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Working Party 3

**PRELIMINARY VIEWs on WRC-19 agenda item 7**

**Agenda Item 7:**

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

Issue A – Bringing into use of frequency assignments to all non-GSO satellite systems, and consideration of a milestone-based deployment approach for non-GSO satellite systems in specific bands and services

# 1. Background

WRC-12 and WRC-15 adopted into the Radio Regulations a series of specific provisions —including RR No. **11.44B**— that clarified the BIU requirements and bringing back into use requirements for frequency assignments to a space station in a GSO network. However, there are no specific provisions in the RR that specifically address the BIU for frequency assignments to space stations in non-GSO satellite systems. In order to complete the recording process for frequency assignments to non-GSO satellite systems notified to the ITU under RR No. **11.2** and in absence of any specific provision for the BIU in the RR, it has been the practice of the Bureau to consider that a frequency assignment to the space stations in any non-GSO system has been brought into use when one satellite from a planned system is deployed in space and capable of transmitting and/or receiving that assignment – irrespective of the number of satellites or of the number of orbital planes indicated in the notification information provided under RR No. **11.2**. This practice, reflected for FSS and MSS non-GSO systems in the Rules of Procedure for RR No. **11.44** (*see* Rule of Procedure for RR No. **11.44**, section 2 (MOD RRB16/58)), has been used for a number of years.

However, in its report to WRC-15 on the experience in the application of regulatory procedures and other related matters, the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau stated that:

QUOTE *“Taking into account of the numerous non-GSO systems received so far by the Bureau, and the possible speculative nature of such submissions that could lead to spectrum warehousing and resurgence of so-called “paper satellite networks”, the conference may wish to consider redefining the notion of bringing into use for non-GSO satellite networks.* UNQUOTE.

WRC-15 invited the ITU-R to examine, under the standing WRC agenda item 7, the possible development of regulatory provisions beyond those under RR Nos. **11.25** and **11.44** on the non-GSO FSS/MSS systems and the implications of the application of such milestones to non-GSO FSS/MSS systems brought into use after WRC-15.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-19 (INS), 23Rev.1 (KOR), 43(AUS), 51 (J), 67 (SNG), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view to support the following principles that shall be taken into account when developing the procedure for NGSO BIU:
* It shall take into account the basic principles of ITU regarding the efficient, rational and economical use of spectrum and orbital resource;
* The date of BIU for non-GSO satellite networks shall be within the 7-year regulatory period. This will create consistency with the current regulations in No.9.1 and No.11.44;
* When notifying administrations submit bringing into use (BIU) of frequency assignments, these following additional information shall be included:
	+ The frequency range that would brought into use;
	+ Orbital planes that would brought into use (inclination, RAAN, argument of perigee, period, apogee, perigee);
	+ Number of satellite within such orbital planes that used to bring into use;
* Every satellites which used in BIU shall be able to transmit and receive in the notified frequency assignments for a 90 days continuous period of ninety days;
* Having received the BIU confirmation submitted by notifying administrations, Bureau shall evaluate all the criteria above. If Bureau find that there are differences between the specification of the real satellite operated compared to the filing i.e. the number of satellites and orbital planes are less than the number notified in the satellite filing, Bureau shall publish the new notification of the satellite network according to the real parameter used by the satellite.

#### 3.1.2 Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Republic of Korea supports further studies related to the regulatory provisions and procedures for bringing into use (BIU) of the frequency assignments of non-GSO systems and establishment of a milestone-based approach for alignment of non-GSO system deployment with the MIFR in specific frequency bands and services.

**3.1.3 Australia** - **Document APG19-3/INP-43**

* Australia supports development of new RR provisions for BIU of NGSO satellite systems under a fair and balanced milestone approach that reflects the practicality of the size of the constellations. However, any changes should not disadvantage existing and future GSO satellite networks and smaller NGSO constellations.

#### 3.1.4 Japan – Document APG19-3/INP-51

* Japan supports the current ITU-R studies to maintain the conditions for BIU, with some additional deployment milestones to certain space services and frequency bands, of frequency assignments to non-GSO satellite systems.

#### 3.1.5 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* In consideration of Issue A, Singapore supports:
1. The definition of the BIU of frequency assignments to NGSO systems in accordance with the current practice as contained in the ROP adopted by the 73rd meeting of the RRB to be left unchanged from the current practice. Further consideration needs to be given on the most appropriate length of the period during which such a satellite needs to operate in one of the notified orbital planes of the NGSO system.
2. A milestone-based approach for the maintenance of the recording in the MIFR of assignments to NGSO systems, which is associated with a minimum number of satellites to be deployed over time.
3. The reduction of the characteristics of the constellation recorded in the MIFR should be based on the number of actual satellites launched, while preserving the rights for the already in-orbit satellites.
4. Systems brought into use and notified, but not fully deployed before the end of WRC-19, shall respect the same milestone-based approach as those systems brought into use and notified after the end of WRC-19. The effective date for the application of the milestone-based approach should be on the last day of WRC-19 or the date set forth in RR No. **11.44**, whichever is the later.

#### 3.1.6 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Firstly, China supports that a solution to address this issue should follow the principles updated by ITU-R WP 4A at its February 2018’s meeting. Secondly, China supports that the definition of the BIU of frequency assignments to non-GSO systems should be in accordance with the current practice as contained in the Rules of Procedure. Thirdly, China supports a milestone-based approach for the maintenance of the recording in the MIFR of assignments to non-GSO systems. Any milestone-based approach should be limited to in specific bands and services. Finally, considering that those systems brought into use and notified, but not fully deployed before the last day of WRC-19, appropriate transitional measures may need to be considered in order to allow administrations to have sufficient time to adapt their current development and deployment schedules to meet milestones, as appropriate.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* For issue on BIU of frequency assignments to non-GSO systems, further consideration is required on what is the appropriate length of the period to be operated and what are the minimum number of satellites to be deployed for non-GSO systems.
* For issue on milestone-based approach for specific services in specific frequency bands, further consideration is needed on which approach is most appropriate for the maintenance of the recording in the MIFR of assignments to non-GSO systems.
* For issue on transitional measures, it is agreed that the transitional measures may be necessary in order to allow administrations to have sufficient time to adapt their current development and deployment schedules to meet the conditions agreed upon by WRC-19. Further study is needed on which transitional measures are appropriate to address the relevant issue.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support further studies related to the regulatory provisions and procedures for BIU of the frequency assignments of non-GSO systems and establishment of a milestone-based approach for alignment of non-GSO system deployment with the MIFR.
* APT Members support the course of action which was taken by ITU-R/WP 4A to separate the studies of BIU of frequency assignments to non-GSO satellite systems in all bands and services and milestone-based deployment approach for non-GSO satellite systems in specific bands and services.

# 5. Other View(s) from APT Members

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* Follow-up studies under this issue (See APG19-2/OUT-06).
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* No preliminary position on this agenda item yet (APG19-2/INP-07).
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* Preliminary views from a few countries support the milestone approach and the six principles for developing options agreed at WP 4A.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue B - Ka-band coordination arc – FSS/MSS, MSS/MSS

# 1. Background

Currently in the Radio Regulations, to determine whether coordination under RR No. **9.7** is required, in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space)/19.7-20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth) in all 3 Regions the following criteria is applied:

– FSS vs FSS: Coordination arc of 8º

– FSS vs MSS: Δ*T/T* > 6%

– MSS vs MSS: Δ*T/T* > 6%

In addition, in the FSS vs FSS coordination, Administrations can always request application of RR No. **9.41** to include additional satellite networks that would be affected taking into account the Δ*T/T* > 6% criteria.

Considering that according to the current Radio Regulations, to determine whether coordination under RR No. **9.7** is required between FSS vs FSS satellite networks, a coordination arc of 8º is the coordination criteria applied in this same frequency band, Agenda Item 7 Issue B studies the possibility to apply this same coordination criteria to determine if coordination is required between MSS systems and between MSS and FSS systems based on the following principles:

– Results of studies show that earth station terminals used in the MSS and FSS in the Ka‑band are quite similar. Therefore, it can be considered that the coordination arc that currently trigger coordination between FSS systems in an effective and efficient manner, can be applied to trigger coordination between MSS and FSS systems and MSS systems.

– Introduction of the coordination arc will reduce the number of Administrations identified for coordination, reducing the number of coordination processes and resulting in a reduction of required resources in Administrations, operators, Bureau, etc.

– Administration will always have the possibility to request application of RR No. **9.41** to include additional satellite networks affected, taking into account the Δ*T/T* > 6% criteria.

As a result of the ITU-R studies, Issue B proposes the introduction of the coordination arc with a value of 8 degrees as coordination criteria between FSS and MSS systems and between MSS systems, in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space)/19.7-20.2 GHz (space‑to-Earth) in all 3 Regions, as substitution of the existing trigger of coordination Δ*T/T*> 6% without referring to the status of the existing and/or incoming FSS and MSS assignments.

Working Party 4A (WP4A) meeting in March 2018 has updated the draft CPM text for WRC-19 Agenda Item 7 Issue B (Annex 34 to Document 675 of the Working Party 4A Chairman’s Report).

**Relevant ITU-R Recommendations and Reports**

* [Annex 34 to Document 675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N34%21MSW-E.docx) of the Working Party 4A Chairman Report, March 2018: Preliminary Draft CPM text for WRC-19 agenda item 7 – Issue B

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 Rev.1 (THA), 67 (SNG), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-2/INF-05 (RCC), 07 (ATU), APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia supports study for introducing the coordination arc concept to determine the coordination requirements between the mobile-satellite service (MSS) and fixed-satellite service (FSS) geostationary satellite networks and between MSS geostationary satellite networks, in the portions of the Ka band.

