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

APPENDIX 30B (REV.WRC‑12)

Provisions and associated Plan for the fixed-satellite service
in the frequency bands 4 500-4 800 MHz, 6 725-7 025 MHz,
10.70-10.95 GHz, 11.2-11.45 GHz and 12.75-13.25 GHz
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ARTICLE 6     (REV.WRC‑12)

Procedures for the conversion of an allotment into an assignment, for
the introduction of an additional system or for the modification of
an assignment in the List1, 2 (WRC‑15)

6.14 The Bureau, acting on a request for assistance under § 6.13, shall send a reminder to the administration which has not replied, requesting a decision together with the results of its compatibility analysis containing the change and/or reduction in the values/limits referred to in paragraph 2.3 of Annex 4 to Appendix **30B**.

**Reasons:** Paragraph 6.10 of Article 6 of Appendix 30B stipulates that:

***Quote***

*“6.10 Comments from administrations identified as affected under § 6.5 in the Special Section of the BR IFIC published under § 6.7 shall be sent to the Bureau and to the administration that has submitted the notice under § 6.1, either directly or through the Bureau, within a period of four months following the date of the publication in the BR IFIC.* ***When an administration has not replied within this four-month period, it is deemed that this administration has not agreed to the proposed assignment, unless the provisions of § 6.13 to 6.15 are applied.”***

***Unquote***

Paragraph 6.13 of Article 6 of the same Appendix provides that:

***Quote***

*“6.13 After the same time period as specified in § 6.10,* ***the notifying administration may request the Bureau to assist in respect of an administration which has not replied within this time period.”***

***Unquote***

The Radiocommunication Bureau in acting in accordance with paragraphs 6.14 sends a reminder to the administration which has not replied, requesting a decision.

Acting in accordance with paragraph 6.14*bis* , the Bureau sends a reminder to the above-mentioned administration drawing its attention to the consequence of no reply, fifteen days before the expiry of the 30-day period referred to in § 6.15.

Pursuant to paragraph 6.15 should no decision be communicated to the Bureau within thirty days after the date of dispatch of the reminder under § 6.14, that administration which has not given a decision would be deemed as agreed to the proposed assignment.

In other words it is considered that it has agreed to the results of the application of the relevant procedure and its associated interference analysis.

The analysis would indicate eventual interference that may likely be caused to the allotment, assignments in List and those in the process of coordination received before the subject assignments for which no decisions was communicated to the Bureau.

The likelihood of interference caused as described above may result to the degradation of the C/I levels/limits referred to in paragraph 2.3 of Annex 4 to Appendix 30B .i.e. degradation of the expected performance of the allotment/assignments of the Administration which failed to reply to the Request for coordination. At the time that the above mentioned Administration implements/uses its allotments/assignments it would receive interference resulted from the non-reply action.

Statistics provided by the Bureau indicating the results of application of paragraphs 6.13, 6.14, 6.16*bis* and 6.15 are reproduced below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | §6.13 Request(networks) | §6.14 BR reminders | Repliesin time  | No reply cases | Replies received afterdeadline |
| 2009-2011 | 30 | 239 | 48 | 187 | 4 |
| 2012-June 2015 | 53 | 338 | 63 | 263 | 12 |
|   | **83** | **577** | **111** | **450** | **16** |

Further clarification was sought from the BR, as follows:

***Quote***

“*It is requested to provide the statistics on results of those non-reply in terms of degradation in limit/level mentioned in paragraph 2.3 of Annex 4 to App 30B (in terms of the amount of reduction in reference value mentioned in that paragraph) together with the name of Administrations on the allotment or assignments of which such degradation occurred.”*

***Unquote***

The following reply/clarification was provided by the Bureau:

***Quote***

“*The maximum degradation values of each affected allotment/assignment could be found in AP30B/A6A Special Section where the characteristics of a new proposed new network is published under §6.7 of AP30B."*

*Up to now, the “implicit agreement” under §6.15 has only applied to one allotment (ATG00000): the aggregate reference situation of that allotment in 13/10-11GHz bands was degraded from 34.199 dB down to 9.707 dB, the down link single entry reference situation going down to 9.723 dB. The reference situation in 6/4GHz bands was not changed as the interfering network has only assignments in 13/10-11GHz bands.*

*For other allotments whose responsible administrations did not reply, their reference situation values have not yet been affected due to the application of §6.15 of AP30B (although virtually because of the non-response their reference situation has been degraded), the reason being that most of the newly proposed networks (that have requested §6.10- 6.15 application) are still at Part-A stage and have not yet entered in the List of AP30B. It is therefore difficult for the BR to prejudge of the degradation of the reference situation to the “§6.15” allotment before the entry into the list of the networks benefiting of “§6.15” agreements. Indeed some of these later network would be cancelled before entering into the list or could have their final characteristics different from those in the AP30B/A6A/ Special Section, with the interference reduced thus the allotments of other administrations being no longer (or less) affected.*”

***Unquote***

Based on analysis of the statistics and the results of the Bureau's analysis so far available, the values/limits referred to in paragraph 2.3 of Annex 4 to Appendix 30B of certain administrations have been degraded (below those levels/limits) as results of non-replying to the request for coordination. These administrations would be therefore faced with a situation that the operation of their satellite networks, if implemented/brought into use, would not be sufficiently/adequately to achieve the objectives envisaged in the revised Allotment Plan at WRC-07.

In view of the above and in order to remedy such deficiencies, it is proposed to modify/amend paragraph 6.14 of Article 6 of Appendix 30B.
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