Outcomes of the first session of the Regional Radiocommunication Conference - 2004

With reference to other primary services (other than broadcasting service)

One of the acute problems considered by the Conference was taking into account the interests of other primary services used in the future digital Plan bands.

The Conference was to take decisions on the following main lines:

1. What other primary services should be taken into account in planning?

2. What criteria should be used to protect other services while developing the Plan?

3. In which way the use of other primary services should influence the access of communications administrations to frequency resource in the interests of broadcasting?

1. "What other primary services should be taken into account in planning?"

First of all the Conference agreed upon the list of services entitled to raise demands with regard to protection in the course of development of the Plan. The list included *aeronautical radionavigation* service used in Russia and a number of other RCC countries under No. 5.312 of Radio Regulations.

At the same time there were fundamental differences in positions of various communications administrations as to what assignments in particular should be taken into consideration. This matter was considered within the framework of definitions of existing and planned assignments subject to be taken into consideration in developing the new Plan.

The complexity of problem for Russia and RCC countries was determined by two main factors:

a) Radiocommunication Bureau stated that for the countries covered by the Agreement "Stockholm 61" no examination of notices for stations of other primary services under No.11.32 (coordination procedures) was made;

b) Up to now no terrestrial services coordination procedures are envisaged between administrations which are not Parties to either "Geneva 89"/"Stockholm 61" Agreements or which are Parties to different agreements.

On this basis the majority of administrations at the Conference insisted that repeated coordination be carried out with regard to all frequency assignments of other services.

However, owing to the RCC reasoned position the Conference adopted the decision that the following frequency assignments of other services should be taken into account:

1) All frequency assignments registered prior to December 31, 1989

2) All frequency assignments registered or being at the stage of registration prior to May 10, 2004. With regard to these assignments it is necessary to resolve all sharing problems. However, even in the case of unresolved problems the relevant assignments will be taken into consideration in planning.

3) Coordinated frequency assignments notified after May 10, 2004.

Item 3 in the above-mentioned list has peculiarities. Under Agreement "Stockholm 61" (item2.2) a frequency assignment of other service before registration should obtain *agreement* of *other* administrations. In practice this requirement meant that any administration could object to the use of assignments of other services and such abjection did not require any grounds.

In the course of the Conference this problem was resolved:

- Resolution [GT PLEN/3] containing *coordination* (rather than obtaining the *agreement*) procedures stating clearly which assignments of other administration can be taken into account in coordination was adopted;

- criteria (coordination distances) for determining the concerned administration were developed.

2. "What criteria should be used to protect other services while developing the Plan?"

In the course of work of TG 6/8 which prepared draft technical Report to the Conference, not all information related to aeronautical radionavigation systems was available and, correspondingly, provided to ITU. As a result the Report reflected only criteria for protection of RSBN (short-range navigation) systems. At the same time a number of systems (primary and secondary radars…,) having much more stringent protection requirements were not reflected in the Report.

This gap was closed after submission of the contribution from the RCC countries containing the required information including protection criteria. This information was included in the Conference Report. At the same time the Resolution was adopted focusing on further ITU-R studies that, apparently, will be carried out in WG 8B.

3. "In which way the use of other primary services should influence the access of communications administrations to frequency resource in the interests of broadcasting"

This issue was considered as a part of the problem of providing *equal access* to frequency resource.

Many countries supported the idea of lessening the access to spectrum in the broadcasting interests for those administrations which use other services.

Administration of Russia and other RCC countries were main opponents to such an approach.

Decision on this issue was taken at the last night before closure of the Conference. As a result the wording was included in the Conference Report stating that in implementation of equal access principle the use by administrations of other services should be taken into consideration but only in the geographic areas and frequency bands used by frequency assignments of these other services. Moreover, implementation of equal access principle should be based on transparent criteria and methodology approved by the second session of the Conference.

4. Conclusions (What should be done?)

Main outcome of the Conference is preservation of maximum freedom in the actions of administrations with regard to protection of their other services.

The following can be listed as main lines of activities within the framework of preparation for planning:

1. Notification in ITU-R and coordination with the concerned administrations of frequency assignments of other services.

2. Revision of frequency assignments of other services registered within ITU-R prior to May 10, 2004 with regard to identification and resolving compatibility problems.

3. Carrying out studies in WG 8B in order to determine protection criteria for aeronautical radionavigation systems (except for short-range navigation RSBN).

Main task related to protection of other services is preserving the balance in needs of other services, on the one hand, and broadcasting, on the other hand.

It is obvious that excessive needs on protection of other services may block the development of digital broadcasting plan in the border areas or make it impossible for the administration protecting other services, to satisfy its needs related to digital broadcasting.

In this connection the following succession of actions of administration seems expedient:

1. Preparation of reasoned needs related to protection of other services.

2. Preparation of requirements for digital planning.

3. Matching the needs of other services and requirements for digital planning, modification (where necessary) of initial requirements.

4. Coordination of requirements within the RCC.

5. Coordination of requirements with other border states (where possible).

6. Provision of data to Radiocommunication Bureau for planning exercise.

7. Updating the data upon the results of the first planning exercise and providing them for preparation of draft Plan to the second session of the Conference.

8. Commencement of talks with border communications administrations in order to resolve the matters of conflict identified as a result of draft Plan preparation.