#### 3.1.2 The Republic of Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1

* The Administration of Korea proposes modifications to the APT Preliminary View adopted at the APG19-2 meeting, and to this effect, the modified APT Preliminary View in the proposal is shown below:

APT Members supports introduction of the coordination arc concept to determine coordination requirements between the GSO FSS and GSO MSS satellite networks and between GSO MSS satellite networks in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space) and 19.7-20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth)where both services are allocated on primary basis, while keeping the possibility for administrations to apply ΔT/T criteria under No. **9.41**, provided that the results of the ITU-R studies does not impact the operations of satellite networks in particular those used for safety of life aspects. Moreover, the studies should indicate that use of such concept (coordination arc) would deliver similar results if ΔT/T were used.

#### 3.1.3 Mongolia – Document APG19-40

* The Administration of Mongolia considers that applying the coordination arc criterion would increase the efficiency of coordination procedure while maintaining the possibility to apply the RR No.9.41. Mongolia is of the view to support the Method B in the draft CPM text.

#### 3.1.4 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports development of coordination triggers between services in the Ka-band. Noting that any procedures should not compromise the protection of a primary service from a secondary service. Australia supports the intent of Method B of the draft CPM Report text.\*

\*refers draft CPM Report text from the October 2017 meeting of WP 4A Document 4A/519 and relevant Annexes.

#### 3.1.5 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61 Rev.1

* With a view to reducing the unnecessary coordination procedure, Thailand supports the application of the coordination arc mechanism to determine the coordination requirements between FSS and MSS systems and between MSS systems in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space) and 19.7‑20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth) in all 3 Regions, to replace the existing coordination criteria **.

#### 3.1.6 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports Method B as it could help to facilitate and improve the coordination procedures.

#### 3.1.7 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* In order to make more efficient the coordination procedures, China supports the course of action of WP 4A that consideration of the introduction of the coordination arc in the Ka-band as criteria to determine whether coordination is required could be done irrespectively of the status of the services.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the consideration of coordination arc concept to determine coordination requirements between the GSO FSS and GSO MSS satellite networks and between GSO MSS satellite networks in the bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space) and 19.7-20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth) , while keeping the possibility for administrations to apply ΔT/T criteria under No. **9.41**, provided that the results of the ITU-R studies does not impact the operations of satellite networks in particular those used for safety of life aspects.

# 5. Other View(s)

* Some APT Members support Method B that uses the coordination arc with a value of 8 degrees as coordination criteria, to determine if coordination is required between FSS and MSS systems and between MSS systems in the frequency bands 29.5-30 GHz (Earth-to-space)/19.7‑20.2 GHz (space-to-Earth), in all 3 Regions, replacing the existing coordination criteria ΔT/T > 6%. It is noted that under this Method, administrations can always request application of RR No. 9.41 to include additional satellite networks that would be affected taking into account the ΔT/T > 6% criteria.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.1.2 ATU - Document APG19-2/INF-07

* None.

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports to apply the coordination arc to both MSS primary and secondary frequency assignments without modifying the current conditions related to the category of allocation applicable to assignments to be taken into account in coordination. Coordination arc criteria would substitute the ΔT/T>6% criteria that currently applies, improving and making more efficient the coordination procedures, while keeping the possibility for Administrations to request ΔT/T criteria under No **9.41**.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC - Document APG19-2/INF-05

* The RCC Administrations consider that when modifying (reducing) characteristics of frequency assignments recorded in the frequency assignment List in RR Appendices **30** and **30А** for Regions 1 и 3 (namely reduction of service area, number of frequency channels, polarization types) and their recording in the MIFR, recorded frequency assignments shall be protected and additional constraints should not be imposed (including additional coordination) on frequency assignments of satellite systems, submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau for consideration prior to the receipt of request for modification (reducing) of characteristics.

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

Issue C1 - Inconsistency between provisions of RR No.11.43A of RR Article 11 and paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix 30B

# 1. Background

Further review of the provisions dealing with any changes to the characteristics of an assignment submitted under provisions of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11**, and that submitted under paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** and confirmed as having been brought into use, reveals that there is a regulatory inconsistency between the objectives of the two provisions/paragraph as follows:

 *“8.13 A notice of a change in the characteristics of an assignment already recorded, as specified in Appendix****4****, shall be examined by the Bureau under § 8.8 and § 8.9, as appropriate. Any changes to the characteristics of an assignment that has been notified and confirmed as having been brought into use shall be brought into use within eight years from the date of the notification of the modification. Any changes to the characteristics of an assignment that has been notified but not yet brought into use shall be brought into use within the period provided for in §§ 6.1, 6.31 or 6.31bis of Article 6.    (WRC‑12)”*

 *“****11.43A*** *A notice of a change in the characteristics of an assignment already recorded, as specified in Appendix****4****, shall be examined by the Bureau under Nos.****11.31*** *to* ***11.34****, as appropriate. Any change to the characteristics of an assignment that has been recorded and confirmed as having been brought into use shall be brought into use within five years from the date of the notification of the modification. Any change to the characteristics of an assignment that has been recorded but not yet brought into use shall be brought into use within the period provided for in No.****11.44****.    (WRC‑07)”*

It is to be emphasized that the concept of the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** was borrowed/taken from provisions of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11**. However, in so doing an important element as contained in RR No. **11.43A** which referred to any change to the characteristics of an assignment that has been *recorded* and confirmed as having been brought into use was changed to *notified* and confirmed as having been brought into use*,* which is quite different.

An assignment may be notified but due to one or other reasons not yet recorded in the MIFR, but the notifying administration might have brought that assignment into use and its date of bringing it to use might have been confirmed.

It is also worth mentioning that an assignment may be notified but being returned to its notifying administration on relevant regulatory grounds. That assignment shall not be benefited as being recorded.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/ INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents APG19-3/ INF-06 (CEPT), 08(CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view to support alignment of the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** with that of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11** while ensuring that this alignment should not impact on any other regulatory practice at present.

#### 3.1.2 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* Korea (Rep. of) supports a single method to address this issue by aligning the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** with that of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11** while ensuring that this alignment should not impact on any other regulatory practice at present.

#### 3.1.3 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia is of the view to support the method that is to address the regulatory inconsistency identified in this issue is to align the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** with that of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11**.

#### 3.1.4 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports efforts that may resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions, clarify certain existing practices, or increase transparency in the regulatory process. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for Issue C1.

#### 3.1.5 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61

* To resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions and to increase transparency in the regulatory process, Thailand is of the view that the Issue C1 under Issue C could be supported.

C1: to address the regulatory inconsistency identified in this issue is to align the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** with that of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article**11**.

#### 3.1.6 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports the single method in each of these sub-issues under Issue C which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

#### 3.1.7 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam supports a single method to address this issue by aligning the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** with that of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11** on dealing with any changes to the characteristics of an assignment, while ensuring that this alignment should not impact on any other regulatory practice at present.

#### 3.1.8 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* For issue C1, China supports a single method to address Issue C1 under Issue C for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method to address this issue by aligning the text of paragraph 8.13 of Article 8 of RR Appendix **30B** with that of RR No. **11.43A** of RR Article **11** while ensuring that this alignment should not impact on any other current regulatory practice.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* For issues C1 to C7, CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL- APG19-3/INF- 08Rev.1

* DIAP: Proposal supporting modifications as shown in the draft CPM text

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue C2 - Clarification of the possibility to notify/bring into use only one of the blocks/one sub-band under AP30B Article 6

# 1. Background

RR Appendix **30B** consists of two blocks/ sub-bands of 250 MHz each in 13-11 GHz band, i.e. 10.70‑10.95 GHz, 11.2-11.45 GHz for downlink and 12.75-13.0 GHz, 13.0-13.25 GHz for uplink. Submission from administrations when applying Article **6** of RR Appendix **30B** for additional use usually covers both blocks/sub-bands of 250 MHz mentioned above or may only submit either of the two blocks for additional use or while successfully applying Article **6** for the two blocks/sub‑bands, when applying Article **8**, only bring into use one block/sub-band of the 13-11 GHz.

There is no provision in the Appendix prohibiting, strictly speaking, to allow Administration to submit an application for one of the blocks/sub-bands in an explicit submission of one of the blocks/sub-bands under RR Appendix **30B**. This concept is analogous to that stipulated in footnote 4 associated with paragraph 6.1 of Article 6 of the Appendix. However, there is no specific provision authorizing that application when submitting RR Appendix **4** for either of two sub-bands. Nevertheless, Rules of Procedure relating to paragraphs 6.5 of Article 6 of the RR Appendix **30B** in its sub paragraph 1 stipulates that:

***Quote***

*“1 The planning exercise and the interference analysis were made by WARC Orb-88 for the whole band of 300 MHz (6/4 GHz) or 500 MHz (13/11 GHz) on a co-channel basis. It may happen that two administrations conclude agreement on the shared use of the frequency bands. In the compatibility examination by the Bureau, the mutual interference between non-overlapping frequency assignments shall not be taken into consideration in formulating findings”*

***Unquote***

The Rules were established during 90th in order that a dispute between two administrations relating the use of the entire bands (two blocks/sub-bands) on a given orbital position be satisfactorily resolved. The adoption of the Rules mentioned above permitted each of these two administrations using one of the two blocks/sub-bands, each of 250 MHz be used at two closely orbital positions.

