regarding the Arab group, we are of the view to allocate to add a primary allocation to Earth exploration-satellite services in the frequency band 7190 to 7250 megahertz. This corresponds to method B. Therefore, we support method B. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, ASMG. We will go to the APT, please.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman, and good afternoon, everyone, APT members of supportive of a global primary allocation to the EESS earth to space direction in the band 7190 to 7250. And APT members are also of the view that the located services in this band should be adequately protected from potential interference due to the possible new allocation, and also no constraints should be placed on these services. Based on this common view, APT agreed on a text for our preliminary common proposal, and which is modified method and based on the method A of the CPM report. The major difference of this common proposal from the method A of CPM report is that we add a new footnote which, that says that space stations in Earth exploration-satellite services, earth to space direction operating in the geostationary satellite orbit shall not claim protection from emissions from the space research services, in this frequency band.

This is based on the sharing studies between the EESS and the space research services near to earth which shows that in some cases, full code frequency operations in particular when the earth stations are geographically co-located or nearby, the interference levels from the near earth SRS uplinks into EESS lights would exceed the applicable ITU criterion, and in order to put no constraints on the already existing SRS services, and we propose this new footnote on this method. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I give the floor to the ATU representative.

>> ABDOU NDIAYE: Thank you, Chair. With regarding this agenda item, ATU supports method A, which is a primary global primary allocation for earth to space, within the frequency bands stated. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, sir. And CEPT.

>> HANSPETER KUHLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. CEPT has also clear position in favor of method A, so the band 7190 to 7250 megahertz is proposed for a primary allocation. We have already in European con a proposal on that so this means it's quite a advanced position in Europe. We see that for the consideration that were just mentioned in the footnote that this could be one solution. But we think since we are talking about an uplink earth to space direction, these stations are anyhow coordinated under national coordination, so that means any potential sharing which might be affected is somewhat coordinated in a local way.

And if there is a cross national, cross border aspect affected, potentially affected, then there is protection through appendix 7. With that, we fully support method A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. CITELE?

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you, Chairman, I would like to start by saying that I'm not an expert in space science issues. But I've agreed to be the spokesperson for CITELE since our coordinators for these various agenda items could not be present at this workshop. I'll do my best to pretend like I am an expert. With respect to 1.11 CITELE supports also method A, and we believe that studies have shown that sharing between the ESS earth to space and other services in 7190 to 7250 megahertz bands is feasible. We don't believe that a footnote making ESS earth to space secondary relative to the SRS to the application of number 921 is necessary. The studies in the ITU-R have indicated that potential interference cases can be resolved by coordination of ESS and the space research systems under the applicable provisions of the SRS. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And last but certainly not least, the RCC, and I note that on my chart it says, does not object to the concept of the allocation, but I could not find a definitive proposal at this time. So perhaps Mr. Alexander Vassiliev can elaborate. Thank you.

>> ALEXANDER VASSILIEV: Good afternoon, distinguished colleagues. I'm grateful to the Chairman for correctly reflecting the preliminary position of the administration of communications RCC.

The administration of communications does not object to the allocation of frequency band 7190, 7250 megahertz on a primary basis to the ESS, on condition that compatibility with systems of service, of space exploitation, space research, are set for fixed and mobile services are ensured. The conditions of compatibility of satellites or ESS in a range of 78 gigahertz to other existing services should be reflected in the radio regulations.

As I've already said, this is a preliminary position. The final decision will be taken next week at the meeting of the administration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you, Mr. Vassiliev. I believe we will have sufficient time to get through all of our items. So I have been asked as a member of the space frequency coordination group to provide its views on these items.

The SFCG supports the primary allocation as provided for in method A. So they do not believe that the 9.21 coordination is a necessity for this item.

Now, I would like to open the floor to any other views that might be available. I see none. Or are there any questions from the floor?

Okay. Then we will move on to the next agenda item. This is agenda item 1.12. Its purpose is to consider an extension of the current worldwide allocation to the Earth exploration-satellite service active in the frequency band 9300 to 9900 megahertz by up to 600 megahertz, within the bands 8700 to 93 megahertz and/or 9900 to 10.5. In accordance with resolution 651.

Again, as always, resolution 651 called for the studies of the possible extension, also ensuring protection of existing services and taking due account of the safety services that are allocated in the 9000 to 9300 megahertz range. There are, well, we came to CPM having two methods to satisfy the agenda item and we left with four methods and some sub methods, and some options.

So things perhaps got a little more complicated. Method A actually has two options, method A1 and method A2. But method A allocates in -- excuse me -- the 9900 to 10,500 megahertz band to the EES active so it's an extension fully upward from the existing allocation. Then method A1 has two sub options and method A2 includes power flux density limits for the protection of the fixed service.

Method B, somewhat parallels method A, but it makes the allocation from 9200 to 9300 megahertz and then 9900 to 10,400 megahertz with two options, method B1 and B2. B2 includes power flux density limits to protect the fixed service but it should be noted that the limits in method B are different than the limits in method A.

Method C actually makes a primary allocation in the bands 9200 to 9300 megahertz and 10,000 to 10,100 megahertz and a secondary, allocation in the band 9900 to 10,000 megahertz. So the result is a 300 megahertz extension rather than a 600 megahertz extension.

Method D is the no change option.

That's what we have from the CPM report. Now the regional positions, and I tried to reflect here as best as I could, so I note that we do appear to have a proposals from the APT, the ASMG, CEPT, CITEL and the RCC, and then ATU did not have a common proposal at this time, but I noted from their document that there was some support for different methods. So I tried to reflect that here as well.

With that, I'd like to start perhaps on the other end with Mr. Vassiliev and the RCC.

>> ALEXANDER VASSILIEV: Thank you. It's true that this item is more complicated than 1.11. Therefore, the RCC proposal contains several positions.

First of all, we think that the extension of the present allocation to ESS in the frequency band 9300-9900 megahertz up to 600 megahertz would be preferable within the frequency band 9900, 10500 megahertz. And only when we have determined the protection systems will the other services in this adjacent frequency bands come in.

So we think that the allocation of bands, in case of additional allocation of bands, that of up to 600 megahertz for ESS, this band shall be used only by systems with PTF limits derived from studies, and also on condition that the systems and satellites should not, shall not ask protection from the service systems for the distribution of bands. We particularly want to note that protection for the system should be ensured, particularly radio location, localization services, up to 9500 megahertz and also systems of 9900 to 10,500 megahertz, and also the radio location systems for the frequency band 9200 to 9300 megahertz deployed on radio boats and sea ships.

This complies with method A2, with specified PTF limits. The overall proposal of RCC will be defined at the meeting and published in addendum 12 to document 815. Document 8 WSC 15.

>> CHAIR: Let's then move on to CITEL.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you, Chairman. CITEL supports as you have on your slide a extension of 600 megahertz above 9900 megahertz and it's in line with the proposals in line with method A1 option 2, which as the traditional time period for the amateur satellite service operating in the 1045 to 10.5 gigahertz range.

CITEL supports method A1, because there were concerns on the impact of ESS to radars on search and rescue transponders operating in the band 9200 to 9300 megahertz. You may be aware that we have developed this common proposal before CPM. We fully acknowledge that there was additional information provided CPM that suggest that there should not be a problem. However, CITEL was not in a position to finalize its assessment of this additional information.

So it has maintained its position on that point at the moment.

There was also concern that a new ESS active allocation as proposed in method B1 would be too close to the SRS allocation used for deep space operations. And that as a consequence, additional provision would be required to ensure that SRS deep space operations are fully protected. Finally we do not believe that PFD masks are required to ensure protection of existing fixed systems. In fact, the one proposed under method A2 feel that would not allow SRS to operate in the new allocation. The one proposed in method B2 would be able to be met by SRS but it would we feel unnecessarily constrain future development of such systems. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. CEPT.

>> HANSPETER KUHLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So CEPT has already an ECP common proposal on this agenda item. CEPT supports what is called method B1, which is the, to make it short, the hundred megahertz below and 500 megahertz above the current allocation.