**2. Documents**

* Input Documents: APG19-3/ INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents APG19-3/ INF-06 (CEPT), 08(CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* Korea (Rep. of) supports a single method which can allow administration to submit an application for one of the blocks/sub-bands of 250 MHz (10.7-10.95 GHz or 11.2‑11.45 GHz for downlink and 12.75-13.0 GHz or 13.0-13.25 GHz for uplink) in an explicit submission of one of the blocks/sub-bands under RR Appendix **30B**.

**3.1.2 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40**

* Mongolia is of the view to support the method that is to add another footnote to paragraph 6.1 of Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to allow administration to submit under paragraph 6.1 an additional use for the two blocks/sub-bands of 250 MHz (10.7-10.95 GHz or 11.2-11.45 GHz for downlink and 12.75-13.0 GHz or 13.0-13.25 GHz for uplink).

**3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43**

* Australia supports efforts that may resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions, clarify certain existing practices, or increase transparency in the regulatory process. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for Issue C2.

**3.1.4 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61**

* To resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions and to increase transparency in the regulatory process, Thailand is of the view that Issue C2 could be supported.

C2: to add another footnote to paragraph 6.1 of Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to allow administration as the follows:

a) to submit under paragraph 6.1 an additional use for the two blocks/sub-bands in 10‑11 GHz but only bring into use one of the blocks/one sub-band or,

b) to submit under paragraph 6.1 an application of an additional use for only one of the two blocks/ sub-bands in 10-11 GHz and notify and bring into use that block/sub-band only;

c) to allow/authorize the Bureau, in applying Article 6, to act according to the nature of submission and further process them accordingly, i.e. to process the two blocks/sub bands or process one of the two block/sub-bands and further process the submission as received;

d) to allow/authorize the Bureau, in applying Article 8, to maintain one of the two blocks/sub-bands as notified even though the entire two blocks/sub-bands were submitted under Article 6 and successfully coordinated under that Article but only one of the block/sub-bands is notified or brought into use.

**3.1.5 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67**

* Singapore supports the single method in each of these sub-issues under Issue C which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

**3.1.6 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1**

* Viet Nam supports a single method which can allow Administration to submit an application for one of the blocks/sub-bands in 10-13 GHz frequency range in an explicit submission of one of the blocks/sub-bands under RR Appendix **30B.**

**3.1.7 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88**

* For issues C2, China supports a single method to address Issue C2 under Issue C for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method which can allow administrations to submit an application for one of the blocks/sub-bands of 250 MHz (10.7-10.95 GHz or 11.2‑11.45 GHz for downlink and 12.75-13.0 GHz or 13.0-13.25 GHz for uplink) in an explicit submission of one of the blocks/sub-bands under RR Appendix **30B**.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* For issues C1 to C7, CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL- APG19-3/INF- 08Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue C3 - AP30B MOD to Article 6 No. 6.10

# 1. Background

Issue C3 addresses the consequences for not replying to the letters from the Bureau initiated by a request for its assistance by a notifying administration seeking the inclusion of the territory of a foreign administration under §6.6 of RR Appendix**30B**.

An administration intending to convert an RR Appendix **30B** allotment into an assignment, introduce an additional system[[1]](#footnote-1) or modify the characteristics of an assignment in the Appendix **30B** List must submit the information specified in Appendix **4** to the Bureau. Following the receipt of the notice, the Bureau examines and publishes it in a special section of the BR IFIC. Among other things, this special section can contain two types of requirements to seek and obtain the agreement of those affected administrations whose:

– Allotments in the Appendix **30B** or assignments in the Appendix **30B** List or those already examined by the Bureau (requirements identified under § 6.5 of Appendix **30B**), or

– Territories have been included in the service area of the assignment under consideration (requirements associated with §6.6 of Appendix **30B**).

It is important to note that under the current regulatory framework, there is a specific provision (§ 6.13) in Appendix **30B** to seek the assistance of the Bureau in case of a non-response of an affected administrations identified under § 6.5 of Appendix **30B** within the four-month comment period. In case of a non-response to the letters from the Bureau initiated under § 6.13, 6.14 and 6.14*bis* of Appendix **30B**, it will be deemed that this administration, identified under § 6.5 of Appendix **30B** has agreed as per § 6.15 of Appendix **30B**. However, none of the provisions referred above (§ 6.13 to 6.15) applies in the case of affected administrations identified under § 6.6 of Appendix **30B**. In fact, there is not a single regulatory mechanism in Appendix **30B** to seek the assistance of the Bureau in this case. For a request for the assistance of the Bureau on issue relating to the inclusion of the territory of an administration, the notifying administration, in its request to the Bureau and the Bureau, in its subsequent letters to the affected administration, have to invoke RR No. **13.1** for this matter. Furthermore, the current Radio Regulations do not specify any action from the Bureau with respect to an administration that did not respond to any of its letters initiated under RR No. **13.1**. This implies that the inclusion of the territory of an administration identified under § 6.6 of RR Appendix **30B** can only result from a formal agreement of this administration and, in no circumstance, results from a non-response to neither the original request for inclusion of its territory nor any subsequent letters from the Bureau on this matter.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/ INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents APG19-3/ INF-06 (CEPT), 08(CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view to support the addition of a new provision in Article 6 of RR Appendix 30B to clearly state that § 6.13 to 6.15 of RR Appendix **30B** do not apply in the context of requirements associated with §6.6 of RR Appendix **30B**.

#### 3.1.2 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Korea (Rep. of) supports a single method to add a new provision in Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to clearly state that § 6.13 to 6.15 of RR Appendix **30B** do not apply in the context of requirements associated with §6.6 of RR Appendix **30B**.

#### 3.1.3 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia is of the view to support the method that is to add a new provision in Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to clearly state that § 6.13 to 6.15 of RR Appendix **30B** do not apply in the context of requirements associated with § 6.6 of RR Appendix **30B**.

#### 3.1.4 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports efforts that may resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions, clarify certain existing practices, or increase transparency in the regulatory process. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for issue C3.

#### 3.1.5 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61

* To resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions and to increase transparency in the regulatory process, Thailand is of the view that Issue C3 could be supported.

C3: to add a new provision in Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to clearly state that § 6.13 to 6.15 of RR Appendix **30B** do not apply in the context of requirements associated with §6.6 of RR Appendix **30B**.

#### 3.1.6 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports the single method in each of these sub-issues under Issue C which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

#### 3.1.7 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam supports a single method to add a new provision in Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to clearly state that § 6.13 to 6.15 of RR Appendix **30B** do not apply in the context of requirements associated with §6.6 of RR Appendix **30B.**

#### 3.1.8 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* For issues C3, China supports a single method to address Issue C3 under Issue C for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method to add a new provision in Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** to clearly state that § 6.13 to 6.15 of RR Appendix **30B** do not apply in the context of requirements associated with §6.6 of RR Appendix **30B**.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* For issues C1 to C7, CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL- APG19-3/INF- 08Rev.1

* PV: Preliminary views from a few countries do not support modification to AP30B; No. 13.1 is to be used.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue C4 - AP30/30A single AP4 notice for List and Notification

# 1. Background

Normally, at the end of the coordination process for Regions 1 and 3 under Article 4 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A** and when a network is about to be implemented, systems are submitted for entry into the List under § 4.1.12 and for Notification under §§ 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A,** respectively at the same time. This is logical since both these two provisions refer to actions following the completion of the coordination process and since they are both required to implement the network.

It would therefore reduce the workload of both administrations and the Bureau if one physical submission could be treated as, and examined in respect of both these provisions. In respect of RR Appendix **30A**, it would seem that this would be in particular of value for notification of receiving space stations and typical earth stations while specific earth stations probably in many cases would be subject to separate notices as the requirements change with time.

Given that the RR Appendix **4** information required for submission under § 4.1.12 and § 5.1.1/5.1.2, are identical for entry into the List and Notification, respectively, there are no negative consequences to allowing a single notice to be treated for, and examined in respect of, both of these provisions.

**Relevant ITU-R Recommendations and Reports**

* [Annex 35 to Document 675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N35%21MSW-E.docx) of the Working Party 4A Chairman Report, March 2018: Preliminary Draft CPM text for WRC-19 agenda item 7 – Issue C

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 Rev.1 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-2/INF-05 (RCC), 07 (ATU), APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 The Republic of Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1

* The Republic of Korea proposes modifications to the APT Preliminary View adopted at the APG19-2 meeting, and to this effect, the modified APT Preliminary View in the proposal is shown below:

APT Members support a single method to create single RR Appendix 4 notice for List and Notification assignment to simplify the processing RR Appendix **4** information required for submission under § 4.1.12and § 5.1.1/ § 5.1.2 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**, and reduce the workload of the Bureau and administrations.

#### 3.1.2 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia is of the view to support the method that is to modify § 4.1.12*bis* to allow administrations to request the Bureau to examine the submission made under § 4.1.12 also in respect of notification under § 5.1.1.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports efforts that may resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions, clarify certain existing practices, or increase transparency in the regulatory process. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for these issues.\*

\*refers draft CPM Report text from the October 2017 meeting of WP 4A Document 4A/519 and relevant Annexes.

#### 3.1.4 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61 Rev.1

* To solidify the information required for submission for entry into the List under § 4.1.12 and for Notification under §§ 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of RR Appendices 30 and 30A whichseem to be identical.

#### 3.1.5 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports the single method in each of these sub issues Issue C which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

#### 3.1.6 Vietnam – Document APG19-3/INP-84 Rev. 1

* Viet Nam supports a single method for which, notifying administration may request the Bureau to examine the submissions for entry into the List under § 4.1.12 and for Notification under §§5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A,** respectively at the same time.

#### 3.1.7 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* China support a single method to address these sub-topics under Issue C for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method in the Preliminary Draft CPM text for WRC-19 agenda item 7 – Issue C for Issue C4.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.1.2 ATU - Document APG19-2/INF-07

* None.

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC - Document APG19-2/INF-05

* None.

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

Issue C5 – MOD to No. 11.46 and six month resubmission

# 1. Background

Pursuant to RR No. **11.46**, the Bureau allows Notifying Administrations six months to resubmit their notified frequency assignments which were returned due to an unfavourable finding with respect to RR Nos. **11.32**, **11.32A** or **11.33**. Any notification resubmitted beyond six months is considered as a new notification with a new date of receipt and would be subject to cost recovery fees. However, neither RR No. **11.46** nor any other provision in the Radio Regulations requires the Bureau to send a reminder to the Notifying Administration at any point during the six month period. If the Notifying administration resubmits the notice to the Bureau beyond the required six month period, the Bureau assigns a new date of receipt and reviews whether the notice complies with the period in RR No. **11.44.1** or RR No. **11.43A** and takes the appropriate action. In the case that a notice resubmitted beyond the six month deadline is receivable, cost recovery fees would be required for the resubmitted assignments. Addressing this lack of a reminder would be beneficial to Administrations who may have experienced difficulties receiving or addressing the Bureau’s return of notice and the need to ensure that frequency assignments that are in use are properly recorded in the Master Register.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 Rev.1 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view that it would be considered advantageous to Notifying Administrations if the Bureau sends a reminder of the option to resubmit returned frequency assignments under RR No. **11.37** or **11.38**. Indonesia support the modification of RR No. **11.46** which requiring the Bureau to remind the Notifying Administration of the 6 month deadline as it would aid Administrations who may have had difficulties in receiving the communication of returned frequency assignments.

#### 3.1.2 Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Republic of Korea supports the single method to modify RR No.**11.46** requiring the Bureau to remind the notifying administrations of six month deadline to resubmit their frequency assignments under RR No. **11.46.**

.

#### 3.1.3 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia is of the view to support the single method has been identified to address this issue. It would be considered advantageous to Notifying Administrations if the Bureau sends a reminder of the option to resubmit returned frequency assignments under RR No. **11.37** or **11.38**. Modification of RR No. **11.46** requiring the Bureau to remind the Notifying Administration of the 6-month deadline would aid Administrations who may have had difficulties in receiving the communication of returned frequency assignments.

#### 3.1.4 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports, in principle, the BR sending a reminder prior to the six month deadline for RR **11.46** resubmission. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for this issue.\*

\* refers draft CPM Report text from the October 2017 meeting of WP 4A Document 4A/519 and relevant Annexes.

#### 3.1.5 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61Rev.1

* To resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions and to increase transparency in the regulatory process, Thailand is of the view that the following seven sub-issues under Issue C could be supported.
* Thailand is of the view that the Issue C5 could be supported. This Issue to be considered advantageous to Notifying Administrations if the Bureau sends a reminder of the option to resubmit returned frequency assignments under RR No. 11.37 or 11.38. Modification of RR No. 11.46 requiring the Bureau to remind the Notifying Administration of the 6 month deadline would aid Administrations who may have had difficulties in receiving the communication of returned frequency assignments.

#### 3.1.6 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports the single method which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

#### 3.1.7 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam supports the single method addressing the lack of a reminder when Bureau allows notifying administrations six months to resubmit their frequency assignments under RR **No. 11.46.**

#### 3.1.8 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* For Issue C5, China supports the single method to address this Issue for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* APT Members support studies undertaken by ITU-R and agreed to develop an APT Preliminary View on Issue C5.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method to modify RR No.**11.46,** asmentioned in the draft CPM text, requiring the Bureau to remind the notifying administrations of the six month deadline to resubmit their frequency assignments under RR No. **11.46.**

# 5. Other View(s) from APT Members

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* None.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* Follow-up studies under this issue (See APG19-2/OUT-06).
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* No preliminary position on this agenda item yet (APG19-2/INF-07).
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* Draft Inter-American proposal: Proposals supporting modifications as shown in the draft CPM text.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue C6 - Single AP4 notice for entry into the RR Appendix 30B List (under § 6.17) and Notification (under § 8.1)

# 1. Background

Normally, at the end of the coordination process under Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** and when a network is about to be implemented, systems are submitted for entry into the List under § 6.17 and for Notification under § 8.1 at the same time. This is logical since both these two provisions refer to actions following the completion of the coordination process and since they are both required to implement the network.

Enabling, as an option, administrations to submit one notice and request in a letter to the Bureau that it should be treated both in respect of entry into the List and Notification would simplify the processing and reduce the workload of the Bureau and administrations. However, this is not possible under the current provisions of RR Appendix **30B** (§ 6.17). In addition, the data items required for the submission under § 6.17 and for Notification under § 8.1 are not the same.

**2. Documents**

* Input Documents: APG19-3/ INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents APG19-3/ INF-06 (CEPT), 08(CITEL)

**3. Summary of discussions**

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Korea (Rep. of) supports a single method to allow one submission to be treated both in respect of entry into the List under §6.17 and notification under §8.1 of RR Appendix **30B** to reduce workload of both administration and the Bureau.

#### 3.1.2 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia is of the view to support the method that would modify § 6.17 to allow one submission to be treated in respect of both provisions and modify RR Appendix **4** to enable this.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports efforts that may resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions, clarify certain existing practices, or increase transparency in the regulatory process. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for Issue C6.

#### 3.1.4 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61

* To resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions and to increase transparency in the regulatory process, Thailand is of the view that Issue C6 under Issue C could be supported.

C6: to modify § 6.17 to allow one submission to be treated in respect of both provisions and modify RR Appendix **4** to enable this.

#### 3.1.5 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports the single method in each of these sub-issues under Issue C which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

#### 3.1.6 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam is of the view that one notice and request in a letter to the Bureau for entry into the List under §6.17 and for notification under §8.1 of RR Appendix **30B** could reduce workload of both administration and the Bureau. Therefore, Viet Nam supports a single method.

#### 3.1.7 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* For issue C6, China supports a single method to address Issue C6 under Issue C for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method to allow one single submission to be treated both in respect of entry into the List under §6.17 and notification under §8.1 of RR Appendix **30B** to reduce workload of both administration and the Bureau.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* For issues C1 to C7, CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL- APG19-3/INF- 08Rev.1

* PV: Preliminary views from a few countries support simultaneous submission of AP4 data for the List and recording.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue C7 - Harmonization of AP30B with AP30/30A on Possibility of Obtaining Agreement for a Specific Period

# 1. Background

Taking into account that the possibility of obtaining agreement from affected administrations for a specified period would considerably facilitate the tasks of those administrations applying Article 4 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A** as well as Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B**, it is proposed to amend RR Appendix **30B** to be harmonized with RR Appendices **30** and **30A** for Regions 1 and 3 and that for Region 2.

**2. Documents**

* Input Documents: APG19-3/ INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 30 (IRN), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 61 (THA), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents APG19-3/ INF-06 (CEPT), 08(CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Korea (Rep. of) supports no changes to the Radio Regulations under this issue.

#### 3.1.2 Mongolia - Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia is of the view to support the method that would add a new provision 6.15*bis* to Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** in order to recognize the possibility of obtaining agreement from affected administrations for a specified period.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports efforts that may resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions, clarify certain existing practices, or increase transparency in the regulatory process. Australia supports the single method of the draft CPM Report text for Issue C7.

#### 3.1.4 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61

* To resolve inconsistencies in regulatory provisions and to increase transparency in the regulatory process, Thailand is of the view that Issue C7 under Issue C could be supported.

C7: to add a new provision 6.15*bis* to Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** in order to recognize the possibility of obtaining agreement from affected administrations for a specified period.

#### 3.1.5 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports the single method in each of these sub-issues under Issue C which provides clarity to the Radio Regulations.

#### 3.1.6 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam supports a single method which would add a new provision 6.15*bis* to Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** in order to recognize the possibility of obtaining agreement from affected administrations for a specified period.

#### 3.1.7 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* For Issue C7, China supports a single method to address Issue C7 under Issue C for improvements of RR.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* None.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support the single method to add a new provision 6.15*bis* to Article 6 of RR Appendix **30B** in order to recognize the possibility of obtaining agreement from affected administrations for a specified period.

# 5. Other View(s)

* Some APT Members support no changes to the Radio Regulations under this issue.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* For issues C1 to C7, CEPT supports the consensus achieved at ITU-R level.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL- APG19-3/INF- 08Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue D – Identification of those specific satellite networks and systems with which coordination needs to be effected under RR Nos. 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13

# 1. Background

The 2012 World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-12) decided to modify RR No. **9.36.2** to Article **9** of the Radio Regulations. Following this provision, the Bureau now publishes a “definitive list” of those networks, systems and earth stations with which coordination under RR Nos. **9.7**, **9.7A** and **9.7B** needs to be effected once a coordination request (a new one or a modification to an existing one, as appropriate) for a satellite network or system is processed. Such a list is published in the relevant Special Section of the BR International Frequency Information Circular (BR IFIC).