It also supports particularly the footnotes that show the protection on the various radio navigation and location services. We also recognize the decision from CPM taken on protection of the search and rescue transponders in the lower hundred megahertz, which eventually showed the feasibility of using that band for that purpose.

This solution of a hundred, 500 megahertz would have a kind of symmetric extension which was from the very beginning the most favored approach, because the observations with radar images are very frequency dependent, and a symmetric, totally symmetric extension would have ensured a total continuity of image material over long time, over years of observations.

But experts in observation say that whatever comes close to it is also acceptable, and that is why we came to B1. Besides the fact that the protection of outer band services particularly in the upper direction 10.6 to 10.7 gigahertz for the radio astronomy and to other passive services ESS and SRS, are better protected if we stay another 100 megahertz away from them, besides the fact that the two recommendations RS2065 and 2066 would fully solve the issue and ensure compatibility. With that, we also came to the conclusion that there is no need for a particular PFD limit or a PFD mask. I must say also, taking it from the reports, so if you look into the report, I think it's RS23.14, this report discusses the two options in a certain detail. But as it was already expressed before, a PFD limit in one option is in one method A2 to our understanding, is so limiting, that it is almost a no change defacto because the band would be not very useful. So that is why CEPT at the end of all these considerations decided to go for B1. This has already been notified to the Bureau. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Let's now go to the ATU, please.

>> ABDOU NDIAYE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On this item on the agenda, a discussion was held in Nairobi and following those discussions, certain countries supported the A2 method of B1 and still more were in favor of no change. Consequently, ATU has no joint position on this agenda item. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Let's now go to the APT, please.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I notice that you use the green color for APT position, and I, but would I like to say it's the same situation as agenda item 1.11. It's our preliminary ECP so that with this position on the APT, we support a majority of our members support an extension of ESS within the frequency ranges 9200 to 9300 megahertz and 9900 to 10400 megahertz, on a primary basis.

We are of the view that extension bands may only be used for those ESS active systems requiring more than 600 megahertz where the operation that cannot be accommodated in existing frequency bands of 9300 to 9900 megahertz.

Also, that with regards of the existing services of the SRS in the adjacent frequency band, 8400 to 8500 megahertz and RS and ES is positive in the frequency band 10.6 to 10.7 gigahertz band no interference should be caused. With regards to the protection of FS stations, we have quite a discussion on whether we need a PFD hard limit, and after sufficient discussion we finally compromised to the method B2, which with PFD hard limit. So this is our PACP. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and thank you for correcting me. I said, I tried, but I saw some of us have been a little imperfect in interpreting what we read.

Lastly then, go to ASMG, please.

>> AHMAD AMIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding this agenda item, our position, our joint position in the Arab group is not to make any amendments in the radio communications area. This is because of the uses of radio localization services, radio location services, sorry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you, sir. Then again, I will provide you the position of the space frequency coordination group, the SFCG supports the extension -- SFCG supports the extension by 600 megahertz. They believe that either method A1 or B1 would meet their objectives. They note that the PFD mask in method B2 can be met by SRS although they believe it would unnecessarily constrain the future development of such systems, and the SFCG opposes method A2 as they believe the proposed PFD mask in this particular method would not allow SRS to operate in the new allocation. So that's their views.

Now I would like to open the floor to any other views.

Okay. And again, are there any questions from the floor? Apparently we are very clear on what we are saying. Okay, very good.

Okay. Then we can move on to agenda item 1.13, and this is provided more or less for information. It is the purpose was to review the footnote 5.268 with a view to examining the possibility for increasing the five kilometer distance limitation and allowing space research, space to space use for proximity operations by space vehicles, communicating with an orbiting manned space vehicle in accordance with resolution 652. There was only one method presented in the CPM report, and that is to modify 5.268 to remove the five kilometer distance limitation, and to not limit the use of the frequency band 410 to 420 megahertz to extra vehicular activities. Then as you see in this slide, and maybe I have it correct, maybe I don't, but it appears that everyone supports the method in the CPM report, and I believe APT it was a preliminary position as well. So I don't want to belabor this one because it appears to be very straightforward. But does anyone want the floor of any of my colleagues to elaborate? Or can we just move on to the next item?

Okay. Then we will move on to work agenda item 1.14. To consider the feasibility of achieving a continuous reference time scale, whether by modification of coordinated universal time, UTC, or some other method, and take appropriate action in accordance with resolution 653.

So, resolution 653 recognizes that a change in the reference time scale may have operational and therefore economic consequences, on telecommunications networks, and the purpose was to examine all of this. What ended up coming out of the CPM were four methods to satisfy the agenda item. Method A is to remove the leap second insertion or deletion from the definition of UTC, in order to make it become a continuous time scale, and either in method A1 retain the name UTC, or in method A2, adopt a new name.

Method B was to keep the current definition of UTC, disseminate the UTC time scale and also disseminate a continuous time scale TAI, on an equal basis, that is the international atomic time.

Method C keeps the current definition of UTC, and enables the recovery of the TAI scale, method C1, or disseminate another continuous time scale, which is method C2.

So things get a little complicated. Then method D is no change, which in a way is the simplest thing.

Let's see. I think here, let's do something a little different. We will go with ladies first, and I will start with APT and Miss Keer.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman. APT supports method A1, which is to stop the insertion of the leap second and keep the name of the UTC.

We have proposals from the APT members, either on method A1 and A2 and finally we had reached the consensus on method A1. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Let's go to CITEU.

>> CHANTAL BEAUMIER: Thank you, Chairman. Just to confuse us a little bit, right? (chuckles).

CITEU supports also method A1, which is UTC without leap seconds, as the best method to achieve a continuous reference time scale. This is a complex issue. I'll take my time to go through some of the rationale for that position.

We feel that the overwhelming majority of systems worldwide that use UTC as a time reference whether in the financial, telecommunications, Internet or defense sectors for example, will require no modifications because leap seconds are inserted manually and cannot be predicted more than six months in advance.

We feel that this method A1 is the simplest solution from both a technical, economic standpoint. It has the lowest economic cost to implement since most systems do not expect leap seconds. So they won't have any impact if they don't receive them.

The other methods that advocate no change, for instance, would incur continuing cost to implement leap seconds each time they are inserted into UTC, as well as the risks associated with the disruptions of the UTC clock count.

The method A1 explicitly transfers responsibility of the UTC time scale away from the ITU so that it rests with the international body in charge of time keeping standards, that is the BIPM, the international Bureau of weights and measures, and also part of that proposal, as you know, involves a period of five years to implement, from the date of entry into force of this change. So that will give sufficient time, we believe, to accommodate legacy systems that do rely on the leap seconds.

We also feel that the name UTC should be retained, as the name describes the function of the time scale. This will avoid confusion in our opinion. The UTC time scale has been changed in the past without changing the name of the time scale, so that would not be a setting a precedent. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. If we left it to APT and CITEU, we would have no problem. But we have other opinions. Let us first go to the RCC.

>> ALEXANDER VASSILIEV: Thank you, Chair. Our position, it sounds very brief. But the green color for method D isn't quite accurate reflection of our position, but the Chairman was in a very difficult situation. The administration of communications of RCC is in favor of maintaining the definition of UTC, in unchanged form, as it says in 1.4 of the radio communications regulations, radio regulations, and in the recommendation F466. The general proposal of RCC has been confirmed and published in addendum 14 to document 8 of WRC-15. I'd like to explain our position, and the reasons why we came to these conclusions.

In our opinion, the maintenance of UTC makes it possible to use the existing time scale based on astronomical time taking account of the revolutions of the world. That is the system which mankind has been using throughout its existence.

Further, this also makes it possible to ensure the reliable functioning of the existing system, including nontraditional and nonelectronic proposals for determining location. And commenting on the statement made by the representative of CITEU, I would like to say that the leap second has already been there for more than 40 years, and during those 40 years there have been nothing seriously wrong. There have been cases in accordance with information received in earlier years, I must say, and usually that was a result of programming mistakes and the incorrect implementation of including the leap seconds. And there were few such cases. Further, maintaining this definition makes it possible not to change legislation or documentation of the programmes.

I would like to point out that the international standardization organisation ISO categorically objects to the use of the term, UTC, for other time scales. I think that is something we also ought to bear in mind.

Finally, the most important thing, and why D is not the method that we really do support, our approach makes it possible to continue using the permanent scale as is now being done, for example, the GPS system. So it's

possible that ascending to other time scales and we are not talking about which method would be used. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Vassiliev. Yes, you did put me in a difficult position, but I took the proposal that the RCC submitted to be, well, it is no change, but I understand from the discussions with you and from what you just said that it could be something other than just no change. Understood.

Okay. Then let's also go then to the ASMG.

>> AHMAD AMIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the Arab group, our position, our joint position is not to make any amendments, as we said in the report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So once again, we see if we had ASMG and RCC as the only people participating in the conference, this would be a very short agenda item again.

But, yet, we have different opinions still. So now we have, we are left with ATU and CEPT, who if I understand correctly, neither has a common position, but perhaps they could give us some information as to what they are discussing.

First I will go to the ATU, please.

>> ABDOU NDIAYE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you put it so well, we didn't manage to reach a common position, because some countries opted for A1, and others for C. So there was no common position on this agenda item. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. And CEPT, please.

>> HANSPETER KUHLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, well, here in this case, CEPT has no ECP at this moment in time. So this is one of the topics that still need to be resolved at the next meeting in Bergen in two weeks.

However, there is some preferences becoming visible. One preference is to start with a negative it's no support for method B, so probably that should be added here, because there should be no broadcast on equal basis of TAI and UTC at the same time that is considered to create confusion and therefore is not supported.

There is a preference for A1, so that based on studies made in ITU-R and also in CEPT, there is a preference to find a feasibility for achieving a continuous reference time scale, whatever way, by modification of UTC or whatever appropriate method, but it should be something continuous.

Therefore, C1 is also an option, and the point is here, C1 or C2 is not an issue, that both is possible, but between A1 and between the two Cs, that is what we probably will come out at the end of the Bergen meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I'm looking at the space frequency coordination group objectives. They basically are of the opinion that space science satellite operations and launches would benefit from a continuous time scale that is unambiguous in its application. So they do not pick any method exactly, but they want something that is continuous apparently.

Then I open to the floor, and are there any views that would like to be expressed from the floor? Yes, sir. New Zealand?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make an observation in response to a comment that was made by the RCC, that there have been no reported difficulties with the insertion of the leap second.

There are recorded events where there have been difficulties, because the insertion of the leap second as has been noted by a number of speakers is a manual process. Many of those difficulties are due to the fact that errors have been made during the manual insertion of the leap second.

The consequences of these errors have varied quite significantly, depending on the time of day at which the leap second is to be made. The custom at the moment is for the leap second to be inserted at midnight on the, in Europe, on the 0 meridian, which of course corresponds to midday on the other side of the world, which happens to affect quite a large part of region 3.

There are recorded instances where difficulties have been experienced in the insertion of the leap second which have caused computer networks to fail. The failure may be momentary. However, it's a failure which because of the traffic conditions continues for some time, because it's part of the business day. And there is an instance where a computer network of an airline was off the air for something like four hours.

That is not an insignificant error. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the observation is that a system which continues with the manual insertion of the leap second is always going to be prone to error. That after all is part of the human condition.

And with the potential for such error, then there is grounds for changing the systems so that we no longer have to insert manually the leap second. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Jamieson. I'm sorry, the lady to my right over here, I did not catch the name. I'm sorry.

>> Thank you so much. I was struggling with the technology here just a bit. (chuckles).

Honorable Chairperson, I had the clarification for those who are not in support of the changes, but I think we need more clarity in terms of what will be the impact of the change at the end of the day, when we are saying we want to adopt this issue. So far, from what I've heard, in terms of the time zone, how it will impact our work, I haven't heard that quite clearly. And I think that we need to have that.

I heard CEPT saying there is no support for the change, but in terms of how that position of N.O.C. is going to benefit us, I did not hear that. I think that we need to actually get a sense of that before we make our decision.

But also, the RCC, you said that after, you know, debating the issue, you do not support method D, but the essence of why you do not support method D didn't come through to us very clearly, in terms of the reference in the other methods A, B, C, as to why we should actually continue with the current time zone or change to it. So generally, Chairperson, I'm trying to seek clarity on some of the issues, rather than just putting across a certain position, and I hope that will be well recorded in that sense.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Mr. Vassiliev, you can probably address at least part of that.

>> ALEXANDER VASSILIEV: Thank you very much. I will speak English, my best. First of all, I said that it's not simple method D. We are saying that we are against of modification of UTC. In certain extent, it's a method D. However, we are still open for other elements, maybe some elements from C1 or C2.

Then I want to say to Mr. Jamieson, maybe my Russian translation was not right but I didn't say that there was no errors or no difficult situations. I said that there were not many. It's a different story. And many conclusions are based on the last reply to the questionnaire sent by the BR. However, there were two questionnaires before sent not only to administrations, but also to companies involved.

And if you analyze replies there, you may find slightly different picture. Then when we speak about insertion of leap second or eliminating leap second, for some systems, if you eliminate leap second, we will need to replace equipment, because some systems operate using and it was pronounced by the Chairman also use leap second to operate perfectly all right, and to a certain extent, I'm sorry saying that, but in English, there is the expression, don't fix it if it's working. If it's working for most cases, why should we fix it? Especially it's natural time, if I could use that terminology.

And it was mentioned that there might be some difficulties in banking systems, etcetera. Banking systems operate with leap seconds more than 40 years. And from that point of view, if there were a few cases, there are some cases when money disappears from banks not because of human errors, sometimes because of human errors but because of human efforts to make a crime. That I think it's only one thing I want to say. We have to be very careful when we change the system for all human beings. We are not talking only about telecommunications. We are talking about human life in general.

And finally, one additional argument. Many of you remember 2000 problem with computers. There was a lot of money invested, etcetera. At certain moment, if you eliminate leap second, we will have similar problem, because we will have to fix again at certain time to come back to close astronomical time. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. As you can tell, he doesn't really care about this topic very much (chuckles).

So, would any of the other panelists like to make any comments? It would seem not.

Any other comments from the floor? I don't think we have -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

>> Thank you very much. Maybe someone was already taking off a leap second and therefore, we missed the comments on the 1.12 in between. It would be nice to hear about a certain clarification, we saw in the

overview on agenda item 1.12, if you could go back, this would be nice. There is the column of the ATU, providing for the different methods some support, some support and some support. And knowing the usual problems with defining numbers in the ITU, it would be very nice to have a clarification on the "some" in this column. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Perhaps before I address that, are there any other comments on 1.14? I think the United States had their hand up? Go ahead.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To further clarify what my colleague from CITELE had said to try and answer the question that was asked, the general outcome of our method would be no cost to most administrations, because you simply would not insert the leap second, which is as was pointed out done manually. It requires having in many cases a great number of personnel and great expense to some companies and to government systems operators to be able to implement that leap second.

What we are looking at would then be a reduction in cost, by enabling us to not do the leap second. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, obviously we have a difference of opinion on that, I believe.

Now, if we can go back to 1.12 perhaps and if the gentleman from the ATU could perhaps address the question that came from the side there. Could you give us some indication of perhaps numbers or subgroups perhaps that may support a method or another? Maybe perhaps will there be any multi country proposal, rather than a ATU proposal? Thank you.

>> ABDOU NDIAYE: Thank you, Chair. Indeed the number of countries that support is in the report, but I don't have this report to hand at the moment. I think I could give the number of countries to you after this. Also if you go to the ITU Secretariat they might be able to give you this report. I think I will be able to find the document and give the information to you later on. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I think that addresses that question. If we could, we have two more items, mostly for information that I would like to at least address here. Item 9.2.1, this is from the report of the Director of the BR, and there is an issue in the CPM text, the issue about defining radio stations operating in the meteorological age service, and basically there is one approach to doing that, and that is to make modifications to article 1, to include definitions of radio stations operating within the meteorological aid service both land and mobile.