The above-mentioned provision (RR No. **9.36.2**) is very useful, because, in the cases of coordination under RR Nos. **9.7**, **9.7A** and **9.7B**, it reduces the administrative workload of identifying the names of specific satellite networks, systems and earth stations with which a new satellite network or system needs to effect coordination.

However, in the cases of coordination under RR Nos. **9.12**, **9.12A** and **9.13**, the Bureau does not publish a list of the satellite networks or systems potentially affected to complement the list of administrations potentially affected by incoming satellite networks or systems that they do provide.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 43 (AUS), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view to support the publication of the list of the satellite networks or systems potentially affected in the cases of coordination under RR Nos. **9.12**, **9.12A** or **9.13** to complement the list of administrations potentially affected by incoming satellite networks or systems that they do provide.

#### 3.1.2 Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Republic of Korea does not support modifications to Article **9** of the Radio Regulations to add the requirements to have a pre-compiled list of potentially affected satellite networks or systems, published for information only, included in the CR/C Special Section for coordination under RR Nos. **9.12**, **9.12A** and **9.13** and the definitive list of affected satellite networks or systems to be considered when effecting coordination under RR Nos. **9.12**, **9.12A** and **9.13** to be included in the CR/D Special Section.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia could support Methods D2 or D3, taking into consideration that this may produce additional administrative burden.

#### 3.1.4 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports Method D2 which reduces the administrative workload related to the identification of potentially affected satellite networks and/or systems with which a new satellite network or system needs to effect coordination.

#### 3.1.5 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam supports method D3 which add the requirements to have the list of satellite networks or systems potentially affected included in the CR/C Special Section for coordination under RR Nos. **9.12**, **9.12A** and **9.13** for information only.

#### 3.1.6 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* China supports the study on identification of those specific satellite networks and systems with which coordination needs to be effected under Nos. 9.12, 9.12A and 9.13, while bearing in mind that the list of administrations identified by Bureau under Nos. 9.11 to 9.14 and 9.21 is only for information purposes according to RR No. **9.36.1**.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* Based on the discussions within the meeting, general consensus was reached. So, APT Members did agree unanimously on the APT Preliminary View.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support Methods D2 or D3,asmentioned in the draft CPM text (See Annex-36 to last WP 4A Chairman’s Report: 4A/675).

# 5. Other View(s) from APT Members

* Some APT Members do not support Method D2, asmentioned in the draft CPM text (See Annex-36 to last WP 4A Chairman’s Report: 4A/675).

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* Follow-up studies under this issue.
* Support No change to the Radio Regulations as the amendments proposed of the CR/C and CR / D Special Sections could be implemented without further amendments to the Radio Regulations.
* Initial endorsement of method D1, taking into account the facilitation of the operative provisions of the Radio Regulations.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* СEPT proposes that the Bureau publish in the CR/D special section the “definitive lists” of those specific GSO networks or non-GSO systems, as appropriate, with which coordination under Nos 9.11A, 9.12, 9.12A or 9.13 needs to be effected, similarly to what is currently done under the provisions of No 9.36.2. CEPT supports adequate amendments to the Radio Regulations to implement the proposal above, as Method D2 in the draft CPM text.
* CEPT understands that, once the relevant software currently used by the Bureau will be amended as needed, such an approach would not significantly increase the daily workload of the Bureau for producing such lists. In fact, the Bureau carries out a similar analysis to produce the list of Administrations currently published in the BR IFIC under the provisions of No 9.36.1; the proposed changes would just modify the details published in the BR IFIC, together with simplifying the administrative burden currently born by many Administrations.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* Draft Inter-American proposal: Proposals supporting modifications to Article 9 to have the list of potentially affected satellite networks or systems published in addition to the list of administrations under Nos **9.12**,**9.12A** and **9.13**.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue E - Harmonization of RR Appendix 30B with RR Appendices 30 and 30A

*Note: WRC-19 agenda item 7 Issues E and F are of a general nature intending to harmonize certain provisions of RR Appendix* ***30B*** *with those of RR Appendices* ***30*** *and* ***30A*** *and to enhance certain provisions of RR Appendix* ***30B****.*

*After discussion at WP 4A it was concluded that appropriate measures to resolve the difficulties raised in Issues E and F will be addressed in a more specific manner in a draft Resolution for consideration by WRC-19. For this reason, Issues E and F are provisionally suspended. Once this Resolution is finalized, Issues E and F will no longer be pursued. A Draft Resolution is given* [Annex 45 of Doc 4A/675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N45%21MSW-E.docx) *of the Working Party 4A Chairman’s Report.*

# 1. Background

Since Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B** to the Radio Regulations adoption, several WRCs have made certain harmonisations between Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B** and Articles **9** and **11** of the Radio Regulations.

Taking into account that:

a) The majority of provisions relating to regulatory regime governing the application and implementation of Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B** were taken from regulatory provisions of Articles **9** and **11** of the Radio Regulations; and

b) These Appendices were adapted at various WRCs and Regional Radiocommunication Conferences in different time, Administrations of the ITU identified at previous WRCs issues/provisions which required harmonization with each other and with provisions of Articles **9** and **11** of the Radio Regulations to increase their effectiveness. Those WRCs have agreed to the proposed harmonization, the results of which were found satisfactory, as such harmonization facilitated their implementation.

To this effect WP 4A at its previous meetings considered certain other required harmonization as proposed.

Being conscious of Resolution **2 (Rev.WRC-03)** on “Equitable use, by all countries, with equal rights, of the geostationary-satellite and other satellite orbits and of frequency bands for space radiocommunication services" and considering WRC-2000, in revising RR Appendices **30** and **30A** for Regions 1 and 3 included provision § 4.1.24 in the revised Appendices, Studies carried out by ITU-R reveal the need to add certain provisions to RR Appendix **30B** in order to be harmonized with those of RR Appendices **30** and **30A** which would result in a more effective and efficient use of the orbital/spectrum resources as well as facilitating the tasks of administrations.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1 (KOR), 30 (IRN), 43 (AUS), 88 (CHN).
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF- 06 (CEPT), INF-08 (CITEL).

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23

* Taking into account the objectives of Resolution **2 (Rev.WRC-03)** and Resolution **4 (Rev.WRC-03)**and fundamental purposes of RR Appendix **30B**, the Republic of Korea supports harmonization of provisions of RR Appendix **30B** with those of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**with regard to period of validity of satellite networks in the RR Appendix **30B** List.

#### 3.1.2 Iran - Document APG19-3/INP-30

* Based on about Editor’s note from the Working Party 4A meeting in February 2018, Islamic Republic of Iran in of the preliminary view that APG19-3 need not to discuss these issues for the time being, pending the development of the matters at WP 4A in July 2018, these issues may be suppressed or reconsidered, as appropriate.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports No Change on Issue E unless studies can identify that any modification to Appendix **30B** is based on the practical difficulties of applying Appendix **30B** encountered by the BR and administrations.

#### 3.1.4 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Further study on this issue is needed to address the relevant concerns of some administrations.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* The issues E and F are of a general nature intending to harmonize certain provisions of
AP 30B with those of AP 30 and 30A and to enhance certain provisions of AP 30B.
* After discussion at WP 4A it was concluded that appropriate measures to resolve the difficulties raised in Issues E and F will be addressed in a more specific manner in a draft Resolution for consideration by WRC-19. For this reason Issues E and F are provisionally suspended. Once this Resolution is finalized, Issues E and F will no longer be pursued.
* Noting that Issue E has been provisionally suspended in Working Party 4A, APT Members agreed to keep the view of APT in APG19-2 meeting, for the time being.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members generally support to study required harmonization of RR Appendix **30B** with RR Appendices **30** and **30A** (See Section **3.2**).
* See Note at the beginning of this issue.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* CEPT believes that any modifications of Appendix **30B** should be based on the practical difficulties of applying the existing Appendix **30B** procedures faced by administrations or the Bureau. CEPT could support the further modification of Appendix **30B** only in the case if such modifications will lead to simplifications of regulatory procedures while ensuring protection of existing networks.
* CEPT therefore does not see general needs for harmonizing the Appendix **30B** with Appendices **30** and **30A** as each of these Appendices are having its own set of conditions and procedures established for two different satellite services and for different proposes.
* CEPT opposes to limit the period of validity of frequency assignments to satellite network in Appendix **30B** by 15 years, with the possibility of a single extension for another 15 years. CEPT notes that this will not facilitate entering new satellite networks into the appendix **30B** List the next 15 to 30 years. CEPT also fails to understand how a satellite operator could handle this restriction and at the same time operate in an efficient and economical manner within the Radio Regulations after having spent 15 or 30 years developing and established business at a given orbital location. Furthermore, these changes were introduced in Appendix **30** and **30A** at WRC-2000 so to date it hasn’t been possible to analyse the effect of this measure.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - APG19-3/INF- 08 Rev.1

* No change to Appendix **30B** and Region 2 BSS plans

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RRC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue F - Concerns with the lack of implementation of certain provisions of the Radio Regulations that can lead to difficulties during the process of entering an assignment into the RR Appendix 30B List

*Note: WRC-19 agenda item 7 Issues E and F are of a general nature intending to harmonize certain provisions of RR Appendix* ***30B*** *with those of RR Appendices* ***30*** *and* ***30A*** *and to enhance certain provisions of RR Appendix* ***30B****.*

*After discussion at WP 4A it was concluded that appropriate measures to resolve the difficulties raised in Issues E and F will be addressed in a more specific manner in a draft Resolution for consideration by WRC-19. For this reason, Issues E and F are provisionally suspended. Once this Resolution is finalized, Issues E and F will no longer be pursued. A Draft Resolution is given* [Annex 45 of Doc 4A/675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N45%21MSW-E.docx) *of the Working Party 4A Chairman’s Report.*

# 1. Background

At previous WP meetings, two sub-issues have been identified under this issue. The first relates to data item B.3.b.1 of RR Appendix **4**, and the second relates to No. 2.6*bis* of Article 2 of RR Appendix **30B**.