I shouldn't say it surprised me but I was able to find information that it appears that four of the regional groups definitively support doing so, and could not find anything under the APT or CEPT on these.

I guess I would just perhaps ask if either the APT or CEPT have any information on this particular item. Zhu Keer.

>> ZHU KEER: Thank you, Chairman. I think that our last APT meeting, we didn't receive any contribution on this 9.2 agenda item. That is why we have no information on these issues. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And I don't know if the CEPT has discussed this at all? I could not find anything on the, on your website. But if you, perhaps you have some information.

>> HANSPETER KUHLEN: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The 9.2 section is already, yeah, is already as a ECP. That means there is a decision. Probably you would like to know what the decision is. (chuckles).

So, that's a very complex issue. There are many, many paragraphs of the Director's report. I could read supports no change regarding issues raised in sections, and now we have plenty of sections of part 2 of the report of the Director. So the other is supports endorses BR practice proposed in, and then we have another summary of sections. I see. There is a much better voice for that (chuckles).

Sorry for that. Okay. Probably Alexander can help us.

>> CHAIR: Go ahead, Alexander.

>> Thank you, Chair. There was no need to read all of this complicated list, because CEPT still does not have a position on this part of the report. We have positions on other parts of the report, but not on this part in particular. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Then quickly, let's move to the last item, which is agenda item 9.2.2, again related to the Director's report. In this case, it deals with clarification of the use of deep space allocations, with regard to

certain provisions of the radio regulations, and there were actually two methods in the CPM report in chapter 2, method A is to add a provision to article 4, describing the permitted use of space research, deep space allocations, near the earth, such as during launch, early orbit, flying by the earth and returning to the earth. Method B is to modify the definition of the space research service within article 1 to add specific provisions for the deep space use near the earth.

The regional positions, at least my understanding is that it appears that the ASMG, CITELE and RCC all support method A, and that the ATU seem to have support for method B, and again, APT and CEPT I did not see any information. But it appears that perhaps they have not made a decision on that at this time.

I will note that the space frequency coordination group was perfectly fine with either solution. They just want the problem solved. So I think that's, that should be something that we can handle at the conference without too much pain, I hope.

So that basically would bring us to the close of panel 9. I thank all of my panelists for helping us have a perhaps more lively discussion than I even expected.

And I certainly thank you for your attention and your interest. And this will close panel 9, and stay tuned for after the coffee break, and I believe you have a little longer coffee break than usual, that we will have the last panel, panel 10, that will discuss agenda item 10, and of course the conclusion and closing of our seminar. So thank you very much. Meeting is adjourned.

(break).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> Good afternoon, everybody. Let's start with the panel session 10 on agenda item 10 that on possible future agenda items for WRC 19. It will be followed by the closing session. So I will hand over to Mr. Daniel Obam who is going to moderate the part of the session dealing with agenda item 10. Daniel?

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much, Mario. Good afternoon, colleagues. I hope this will be more, as interesting as the previous sessions. But nevertheless, we will try to, at least on my part I'll try to make it as short as possible because I've seen already people with suitcases because they anticipate maybe we finish early.

As a introduction remark, I'd like to point out that my presentation is just showing you what were discussions that are going on in the regions, in the countries, about possible future agenda items. They have not, some of them have not even been approved by the individual administrations or regions. But we thought it would be good to share what is being discussed, so that when you go to, I think working group 6B, during the conference, these are the kinds of things you are likely to be confronted with.

Talking about a case when we were in Nairobi for the Africa meeting, we did our meetings very well and efficiently but on the last day when we came to this agenda item 10 we debated for two hours and finished almost at 7, when we thought we were going to finish at 2.

At the end of it, actually we came up with a no common position on future agenda item as the Africa group. Maybe because of that, that we did not have a common position, that the BR asked us to make a presentation on this.

I'll start my presentation by going to my first slide, and the agenda for next year actually was set by WRC 12, which in resolution 808 did ask that WRC-18, at that time they expected WRC 18 to be held, I mean WRC to be held in 2018, to place two items on the agenda, and that was to consider regulatory items including spectrum allocations to support GMDSS. That is how the first agenda items for the conference was set.

This is continued in resolution 359 of WRC-12. Secondly, the WRC 12 also asked WRC, the next WRC to consider appropriate regulatory procedures for notifying nano and pico satellites, and again if you refer to resolution 757 of the WRC 12, you will be able to get the details of this.

Now, during that same conference, in resolution 804, there are some two annexes, one is principles for submitting, establishing agendas for WRCs, which is annex 1. Then in annex 2, there is a template which administrations are invited to use when proposing agenda items. That set the stage for future agenda items. After that introduction, I'd like to go to the next slide, where I'm looking at discussions that are taking place and I have attempted to place the agenda items in groups in services. The first one is mobile and IMT. I've summarized what is being considered. IMT above six gigahertz. But if you look at the discussions, there is a discussion between six gigahertz and 110 and 70, 31 to a hundred, some people are saying studies above six gigahertz. Others are saying additional spectrum to IMT.

Generally, there seems to be a lot of discussion about a future agenda item and possibly with a resolution that will point out specifics on what the studies should be carried out, and in particular taking into account the protection of existing services.

That is how I'd like to summarize the discussion around mobile and IMT.

What I'm going to do now and what I'll do as I go on is that after I finish discussing a specific service, I'll pause and ask the regions, those who are represented here, to say if they have any comments on this particular topic that is being discussed and then I'll open the floor for you to give comments as delegates. I'd like to start from my extreme right, from ASMG. Any comments on this particular proposal?

>> Thank you very much, Daniel, for this presentation. With regard to the IMT above six gigahertz, mobile and IMT the SMG group in their last meeting held last week discussed this issue, and we also submit our proposal for agenda item or prepare our current proposal with number of agenda.

One of them, it is similar to this agenda which is defining spectrum requirement for mobile services and identify for IMT. However, in our proposal, we have limited our frequency, or studies should be above 31 gigahertz, because from six gigahertz up to 31 gigahertz, the services is congested and we have a lot of operation services. And that we feel to be difficult to find any spectrum there for mobile.

We cannot allow something that to cause any problem, difficulties to our services between this range which is six up to 31. We propose number of frequencies in the meeting, but at the end the Arab current proposal came up that the studies if they will be conducted in this band should be above 31 gigahertz. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. APT?

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon to you and to everybody. The APT also considered this matter, and broadly speaking supports this agenda item in our draft proposal. But in our proposal, we in fact indicate specific bands in the range 25.25 gigahertz to 86 gigahertz. We are not considering the whole range. But we have five or six specific bands within that range that we think are worthy of study, that we have tried to narrow down the scope of the overall agenda item to something which is manageable.

The details of those bands can be found in the annex 1 to the resolution which we have attached to our proposal and in our input contribution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CEPT?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I give you a short introduction to the overall agenda item from a CEPT perspective. The coordinator for agenda item 10 is Wesley Milton, I believe he has got probably the best excuse of not being here, he is on holiday. As you might be aware, CEPT has two finalization meetings, the last one will be in two weeks time in Bergen, Norway. This agenda item on IMT is typically one that needs to be finalized at that meeting. CEPT is currently discussing 13 different proposals. One of them and we believe is the biggest one, is the IMT, as set above six gigahertz, at least it absorbed about all the time during the last project team meeting, so it must be a lot of big impact on the whole work that we have to do for the WRC. The views that CEPT currently have on this possible new agenda item is that we believe that it should focus on manageable number of bands, and that only these bands will be studied at the next Study Group period. We have identified a number of bands at this moment, and we believe they are suitable to be studied for applications. The bands are around 32 gigahertz, around 42 gigahertz, around 46 gigahertz, the 66 up to 71 gigahertz, the 71 up to 76 gigahertz, and 81 until the 86 gigahertz.

Continuing further discussions, yes, we expect that during our last meeting at CEPT where some administrations and mobile industry like to find additional bands to study IMT below the 31 gigahertz. With that, I'll give it back to you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. CITELE?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an issue that we knew was going to cause us some problems, and as coordinator of the future agenda items, I was lucky enough to be able to hand this off to a very competent Chairperson to handle this as a drafting group.

The result of that drafting group was an inter-American proposal, signed on to by CITELE administrations, in accordance with our procedures. We went a little bit lower. We went from 10 gigahertz up to 76 gigahertz. As a matter of fact, I see that there are several that have, that are going from 31 gigahertz or above. We have one, two, three, four bands below 30 gigahertz to look at.

Actually, yes, and then a few of them above that, so we have quite a few bands, and I think probably at the conference one of the problems is going to be figuring out exactly which ones are coming to an agreement here that will make everyone as equally unhappy. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. RCC.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first thing I want to say is that on item 10, we have no general proposals, because we are going to be looking at it next week. It is not the first time we have heard about it here in this room. But I would like to tell you about our general approach to formulating this item on the agenda. First of all, our basis is the principles I talked about on the first day, and one of the fundamental principles is that we need to observe the interests of the various services, particularly those who have been allocated bands in this scale. We obviously have to take that into account.

Then further examination of the spectrum for IMT, it doesn't matter if it's above six or 30 or whatever, we have to look at that part. And I think that on the basis of this principle, which would use the experience we have, what I mean is that this conference, 2015 and the one before, when we formulated the items on the agenda, so that throughout the period, we look not only at solutions to the questions, but to the understanding of the questions, and it's only at the end of the study period that the famous Study Group on 11 defined 19 bands, and we have to avoid that kind of thing.

We have to go to the conference knowing which bands we are talking about, and taking these small comments into account, our approach to this item and others will be the same and I think we will come next week with proposals on this item. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. I'd like to move on to the next two slides which cover four different issues. The first one is on the radio lands in the five gigahertz band, and there is a discussion that we should look at sharing within the band in the four radio lands in this frequency range.

The second item is about how much service, there are three different bands that people are looking at, I think for WRC-15 there is only one band but in this case there are three that are being considered by certain regions. 1800, 2000 kilohertz, 47, 67 megahertz and 50 to 54 megahertz.

That is likely to come up as another location, possible location to measure service. The next one with frequency above 275 gigahertz, it's the next slide. And this is a possible location to land, mobile and fixed services, but taking into account footnote number 5.565. This footnote identifies bands in the range 275 to 1,000 gigahertz for use for passive services. It provides that administrations that wish to make frequencies in this range available, for active services, have right to take all protocol steps to protect passive services from harmful interference.

When this is considered, or this footnote is taken into account. Then the last item, this general topic, is carrying out studies on the use by hubs within, to get spectrum within existing fixed services for high altitude platforms. So that is something that actually we in our Nairobi meeting we had several presentations on this. Those are the four items that maybe as I take the next round of comments, I'd like the general representatives to, if they can, to give their very short views on this issue, of the radio lands and five gigahertz band, the measure of service, the location of frequency above 275 to the land, mobile and fixed service, and the issue of getting spectrum for fixed service for the high altitude platforms. Again I'll start with ASMG.

>> TARIQ ALAWADHI: Thank you very much, Chairman. With regard to those issues, the ASMG has submitted a proposal, or prepared a proposal for services for additional allocation between 50 to 54 megahertz on secondary basis.

With the other issues, which has been raised here right now, for the fixed or mobile, we have not discussed this in the last meeting. However, we can consider it in the, during the WRC about those issues. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Alan Jamieson.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In this group of potential new agenda items, the only one that the APT has considered and in fact has a preliminary APT common proposal is the potential agenda item for the mobile and fixed service above 275 gigahertz. It's been noted that passive services have some allocations in this range, and the consideration, the APT now favors is for consideration to be given to the mobile service and the fixed service, but to ensure that the compatibility and protection of the passive services is adequately covered. So that is why we propose this as a potential agenda item. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CEPT on that group of four items?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under consideration for within CEPT we have the wireless access including our lands in the five gigahertz range, the three following proposals for the amateur service are under consideration within CEPT too, and following your slides, fixed and mobile, the allocation of frequency bands above 275 gigahertz is also taken in consideration, only we limit it, the range of that up to a upper band of 450 gigahertz currently, as to the smaller portion, this band is the degree of work that needs to be done during the next cycle. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CITEL.

>> CARMELO RIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of those agenda items, CITEL has two inter-American proposals, one of them on our land in the 5350 to 5470 gigahertz band, consideration of additional primary allocations to the mobile service, identification for implementation of wireless access systems, including radial local area networks and we also have in the broadband applications delivered from high altitude platforms systems, haps, to study the possible expansion of existing haps identification by revising existing geographical, technical and regulatory restrictions, as well as possible additional identifications within the existing fixed service allocations.

The other agenda items we have not, we do not have positions on at this time. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. RCC.

>> ALBERT NALBANDIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just repeat what I've already said, that is certainly all of these six proposed items on the agenda have the right to be examined, under the principle I've mentioned, we will bear them in mind when we study these items carefully and when we take a decision we will be giving particular attention to possible consequences of the adoption of any given item on the agenda, and the further influence throughout telecommunications.

Therefore, again, I repeat, next week we are going to examine them very carefully. We have the big advantage that we already have items to think about. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you, Albert. I'll still be coming to you as I talk about this, so if you don't have a comment, you can just say that you don't have a comment. But I'm required to poll everybody. Actually I've been skipping myself because I represent the Africa telecommunication, the African region but the reason I don't say anything is because we haven't come out with any common agenda item for agenda item number 10. But given the experience that we have had here, in this session, perhaps when we go back and have regional meetings which are still going to take place, we may be in a better position to consider some of the future agenda items, even in the event that we do not have an input in the conference, at least by that time we go to the conference and participate in the work of the proposed working group 6B, at least we will be in a position to be able to participate in the discussions.

I would like to move on to the next subject, which is three areas that have been considered, and one relates to looking at spectrum related issues, and regulatory action for intelligent transporter systems, applications taking into account studies. When I saw this, I went and looked for the description of what an intelligent

transport system is. This just for me probably you all know what it means, but I'll read it for my own satisfaction.

This is advanced applications which aim to provide innovative services relating to different modes of transport and traffic management and enable various users to be better informed and make safer more coordinated and smarter use of transports networks. This is from wikipedia. I did not look for very elaborate dictionary (chuckles).

That is one. Number two, there is other issues to consider as spectrum and possible regulatory action, support the next generation spectrum system between train and truck sites. And the third one is spectrum related issues in support of wireless power transmission, take into account studies.

Again I looked at wikipedia, and wireless transmission systems are transmission of electric power from a power source to a consuming device without using solely wires or conductors, used for battery charging. There are companies that make mobile phones now that you can charge wirelessly. You have to place the phone on top of a charger so it is not like it's transmitting it. But I suppose this is the kind of system that they are looking at. These are three other areas that could possibly be studied. With those three again I'd like to revert to my panelists and ask if any of the regions have studied, have looked at this matter and I'll start with Albert, make a comment on any of this.

>> ALBERT NALBANDIAN: Yes, following here, following your instructions, I'll just say we will examine that too. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. CITEL.

>> CARMELO RIVERA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, CITEL has not considered either one of these agenda items and have no position at this time. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CEPT.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm afraid I have similar remarks to make on this. It hasn't been considered yet. I haven't seen anything coming in for a next meeting, looking forward to the WRC, the wireless power transmission might be interesting.

>> DANIEL OBAM: We haven't considered it, either. I would like to move on to Dr. Jamieson from the APT region. What are you thinking?

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm delighted to inform you that we have considered all three. (chuckles).

In fact, we have proposed all three. So, I encourage my very distinguished colleagues here to consider these three proposals actively.

In terms of the intelligent transport systems, I do need to make the point that this is quite a different topic to agenda item 1.18, at WRC-15.

This is considering implementation aspects of intelligent transport systems as they might apply in frequency bands that are much much lower than the 78 gigahertz band that is considered under agenda item 1.18.

In terms of the train and truck site communication requirements, this has been identified as being a application of radio communications that will have particular importance to high-speed train development, and it would involve both the safety aspects of train transport, but also to provide communication services to passengers on board as well.