For the first sub-issue, it has been noted that the Note to data item B.3.b.1 of RR Appendix **4** has not been taken into account by some administrations submitting satellite Networks under Article 6 of Appendix **30B**. Such ignorance of duly applying the objectives of that Note has caused considerable difficulties for administrations which just wished to modify their national Allotment to take into account the advances of technology using more modern parameter, as well as using shape beams and, in some occasions extending the service area of their national allotment to make the satellite networks more economically viable.

In order to make more emphasis about the alignment of coverage area of their satellite networks and their objectives service area, it is proposed to make some modification to Appendix **4** data element B.3.b.1.

For the second sub-issue, taking into account the requirements stipulated in Article **44** of the ITU Constitution and avoidance of multiple orbital locations to cover the same service area by submitting administrations, to fully meet the objectives of the provisions 2.6*bis* a) and 2.6*bis* b) in spirit, as a one method to satisfy this issue, it is proposed to make some modification to Article 2 of RR Appendix **30B**.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1 (KOR), 30 (IRN), 43 (AUS), 88 (CHN).
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL).

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23

* The Korea (Rep. of) supports further study to address the relevant concerns with the lack of implementation of certain provisions of the Radio Regulations that can lead to difficulties during the process of entering an assignment into the RR Appendix **30B** List.

#### 3.1.2 Iran - Document APG19-3/INP-30

* Based on about Editor’s note from the Working Party 4A meeting in February 2018, Islamic Republic of Iran in of the preliminary view that APG19-3 need not to discuss these issues for the time being, pending the development of the matters at WP 4A in July 2018, these issues may be suppressed or reconsidered, as appropriate.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Issue F: Australia does not support special treatment when converting an allotment into an assignment. In order for Australia to support change, studies would need to clearly illustrate the problem, and the proposed regulatory solution(s) would need to be easily applied.

#### 3.1.4 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Further study on this issue is needed to address the relevant concerns of some administrations.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* The issues E and F are of a general nature intending to harmonize certain provisions of
AP 30B with those of AP 30 and 30A and to enhance certain provisions of AP 30B.
* After discussion at WP 4A it was concluded that appropriate measures to resolve the difficulties raised in Issues E and F will be addressed in a more specific manner in a draft Resolution for consideration by WRC-19. For this reason Issues E and F are provisionally suspended. Once this Resolution is finalized, Issues E and F will no longer be pursued.
* Noting that Issue F has been provisionally suspended in Working Party 4A, APT Members agreed to keep the view of APT in APG19-2 meeting, for the time being.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support further study to address the relevant concerns with the lack of implementation of certain provisions of the Radio Regulations that can lead to difficulties during the process of entering an assignment into the RR Appendix **30B** List (See Section **3.2**).
* See Note at the beginning of this issue.

# 5. Other View(s)

* None.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT- Document APG19-3/INF- 06

* CEPT believes that any modifications of Appendix **30B** should be based on the practical difficulties of applying existing Appendix **30B** procedures faced by administrations or the Bureau. CEPT could support further modifications of Appendix **30B** only in the case if such modifications will lead to simplifications of regulatory procedures while ensuring protection of existing networks.
* CEPT does not favour any of the two sub-proposals included in issue F. With regards to data item B.3.b.1 and its associated Note, CEPT opposes the proposed amendments to the Note as they may hinder efficient spectrum utilization and development of economically viable satellite networks when providing design objectives for all administrations, both newcomers and administration already having satellite networks in the Appendix **30B** List. CEPT also opposes the requirement of reducing the coverage area of a network to be aligned with its service area as it is not always technically possible.
* With regards to the sub-proposal to amend 2.6*bis* c) of Article **2**, CEPT opposes converting provision 2.6*bis* into a provision to be examined by the Bureau, as provision 2.6*bis* currently offers general guiding principles for administrations, and not regulatory provisions to be examined by the Bureau. As such, these guidelines need to take into account the diversity of requirements of various countries, e.g. countries with large or geographically separated territories, countries with wide cultural or ethnic diversity or satellite networks serving more than one country (with the explicit agreement of those countries). Attempting to convert these general guidelines into provisions to be examined by the Bureau could also be in contradiction to the objectives of efficient spectrum utilization and developing satellite networks providing services in an economically viable manner. In addition, the proposed amendment doesn’t provide the Bureau with clear instructions on what action to be taken, if any, if the condition set in 2.6*bis* c) is not met.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - APG19-3/INF- 08 Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue G – Updating the AP30/30A reference situation

# 1. Background

§§ 4.1.18-20 of Appendix **30** to the Radio Regulations describes the requirements and conditions for recording in the Regions 1 and 3 List of a network with outstanding coordination requirements.

§ 4.1.18 prescribes that in the case of recording in the List with outstanding coordination requirements, this recording shall be provisional, but that the entry shall be changed from provisional to definitive recording in the List if the Bureau is informed that the new assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 List has been in use, together with the assignment which was the basis for the disagreement, for at least four months without any complaint of harmful interference being made. In doing so, the practice of the Bureau is to update the reference situation of the interfered-with network when changing the recording of the new assignment from provisional to definitive, i.e. after four months without complaints about harmful interference.

There may be many reasons why harmful interference does not occur during the first four months of operation, e.g. during this period, the interfered-with network may not operate with its most sensitive characteristics among its assignments in the List (use of larger antennas, modulation/coding that is more robust, e.i.r.p.s higher than the minimum values, …) or the interfering network may not operate with its most interfering characteristics (lower e.i.r.p.s, transponders with no customers, steerable beams pointing in another direction, …).

However, at the end of this four-month period, the reference situation of the interfered-with network will be updated to incorporate the maximum interference (as contained in the submission to ITU, even if during the 4-month period actual operation may have been with parameters causing less interference) from the network to which it has not given its agreement. This could severely affect the reference situation and thereby the protection of the interfered-with network and later submissions could impose significantly more interference upon the interfered-with network before exceeding the relative degradation which triggers coordination.

As a result, the interfered-with network may find itself with reduced protection due to a network which has not completed the required coordination with the interfered-with network and to which it has not given its agreement.

The WP4A meeting in March 2018 believed that further data about the actual implementation of § 4.1.18-4.1.20 is necessary to be assessed before envisaging a change to these provisions. Any such changes would also require considering that both the existing and new incoming systems have to operate with their notified parameters.

**Relevant ITU-R Recommendations and Reports**

* [Annex 39 to Document 675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N39%21MSW-E.docx) of the Working Party 4A Chairman Report, March 2018: Preliminary Draft CPM text for WRC-19 agenda item 7 – Issue G

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1 (KOR), 40 (MNG), 43 (AUS), 51 (J), 55 (J), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-2/INF-05 (RCC), 07 (ATU), APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 The Republic of Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1

* The Administration of Korea proposes modifications to the APT Preliminary View adopted at the APG19-2 meeting, and to this effect, the modified APT Preliminary View in the proposal is shown below:

APT Members support further study on possible modifications to §4.1.18 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A** where taking due account the implication to the assignments that are already in the Regions 1 and 3 List while updating the reference situation.

#### 3.1.2 Mongolia – Document APG19-3/INP-40

* Mongolia supports further study on Issue G.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia is yet to form a view on this Issue.

#### 3.1.4 Japan - Document APG19-3/INP-51

* With respect to Updating the AP30/30A reference situation (Issue G), Japan supports to maintain EPM criteria (RR Appendix 30) appropriately and update the reference EPM properly, making a point to protect operation of the existing BSS Plan and List and to ensure smooth introduction of the future BSS.

#### 3.1.5 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Further study on this issue is required with an aim to find the solution to address concerns raised by some administrations.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* Some APT Members support to maintain EPM criteria (RR Appendix **30**) appropriately and update the reference EPM properly, making a point to protect operation of the existing BSS Plan and List to ensure smooth introduction of the future BSS.
* Some APT Members noted the discussions at the March 2018 meeting of ITU-R WP 4A about the application of 4.1.18 and 4.1.18bis, an alternative solution had been considered in response to the concerns raised in respect of the current Method A in [Annex 39 to Document 675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N39%21MSW-E.docx) of the Working Party 4A Chairman Report. At the July 2018 meeting of WP 4A, there could be proposals to replace the current Method A with this alternative solution. This solution would modify 4.1.18bis with the view to enable affected administrations to determine in an explicit manner whether or not the reference situation should be updated, taking into account the outcome of the next meeting of WP 4A. See also Document 675 of the Working Party 4A Chairman’s Report.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support further studies of the possible modification to paragraphs. 4.1.18 and 4.1.18bis of RR Appendices 30 and 30A without adversely affecting the Plan while taking into account the implication of the modification on the assignments in the List.

# 5. Other View(s)

* Some APT Members noted that any action in regard with application of 4.1.18 and 4.1.18bis which are sensitive provisions in Appendices 30 and 30A needs to be taken with necessary caution.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.1.2 ATU - Document APG19-2/INF-07

* No preliminary position on this agenda item yet.