The third one, the wireless power transmission, this is a new emerging type of technology, and you mentioned cell phones, Mr. Chairman, and that is certainly one aspect. But it goes much further than that, and has applications for devices, perhaps even motor vehicles in terms of recharging as they are in motion.

There are a number of aspects of that particular application that will be of interest to us, both from an interference point of view, but also from an enabling point of view.

Once again, I would encourage all the regional groups to consider these aspects. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. Any comment from ASMG on this one?

>> TARIQ ALAWADHI: Thank you very much, Chairman. Similar that we haven't considered those issues.

However, looking to this three points and just explanation by my colleague Alan on second issue, it seems this is interesting agenda item. Maybe we will consider it and especially in our country also, UAE, it's, they have

more or different kinds of transportation, including trains there and so maybe that we will consider this one. Thank you very much.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. I'd like to move on to the next possible agenda items, and this I've grouped them as science services and there are three of them. One is to establish some power limits within the mobile satellite service in some frequency bands there, which are indicated, the first bullet. The second one is, seeks to upgrade the secondary location to met sat to primary status while protecting the existing fixed service and mobile service in the band 460, 470. The third one is proposals and allocation to the space operation service in frequency band 137 megahertz, 960 megahertz to accommodate the increasing number of nano geo satellites. Those three again are being discussed and I would like again to start with the extreme left, Albert, if you have any comment. Then I'll proceed that way.

>> ALBERT NALBANDIAN: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The same comments, following what you said, we are going to consider those three questions too. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. CITEL.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first one we have not considered. The second one though, the review, the allocations for MetSat, 460, 470 band with view to upgrade the secondary MetSat allocation, that is a inter-American proposal, that's come out of the last CITEL meeting.

We have very much interest in that. I'm not saying that I have any personal interest in it. But we have looked at that and we are looking for studies to ensure that we can operate with co-primary in that band without causing interference to the incumbents in that band.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CEPT. Any comment on those three?

>> Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have full score on these three points, all three points are under consideration already. Both the MetSat proposed in the first two bullets and the, of course, the third one, for the accommodate the growing number of small nongeosatellites between the 137 megahertz and the 960 megahertz. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. APT. Oh, ATU did not have any consideration of this matter. APT, please.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The APT hasn't considered these matters, either. So we have no comment to make on these three. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. ASMG, any comment?

>> TARIQ ALAWADHI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, no comment also from ASMG on this one. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. I'd like to move on to the next service which is satellite service, and there are quite a number of possible agenda items. One is additional primary location to the fixed satellite service, earth to space in the 51 gigahertz band. Then the regulatory framework, FSS system, 7.5 .52.4. The next one is use of the frequency bands 17.7 to 19.7 and between 7.5 to 9.5 by earth stations on mobile platforms communicating geostationary space station as fixed satellite service. The third one is to consider spectrum requirements for the development of the fixed satellite service and regulatory action including allocations in the frequency bands that are shown, 32.3, 33 and 37.5 to 39.5. This allocation for fixed satellite service taking into account current services and studies. The last one on this slide is modification of the regulatory provisions related to notifying the satellite networks for nano satellites and pico satellites as per resolution 757.

This came out of WRC-12. This is the agenda item that will satisfy the requirements of attribution of WRC 12. Because this is quite a number, I'm going to ask my panelists starting from the left if there is any comment. If you don't have a comment, you don't need to say anything, but if you have a comment, you can take the floor.

>> Thank you. No comments.

>> CITEL.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have an inter-American proposal on the additional allocation, fixed satellite service, consider spectrum requirements and possible allocations, FSS and 32.3 to 33 gigahertz earth to space and space to earth, and for reverse direction operations for gateways in 37.5 to 39.5 gigahertz. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Only the third one is not under consideration within CEPT. The first two ones on FSS and the last one is under consideration within CEPT. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. The Africa region also did not consider this. I'd like to go into APT and see whether they are considering any of these bands.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no comment to make on these.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. ASMG?

>> TARIQ ALAWADHI: Thank you, Chairman. I believe that we have prepared a current proposal on the last one related to the nano and pico satellite. The rest we have no comments on.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. I will go to the next slide which also deals with satellite services and again there are three. There is the first one is to consider nonGSOs in the V band and the proposal here is to eliminate the regulatory uncertainty inherent in the application of numbered 22.2 to nonGSO satellites operating in the V band and absence of coordination conditions applicable such systems.

I looked at number 22.2, and it says that nonsystems shall not cause unacceptable interference to and this regulation shall not claim protection from geostation satellite networks in the fixed satellite service and broadcasting satellite service operating in accordance with radio regulations.

The second one is to review the need for better position limitations on modifications to the broadcast satellite service plans and the list contained in annex 7 to appendix 30. This list contains orbital positions. So review this and possibly modify the list and then also conduct studies and consider possible modifications to this list as a second one. The third one, this is I think more like a standing agenda item, which responds to resolution 86 of the Plenipotentiary Conference Marrakesh 2002, and deals with advanced publication, coordination, notifying and recording procedures for frequency assignments pertaining to satellite networks.

Again I'd like my panelists, ask my panelists if any of them has any comments to make on those three possible agenda items for WRC 19.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to draw your attention to the paragraph 7 which has square brackets, item 7 on the agenda. This is not only a problem facing us. I think it's a problem for other regional organisations too. There is a certain amount of concern that this will be difficult to manage, and at any time at the preparatory or even at the conference it is possible to put new items in to examine new combinations. This is a general appeal to us to think about if it's realistic and to bring in new questions during the process of the conference.

Of course, we have to put this item on the agenda, but we are worried, and we will try to prepare specific proposals. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CITEL.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first issue, the NG S O's in the V band, is under discussion at CITEL. It is almost a inter-American proposal according to our procedures. It still requires, and I've been checking all day long and still requiring one more administration to sign on to it before it could be elevated to a inter-American proposal.

That one is not yet, has not reached that status.

The second one, the annex 7 to appendix 30 update, is an inter-American proposal at CITEL. It is for BSS and FSS systems serving different regions that could successfully exist with orbital separations as small as 1/2 and 2 degrees depending on the carrier parameters and geographic discrimination assumed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much, CITEL, for that. CEPT. Any comments on this?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The part under consideration within CEPT is the second one, concerning the annex 7 of the appendix 30, to delete a part of it or even more on annex 7 but that is still to be discussed at our final meeting.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. APT colleagues, any comments on this?

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The APT has not considered these matters. But if I may be permitted a personal plea, Mr. Chairman, and it concerns in the first bullet point, the mention of the V band.

Mr. Chairman, we have a mode of operating in the ITU-R in which we do not use the letter descriptions of particular bands.

Our late colleague, Mr. Kaswari was always very strong on this point. I note even at this meeting and I've been guilty of this as well in referring to bands such as the O band and C band, we should not do that, Mr. Chairman. We should use the correct numbers so that everybody knows exactly which band we are referring to. That is a personal plea. And I apologize for introducing it. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you, that is good. I had to find out where the V band lies, I didn't know, either. So your comment I think is very appropriate. ASMG, do you have any comments on these?

>> Thank you, Chairman. First I'd like us to thank you for this comment and we share the same concerned about these letters as mentioned because I always was not happy to mention those letter. However for those certain item we haven't considered there in our meeting, but maybe this is the second point, which is annex 7 of appendix 30, let me relate we need to know about it. I had asked some question about it before, for the region who proposed this one. Maybe later we can have some clarification.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. I'd like to move to the next slide, which actually I'll not consider because it was in my introductory slide. This comes from WRC 12.

The two bullets, so I already talked about that, because that was placed on the agenda by WRC 12 and we will be looking at it. Going to the next one, France. Yes, France. Sorry. Pardon.

>> FRANCE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Very sorry to dampen your enthusiasm but I have got some things to say about the maritime part with your permission. But I promise you I'll be quite brief.

I want to draw my colleagues' attention to the first bullet that we have on the screen, which is in fact the copy of 2.1 of resolution 802, which was proposed by the 2012 conference. On this possible agenda item, we have to study the modernization of GMDSS and the implementation of e navigation. These two subjects have been dealt with at IMO and unfortunately they have got very far behind with their work. Evidence of that is the latest report of the maritime safety committee of the IMO. So I'll read in English a very brief paragraph which explains the situation.

Due to the complexity of the work relative to the review of the GMDSS, IMO plans to complete the modernization plan for GMDSS in 2018. The first stage on further work to be undertaken on the implementation of e navigation is expected to take place in the period 2016 to 2019. Taking into account the above, it is not expected to be possible defining detailed regulatory actions in a time available before WRC 19. I will continue in French.

Taking account of this IMO position, it's clear that we are faced with an agenda item which is going to be empty for the WRC 19. Even if IMO can give us any detailed information that they have at the beginning of 2018, it's going to be too late in the study period. That is why my administration among others does not support keeping this agenda item.

However, under GMDSS is another agenda item which is not on the screen and that is the introduction of a new service supplier by satellite for GMDSS. This item is important and it's going to be considered at the next meeting of the IMO ITU group of experts, which is meeting from the 5th to the 9th of October next.

So it is to be hoped for the conference something will certainly come out of the group. You can count on me. I'm going to be there. We are going to have a point which may make it possible to link GMDSS and the arrival of a new satellite service supplier, and the second bullet as it is on the screen is not exactly the proposal being made by CEPT but it's similar. So in fact, we just have one agenda item.

In conclusion, I want to say that the first bullet, I would tell you we need to be very careful, and not put before the conference in 2019 something which will be empty and won't add anything at all, and might be damaging to the maritime community. Thank you very much.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you, France. We take note of your comments, and the concerns you are expressing. With regards this agenda item, it was given to us by WRC 12. I think that the Chair of the proposed working group 6B, informal group, Mr. Albert Nalbandian has his work cut out, so I think they will take all this into account.

My session was a informal session but I see Russian Federation wants to have the floor. CITEL asked for the floor so let me give the floor to them and then Russian Federation and then next slide. CITEL, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to mention that CITEL does have an inter-American proposal that will be submitted to this WRC for our future agenda item which may lead to changes of many maritime provisions of the radio regulations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have a very brief comment to make on the fact that the previous slide used letters to indicate the frequency ranges, and what Mr. Jamieson said, not using letters, I would like to say that we have a recommendation, and I would like to advertise recommendation, this recommendation 431, 431-8, which lists all the letters and all the ranges, and they are used by many administrations to indicate the frequency ranges in accordance with this recommendation. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Pastukh for that. I'm sure it has been noted. I want to go actually to my second last slide. This is the global aeronautical distress system. We had a lot of discussion on the issue of global flight tracking in the first day of our meeting. We saw the possible ways of meeting the requirements of resolution 185 of the Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, where the issue of global flight tracking was put on the agenda of the conference.

From what we had from IKO and other colleagues that maybe just picking one of the options in the Director's report doesn't really solve the whole problem. But to have a comprehensive solution to this issue is to, we need to look at it as an agenda item in WRC 19, so there are proposals that we look at possible regulatory actions for development and implementation of a global aeronautical distress and safety system. This will introduce a comprehensive distress and safety system in the aeronautical service bands. This is coming in from, it has been discussed, we had a bit of it in our Nairobi meeting but I would like to ask my panelists if any one of them has a comment. I'll start from my right going to the left if you have any comment on this agenda item, or proposed agenda item.

>> No comment.

>> CHAIR: Dr. Jamieson.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The APT has developed a PACP on this topic. We are picking up on the work and studies that have been conducted in IKO already -- ICAO already and we are certainly in support of this particular proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. CPT?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be brief on this. It's under consideration.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. CITEL.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CITEL does have an inter-American proposal, looking for a spectrum requirements for GADSS and aircraft flight tracking that will be submitted to the conference. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a very important point, and we are going to be examining it even more carefully than all the other items. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. The next slides -- ICAO. Sorry. I'm concentrating too much on my papers here.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I'm happy to maybe make a few words on this item and explain how it is different from the global flight tracking, if you can bear with me for a couple of minutes.

This all kind of started, I suppose, last year and upon completion of our special meeting of global flight tracking in May, 2014, ICAO and I ata forged a consensus to, that we need to, as a priority, in the near term, to track airline flights no matter the global location or destination. That is global flight tracking.

But in addition to that, we also agreed to pursue as a matter of urgency work on the global aeronautical distress and safety system or GADSS, an effort which will address issues such as aircraft tracking under normal and abnormal conditions, autonomous distress tracking, automatic deployable flight recorders, procedures and information management, a many-pronged aspect.

The collective urgency of the situation is highlighted certainly in the decision of the ITU Plenipotentiary, through resolution 185, and that is what we have as global flight tracking.

But with respect to GADSS or the global aeronautical distress and safety system, we are still working very hard to define the requirements. Therefore, we do anticipate that there will be a need to change the radio regulations accordingly as well to facilitate the introduction of such a system. That is why we are proposing an agenda item that is flexible enough to address any required changes to the radio regulations. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much, ICAO. I would like to stop my presentation there, and I know I've had some comments from the delegates, but I would like to give you this opportunity, if there is anyone who is not among my panelists who has a comment to make on any of the proposed future agenda items that are presented to you. Again these are just proposed future agenda items. I think we will see the full scope of the agenda items when we go to the conference in November. And we go to the relevant working group. I don't see any person asking for the floor. I would like to ask my panelists if any one of you has any last words on the subject matters that we have considered. I'll start from my right and I'll end on my left. Last words.

>> We don't have any comments. Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. Dr. Jamieson.

>> ALAN JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would very much like that any words we say now will be our last words on these agenda items. But I doubt it somehow (chuckles).

I think Albert is going to have a big job to do at WRC, and we will have many words to say on all of these agenda items. Nevertheless, certainly the matters that have been tabled are of interest to each of the regional groups to varying degrees. And I'm sure along with my colleagues on the panel, we all would encourage each other to consider these matters before we get to the WRC. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you very much. Any last words?

>> I have nothing to add.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Last words for today until 5:00, after that you can start discussing the agenda items again (chuckles).

>> Thank you for that. I have nothing to add to what Mr. Alan Jamieson put forward. They are relevant issues.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you. CITEL?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some interesting issues have come up during this panel discussion, but I also wanted to indicate that we also have two other inter-American proposals for agenda items for the future conferences in 2023, we assume. One of them has to do with the allocation of Earth exploration-satellite service and the 40 to 50 megahertz band, and the other one has to do with space weather sensors. I wanted to assure everyone we are not talking about hurricanes or typhoons in space. But we are talking about issues in space that can affect us all, and the protection of those sensors in the radio regulations.

Thank you.

>> DANIEL OBAM: If you download the presentation, I captured it on the last slide. But I didn't present it because of time. You have the last last word, Albert.

>> ALBERT NALBANDIAN: I'm lucky. I'm the last one to speak. First of all, I'd like to thank everybody who has formulated the items we have just examined. It was a lot of preparatory work for us for next week and each of the items proposed will be examined in detail, and the necessary decisions will be taken. Thank you very much.

>> DANIEL OBAM: Thank you, on my part, I'd like to thank the panelists for their contribution to this session. This was supposed to be sort of like a crystal ball on what could possibly face Albert when he is chairing the proposed working group 6B. I'm sure many more will come in. So thank you very much for the support. I'd like to thank Mario, the Director and Philippe and also thank you for being a very good audience. That concludes my work for this workshop. I would like to hand over the meeting to Mario, to summarize and conclude our session. Mario, you have the floor.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thank you, Daniel and to all for this interesting session and for a very full three days that were very interesting to all of us. Daniel said that I should summarize and conclude. I don't know if I am able to summarize.

But I will surely conclude. (chuckles).

My conclusion of this, not only of these three days but of all the preparatory process that has started a long time ago and in the best tradition of the ITU-R it starts right the following day of the end of the WRC, which might be seem like crazy for people from the outside, but it makes sense when you are in the inside.