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports that when a network enters the List under § 4.1.18 of Appendix **30** or **30A**, the reference situation of the interfered-with network shall only be updated if and when the Bureau is informed that the agreement has been obtained. CEPT suggests to modify § 4.1.18 to reflect this view, as Method A in the draft CPM text

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* Draft Inter-American proposes no change to the AP30B and Region 2 BSS Plans.

#### 7.1.5 RCC - Document APG19-2/INF-05

* The RCC Administrations consider it unreasonable to modify No. 4.1.18 of RR Appendices 30 and 30A, where the reference situation of the victim satellite network would be updated only after the agreement between the Administration notifying the network and the Administration notifying interfering new network.

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

Issue H – Modifications to RR Appendix 4 items to be provided for non-geostationary satellite systems not subject to the procedures of Section II of RR Article 9

# 1. Background

The RR Appendix **4** items provided in the Advance Publication Information (API) or the Coordination Request (CR/C) for satellite networks or systems are used initially by administrations to identify potential interference scenarios to their existing and planned systems and to formulate their comments under RR No. **9.3** or RR No. **9.52** as appropriate. The capability of these administrations to identify such potential scenarios depends, amongst other things, on whether the satellite orbits can be modelled properly based on the information provided in the API or in the CR/C, as appropriate. For a satellite in a geostationary (GSO) network, the only information required is the nominal orbital location of the satellite. However, the modelling of the orbit of satellites in non-geostationary (NGSO) systems requires significantly more information than a GSO satellite network. Recent analysis performed for NGSO satellite networks or systems (API or CR/C) as published in the Radiocommunication Bureau International Frequency Information Circular (also known as BR IFIC) have shown that, in some instances, there is need for additional information in order to model properly the satellite orbits.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 43 (AUS), 61 Rev.1 (THA), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view to support the addition of new parameter of RR AP4 for API of NGSO satellite system that would help administrations to identify potential interference scenarios to their existing and planned systems and to formulate their comments under RR No. **9.3** or RR No. **9.52** as appropriate.

#### 3.1.2 Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Republic of Korea supports further study to determine whether additional RR Appendix **4** data elements are required to enhance the capability of administrations to model non-GSO satellite systems based on the information provided in the API for non-GSO system.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports determining adequate representation of NGSO Appendix **4** data elements for systems not subject to coordination.

#### 3.1.4 Thailand - Document APG19-3/INP-61Rev.1

* Thailand is of the view that the modifications to RR Appendix 4 data elements to be additionally provided for non-GSO satellite networks/systems could be supported in order to facilitate administrations to identify potential interference scenarios to their existing and planned networks/systems.

#### 3.1.5 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Further study is needed on modifications to RR Appendix 4 data elements for non-GSO satellite systems not subject to the procedures of Section II of RR Article **9**.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* Some APT Members support modifications to RR Appendix 4 data elements for non-GSO satellite systems not subject to the procedures of Section II of RR Article **9** and some other APT Members support further study is needed on Issue H. So, it was agreed that the issue H would be further discussed at the next APG meeting.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support further study on this Issue.

# 5. Other View(s) from APT Members

* Some APT Members support modifications to RR Appendix 4 data elements for non-GSO satellite systems not subject to the procedures of Section II of RR Article **9**.
* Some other APT Members support further study is needed on modifications to RR Appendix 4 data elements for non-GSO satellite systems not subject to the procedures of Section II of RR Article **9**.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports to further study the impact of this proposal in detail before taking any action. In particular, CEPT will study the possibility to make mandatory the relevant information of item A.4.b for non-GSO satellite systems not subject to the procedures of Section II of RR Article 9, taking into account the flexibility that may be required for non-GSO satellites with short-duration missions and some satellites for scientific and/or experimental purposes.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* Preliminary views from a few countries support new data elements, i.e. for elliptical orbit, the argument of the perigee; and for a constellation, the angular separation between two consecutive ascending nodes, and between two consecutive satellites in the same orbital plane.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue I – Additional RR Appendix 4 data items to be provided for non-geostationary satellite systems with multiple orbital planes

# 1. Background

Issue I address the need to provide through Appendix **4** of the RR means to distinguish between:

* + submission of Advance Publication Information (API) or Coordination Request (CR/C) for frequency assignments to a non-GSO satellite system with one (or more than one) set(s) of orbital characteristics with an indication that all frequency assignments of the non-GSO satellite system would be operated simultaneously, and
	+ submission of API or CR/C for frequency assignments to a non-GSO satellite system with different sets of orbital characteristics with an indication that the different sets of orbital planes would be mutually exclusive, i.e. satellites on these sets of orbits would not be operated simultaneously and only one of these sets of orbital planes would be implemented.

At the February/March 2018 meeting of WP4A, working document towards draft CPM text was developed. One single method proposed to include two new items in Appendix **4** of the RR for the provision of information relating to the multiple orbital planes and their relationship with respect to the NGSO satellite system.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-19 (INS), 23 Rev.1 (KOR), 43 (AUS), 88 (CHN)
* Information Documents: APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Indonesia - Document APG19-3/INP-19

* Indonesia is of the view to support the addition of new parameter of RR AP4 for API of NGSO satellite system that would help administrations to identify potential interference scenarios to their existing and planned systems and to formulate their comments under RR No. **9.3** or RR No. **9.52** as appropriate.

#### 3.1.2 Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* The Republic of Korea supports further study to determine whether additional RR Appendix **4** data elements are required for the provision of information regarding the treatment of the multiple orbital planes for non-GSO system.

#### 3.1.3 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports determining adequate representation of Appendix **4** data elements for multiple plane orbits.

#### 3.1.4 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Further study is needed on additional RR Appendix **4** data items to be provided for non-geostationary satellite systems with multiple orbital planes.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* Some APT Members support additional RR Appendix **4** data items to be provided for non-geostationary satellite systems with multiple orbital planes. Some other APT Members support further study is needed on the Issue I. So, it was agreed that the issue I would be further discussed at the next APG meeting.

# 4. APT Preliminary Views

* APT Members support further study on this Issue.

# 5. Other View(s) from APT Members

* Some APT Members support additional RR Appendix **4** data items to be provided for non-geostationary satellite systems with multiple orbital planes.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* Follow-up studies under this issue (See APG19-2/OUT-06).
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports to further study the impact of this proposal in detail before taking any action.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* Preliminary views from a few countries support new data elements, ie the number of configurations and the identification of orbital planes for each configuration.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* None.
* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

Issue J – Possible modification to Section 1 of Annex 1 of RR AP30 to allow a specified power flux-density to be exceeded

# 1. Background

Although WRC-2000 adopted a revised Plan that assigned 10 channels in Region 1 and 12 channels in Region 3, this channel capacity may not be enough to meet a national requirement in terms of spectrum for UHDTV or any future generation of HDTV.

In order to provide the advanced broadcasting-satellite services (BSS) like UHDTV (see Rec. [ITU‑R BT.2020](http://www.itu.int/rec/R-REC-BT.2020/en)), a modulation scheme with high spectrum efficiency (e.g. APSK) and high required *C/N* (carrier-to-noise ratio) is necessary (see Rec. [ITU-R BO.2098](http://www.itu.int/rec/R-REC-BO.2098/en) and Rep. [ITU-R BO.2397](http://www.itu.int/pub/R-REP-BO.2397)). In that situation, a pfd value exceeding the limit of −103.6 dB(W/(m2 · 27 MHz)) within the service area is required in order to achieve the same service availability as the conventional BSS.

§ 5.2.1 d) of RR Appendix **30**, specifies that the limit of −103.6 dB(W/(m2 · 27 MHz)) could be exceeded under the conditions.

– *in the case of the notification of Plan assignments, use of an e.i.r.p. which produces a pfd that exceeds the limit of −103.6 dB(W/(m2 · 27 MHz)) given in Section 1 of Annex 1 to Appendix****30*** *on the territory of the notifying administration under the condition that the calculated pfd at test points of any Plan assignment, List assignment or proposed assignment submitted under Article 4 are equal to or below that of the original Plan assignments in the same channel of the administration applying this section.*

The Rules of Procedure addresses implementation of the pfd limit referred to in the first paragraph of Section 1 of Annex 1 to Appendix **30** of the Radio Regulations as a hard limit that shall not be exceeded in order to protect BSS assignments from interference that may be caused by BSS networks located outside an arc of  9 around a wanted BSS network.

Accordingly, it is proposed that Section 1, Annex 1 of RR Appendix **30** be modified in order to allow assignments in the List to exceed the pfd limit given in Section 1 of Annex 1 to RR Appendix **30** only within the national territory of the notifying Administration under the condition that the assignment does not overlap with the Regions 1 and 3 guardbands as defined in § 3.9 of Annex 5 to RR Appendix **30** and also under the condition that, on the border areas and other territory of other country, this pfd limit is not exceeded.

Additionally, it is proposed that, in case that any administration reports that this limit is exceeded over the territory under its jurisdiction, the administration which operate assignments with exceedance of pfd upon receipt of the report of exceedance of the pfd shall immediately reduce the exceedance to an acceptable level over the territory of the administration which reported the exceedance of pfd.