You have done an excellent job in trying to prepare the best possible for this coming conference that is probably one of the more complex ones, because the complexity is increasing as we go along, the number of issues that we are dealing with, the number of participants that are attending, the number of proposals that we are getting. So this way of preparing the conference through regional groups, through regional discussions, has been, has proved to be a way to try to streamline the discussions and to focus them on the issues that are really problematic, and try to iron out the others that can be resolved in an easier way, so that the conference is a more efficient one.

So, we have seen how the regional groups have prepared for this conference. We are very pleased with the way in which it was, has been carried out, not only the way in which this was done but the, let's say, the lack of this difference that we had before, even when there were regional preparations, that some regions were much more prepared than others, and now we see that this is disappearing, and all regions are preparing very seriously and very thoroughly. So this will necessarily help everybody to have a very, a smoother conference.

Of course, we will still have topics that are difficult, that will be the object of long discussions.

But at least those are the ones that we cannot avoid I mean these kinds of discussions, and the others will be ready for a quick let's say decision and approval.

So I would like to thank again all the regional groups, all the regional organisations that worked so hard in this, all the individual countries that of course have backed this work, and again on behalf of Francois and the staff of the BR, I'd like to thank you all for having come to Geneva to share with all of us all the results that we have so far. And we will see you probably in the two regional meetings that are still outstanding, and after that in October for the assembly and in November for the conference. I wish you all a safe trip back home, and safe finalization of the preparation. Of course I will open the floor for the regional coordinators if they want to say something again, and to any of you if you have any final thoughts.

Thank you.

ASMG, please.

>> Thank you very much, Mario. I would like here on behalf of ASMG to thank ITU BR for organizing this interregional workshop for WRC 2015, and all people who worked on this issue in order to make success of this workshop. It's really a very nice workshop, where we share our preparation for WRC 2015, and to know each other where we stand. Before the conference, it was really very good dialogues between the countries, between the administrations, or even between the regions.

This will help us a lot to make further preparation, to know exactly what we do, we should do during the conference. I just would like also to thank all regional groups for their hard work, for their cooperation, and for those regional groups also submitted their proposals, and all administrations working very hard here. I just would like to say one message here. A few days that we have seen how that we are working together and I've been hearing maybe in the last one year also or more that everybody is saying that this frequencies will be taken to another or somewhere else like this, I mean broadcasting community say this frequency will be taken from us or satellite will be taken or mobile.

We just should know here that these all frequencies belong to the country, to the administration. Each administration know what they want for themselves, in order to improve their system or network, in order to introduce new technologies.

So we have to think about that one. It is not that any frequency will be taken to other services. This means that that services cannot exist. But this is the need of the country, need of the administration, to introduce those new technologies. We have to keep in mind that one. We have to come to the conference to see how we can, to say that, to please our customer, or our people, that try to bring their need, new technologies and improve them for such other countries. With this one, that we have to work together again, collaborate together again and during the conference as we did in the previous conference. This is just a message from

ASMG, and hope that everybody can work together as a team, and look forward what need for future for the customer, for our customer, for our people, for our public.

Again, would like to thank everybody here to come to this workshop and to thank Mario and please also give our regards to Francois. We miss him here in this meeting. But I'm sure that you will deliver our message to him. Thank you to Daniel for chairing this whole workshop, really, appreciate for all his work. Wish you all the best. Thank you.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thank you very much, Tariq. Alan.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly join with Tariq in thanking the BR for organizing this workshop, in fact the whole series of workshops, this after all is the third one that's been held in this particular study period. I'm moved to observe that the color green was quite evident during the sessions that we held, and what was even more apparent was the alignment of the color green, not always, but quite frequently. And that surely is our objective at the WRC that we can reach a point where we do reach consensus and agreement on the issues that lie before us.

So, Mr. Chairman, the APT is certainly grateful for the opportunity to participate in this workshop. For some of us it's a long long way to come for three days. But the benefits that we derive from participating in the workshop are quite major. It's evident that the preparations of the regional groups has been thorough, the knowledge on the issues is quite deep, and we have all benefited not only from the sessions but also the many corridor discussions that we have been able to have. Please do pass on our best regards to the Director. We have missed him. We certainly look forward to his participation in the RA and the conference itself.

The APT would like to offer its best regards to our colleagues and the other regional groups. We have enjoyed our interaction with you, and we look forward to further cooperation with you when we come to the conference. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thank you very much, Alan. Daniel.

>> Thank you, on behalf of the Africa telecommunication union and African countries I'd like to first thank the Director and the Director Mario and the staff of the BR for organizing this workshop. Although it was just a information workshop, but we have benefited tremendously from the interaction with colleagues from other regions. I'd also like to thank the other ITU regions for sharing their work with us. We had a lot of pending items, but with the interaction that we have had, both in the meeting and also outside the meeting, we have gathered information that we believe will help us to make decisions in those agenda items that we had not made decisions, even if we do not submit as I mentioned earlier a report, a proposal to the conference, but going into the conference with the kind of interaction we have had, I think we will be in a better position to be able to discuss.

So again, I thank you very much for coming for this meeting, and I can only wish you bon voyage when you go back and look forward to seeing you in either October or November, depending on which meeting you are coming for. Thank you.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thanks very much. CEPT. Go ahead.

>> Thank you, Mario. On behalf of CEPT, a little look back on the first two sessions that we had on the preparation for WRC, there was a lot of sending information in those first two workshops. We hoped to see in the third meeting, to see more discussions, as we currently have a number of positions that are currently known. We saw an increase during this third session and we saw even more discussions took place outside the meeting which is good.

These discussions were possible due to your presentation of your participation over here and we would like to thank you for that, especially to the ones who came a long way for just three days of meeting here. Are these sessions helpful? Absolutely. Did they solve issues? Not directly visible. But it helped the process, and understanding of positions. It provided good overviews and as Alan said, nice lines of green to have a good common understanding of the way forward for WRC particular issues.

CEPT still needs to have a final meeting in the preparation for the WRC. We will gain benefit from these discussions, as we are trying to achieve common proposals prior to the WRC, reasons for also having a collaborative regional discussions and dialogues. Almost every WRC surprises us with challenging discussions

on relatively easy topics. Let's surprise ourselves during the coming WRC with the opposite, quick solutions for difficult topics. Or is that a dream that we all have? At least let us not end in night sessions based on the traditions that we had during the last couple of WRCs.

We would like to thank the ITU staff for organizing these preparatory WRC workshops in an excellent way, especially to Mr. Philippe Aubineau and would like to send our best regards to the Director of the Bureau. Monday 14th of September, we will start our final meeting on the cycle for the WRC. The meeting will be held in Bergen, Norway. We are looking forward to meeting you over there, any of you over there, we are looking forward to meeting you at the coming WRC in November if you are not over there. Thank you.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thanks very much. CITEL.

>> That is a tough act to follow. What he said.

Anyway, I would like to on behalf of CITEL thank the ITU especially the BR, for giving us this opportunity to interact with our colleagues from around the world. I think and I agree with my colleague from CEPT that this will make the conference a little easier for us. We will have more knowledge where we can focus our energies and resources, because some people have small delegations, and they will know better which way they need to go from the very start of the conference. Again, thank you all for all the hard work. I know there is also a lot of hard work for each one of the regions putting together their presentations, proposals, for the moderators putting on their presentations. And I do want to thank you all and hope to see you all in, back here in Geneva in a couple of months or month and a half, or whatever time we have left.

Thank you.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thank you, Carmelo. RCC.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's already 5:00, so I'll be brief. Distinguished colleagues, distinguished heads of the BR, on behalf of the RCC, I thank each and everyone separately for the organisation, the preparation and participation in our debates. When I say colleagues, I mean above all, all those who are sitting in the room, including the interpreters who have been helping us to work, and the organizers. Thank you very much, everybody.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Thank you, Albert. Anyone else that would like to say something before we close? I see none. So thank you very much again. And have a safe trip back home. See you soon. Bye-bye.

(applause).

(meeting adjourned at 1703)

This text is being provided in an unedited Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