**Relevant ITU-R Recommendations and Reports**

* [Annex 42 to Document 675](https://www.itu.int/dms_ties/itu-r/md/15/wp4a/c/R15-WP4A-C-0675%21N42%21MSW-E.docx) of the Working Party 4A Chairman Report, March 2018: Preliminary Draft CPM text for WRC-19 agenda item 7 – Issue J

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1 (KOR), 43 (AUS), 51 (J)
* Information Documents: APG19-2/INF-05 (RCC), 07 (ATU), APG19-3/INF-06 (CEPT), 08 Rev.1 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 The Republic of Korea - Document APG19-3/INP-23 Rev.1

* The Administration of Korea proposes modifications to the APT Preliminary View adopted at the APG19-2 meeting, and to this effect, the modified APT Preliminary View in the proposal is shown below:

APT Members are of the view that the power flux-density limit referred to in the first paragraph of Section 1 of Annex 1 to RR Appendix **30** is a hard limit that shall not be exceeded in order to protect BSS assignments from interference that may be caused by BSS networks located outside an arc of  9 around a wanted BSS network.

#### 3.1.2 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia is yet to form a view on this Issue.

#### 3.1.3 Japan - Document APG19-3/INP-51

* With respect to pfd limit of Section 1, Annex 1 of RR AP30 (Issue J), Japan supports to modify the RR AP30 and allow exceedance the pfd limit of -103.6 dB(W/(m2 · 27 MHz)) only within the national territory under the jurisdiction of notifying Administration and in the assignment frequency not overlapping with the Regions 1 and 3 guardbands, making a point to ensure smooth introduction of the future BSS.

#### 3.1.4 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* Taking into account BR clarification on how to check the exceedance of pfd levels, China is the preliminary view that NOC to RR may be appropriate to satisfy this issue.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* Some APT Members support no change to Section 1, Annex 1 of RR **AP30** sinceBR does not check pfd levels over the territory under the jurisdiction of the notifying administration**.**
* The practice of the Bureau, in relation to test points, particularly those located in territorial waters under the jurisdiction of administrations are taken into account in its examination or in processing of the submitted network, need to be made available to administrations.

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support further studies of the possible modification to Section 1 of Annex 1 of RR AP30 to allow a specified power flux-density to be exceeded within the national territory under the jurisdiction of the notifying administration.
* See also Background material relating to exceedance of pfd over territory under the jurisdiction of other administrations.

# 5. Other View(s)

* Some APT Members are of the view that the power flux-density limit referred to in the first paragraph of Section 1 of Annex 1 to RR Appendix **30** is a hard limit that shall not be exceeded in order to protect BSS assignments from interference that may be caused by BSS networks located outside an arc of  9 around a wanted BSS network.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.1.2 ATU - Document APG19-2/INF-07

* No preliminary position on this agenda item yet.

#### 7.1.3 CEPT - Document APG19-3/INF-06

* CEPT supports to further study the impact of this proposal in detail before taking any action.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL - Document APG19-3/INF-08 Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC - Document APG19-2/INF-05

* None.

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* No information documents to APG19-2 or APG19-3.

Issue K – Difficulties for Part B examinations under §4.1.12 or 4.2.16 of RR Appendices30 and 30A and § 6.21 c) of RR Appendix 30B

# 1. Background

To address the difficulties encountered by the notifying administration in the Part B examination of its junior network (herein after referred to as “Network JR”) under RR Appendices**30**and **30A** § 4.1.12 or 4.2.16or RR Appendix **30B** § 6.21 *c)*, it is proposed to add one more examination under §4.1.12 or 4.2.16 RR Appendices**30**and**30A** and § 6.21 *c)* of RR Appendix **30B** such that should any remaining affected networks whose assignments have been entered in the List or Plan, as appropriate, before the submission under §4.1.12or 4.2.16 of RR Appendices**30** and**30A** or § 6.17of RR Appendix **30B**, the Bureau shall further examine if the remaining corresponding assignments in the List or Plan are still considered as being affected.

In this way, like the current practice today, if examination under §4.1.12 or 4.2.16 of RR Appendices**30**and **30A** or § 6.21 *c)* of RR Appendix **30B** of Part B of a junior network (herein after referred to as “Network JR-Part B”) in respect of Part A of a senior network (herein after referred to as “Network SR-Part A”) is favourable, the senior network (herein after referred to as “Network SR”) is considered as NOT being affected like today and no further examination will be conducted.

Meanwhile, it addresses the difficulties experienced by the notifying Administration and allows its notice submitted under § 4.1.12 or 4.2.16 of RR Appendices**30**and **30A** or § 6.17 of RR Appendix **30B** (Network JR-Part B) to receive favourable findings in respect of Network SR if Network SR‑Part B is considered as not affected in the further examination based on method of Annex 1 (Appendix **30**), Annex 1 (Appendix **30A**) or Annex 4 (Appendix **30B**), this avoid overprotection of Network SR based on the characteristics which are outdated and no longer valid while ensuring Network SR is adequately protected.

The following sections, 3/7/11.2 Background as well as 3/7/11.3 Summary and Analysis of the results of ITU-R studies describes this Issue using RR Appendix **30B** as example. However, the same principle applies to RR Appendices**30** and **30A**.

# 2. Documents

* Input Documents: APG19-3/ INP-23 Rev.1 (KOR), 43 (AUS), 67 (SNG), 84 Rev.1 (VTN), 88 (CHN).
* Information Documents: APG19-3/ INF-06 (CEPT), 08 (CITEL)

# 3. Summary of discussions

### 3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views

#### 3.1.1 Korea (Rep. of) - Document APG19-3/INP-23Rev.1

* Korea (Rep. of) does not oppose the method to add one more examination under § 4.1.12 and 4.2.16 of RR Appendix **30** and**30A** and § 6.21 c) of RR Appendix **30B** such that should any remaining affected networks whose assignments have been entered in the List before the submission under§ 4.1.12 and 4.2.16 of RR Appendix **30** and **30A** or § 6.17of RR Appendix **30B**, the Bureau shall further examine if the remaining corresponding assignments in the List are still considered as being affected.

#### 3.1.2 Australia - Document APG19-3/INP-43

* Australia supports Method A of the draft CPM Report text subject to the benefits being demonstrated of this approach\*.

\* refers draft CPM Report text from the October 2017 meeting of WP 4A Document 4A/519 and relevant Annexes.

#### 3.1.3 Singapore - Document APG19-3/INP-67

* Singapore supports Method A which is to add one more examination under § 6.21 c) such that should any remaining affected networks whose assignments have been entered in the List before the submission under § 6.17, the Bureau shall further examine if these assignments in the List are still being affected, using its Part B characteristics. This method avoids overprotection of networks based on characteristics that are no longer valid and could potentially reduce the application of provisions for provisional recording in the List.

Note: this contribution did not take into account the February 2018 WP 4A meeting.

#### 3.1.4 Viet Nam - Document APG19-3/INP-84Rev.1

* Viet Nam supports method A which add one more examination under §4.1.12 and 4.2.16 of RR Appendix **30** and**30A** and§ 6.21 c) of RR Appendix **30B** such that should any remaining affected networks whose assignments have been entered in the List before the submission under§4.1.12 and 4.2.16 of RR Appendix **30** and **30A** or § 6.17of RR Appendix **30B**, the Bureau shall further examine if the remaining corresponding assignments in the List are still considered as being affected.

#### 3.1.5 China - Document APG19-3/INP-88

* China is the preliminary view that the aim of this issue to facilitate entering new assignments into the RR Appendix **30**, **30A** and **30B** List and to facilitate coordination of networks for newcomers could be supported.

### 3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting

* Not all Members states were able to form a view, prior to APT meeting, on the revised Method A (February 2018 WP 4A meeting).

# 4. APT Preliminary View(s)

* APT Members support further consideration of Method A developed at the meeting of Working Party 4A in October 2017.

# 5. Other View(s)

* Some APT Members support method A as described at the meeting of Working Party 4A in February 2018.
* Some APT Members need further consideration on the Method A as adopted at the meeting of Working Party 4A in February 2018.

# 6. Issues for Consideration at Next APG Meeting

* APT Members are invited to follow the progress of ITU-R studies, and are encouraged to submit their contributions for further considerations at the next meeting.

# 7. Views from Other Organisations

### 7.1 Regional Groups

#### 7.1.1 ASMG

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ASMG, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

#### 7.1.2 ATU

* In order to access to update views/positions of the ATU, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

**7.1.3 CEPT**- **Document APG19-3/INF-06**

* CEPT supports that the examination under RR Appendix 30B §6.21 c) is performed in two steps, if needed, to better reflect the actual situation and to enable newcomers to benefit from the reduction of satellite networks parameters and characteristics during the coordination process, and thus increase the efficiency of spectrum use, as Method A in the draft CPM text.
* CEPT believes that this method avoids over protection of earlier networks based on part A characteristics which could be obsolete and no longer valid due to changes during the coordination and entering into the List. This method would hence enable spectrum efficiency by addressing potentially encountered by notifying administrations in the Part B examination to enter into the List with favourable findings.
* CEPT support the overall aim to facilitate entering new assignments into the RR Appendix 30B List and to facilitate coordination of network for newcomers which proposal in issue K targets.

#### 7.1.4 CITEL – Document APG19-3/INF- 08 Rev.1

* None.

#### 7.1.5 RCC

* In order to access to update views/positions of the RCC, APT members are encouraged to refer to the ITU web site, as follows: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/conferences/wrc/2019/Pages/reg-prep.aspx>

### 7.2 International Organisations

#### 7.2.1 IARU

* None.

#### 7.2.2 ICAO

* None.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. See § 2.6 of RR Appendix **30B**. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)