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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;

Discussion

§§ 4.1.18-20 of Appendix 30 to the Radio Regulations describes the requirements and conditions for recording in the Region 1 and 3 List of a network with outstanding coordination requirements. Similar provisions are found in respect of Region 2 in §§ 4.2.21A-21D. Similar provisions also are contained in Appendix 30A.

§ 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 Appendix 30B, the corresponding provisions (§§ 6.25-6.29) are worded different in respect of the change from provisional to definitive recording, saying that the entry in the List shall be changed from provisional to definitive only if the Bureau is informed that **all required agreements have been obtained**.

The wording of § 4.1.18 are similar to those that existed in RR No. 11.41 earlier. However, Norway notes that these were deleted by WRC-12. More importantly is the principal difference between the unplanned and planned bands in that while the unplanned bands just have single-entry protection criteria, the planned bands have a reference situation which takes into account the aggregation of interference from all other networks which the protection criteria are based upon (a relative degradation of the reference situation e.g. 0.45 dB or 0.25 dB).

In entering a network provisionally into the List, the reference situation of “victim” networks with which coordination is not completed is not updated. The Radio Regulations does not provide exact instructions as to if and when the reference situation of these “victim” networks is to be updated and the Bureau has been obliged to adopt a practice for how to do this.

In respect of Appendix 30B, the current practice is that the reference situation is updated after agreement is reached. Norway thinks this is a logical approach.

However, in respect of Appendices 30 and 30A, the current practice is that the reference situation of the “victim” network is updated when changing the recording 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, e.g. during this period, the “victim” network may not operate with its most sensitive characteristics (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 EIRPs, transponders with no customers, steerable beams pointing in another direction, …..).

However, at the end of this four-month period, the reference situation of the “victim” network will be updated to incorporate the full interference from the network to which it has not given its agreement. This could severely affect the reference situation of the “victim” network and other later filings could impose significantly more interference upon the “victim” network before exceeding the relative degradation which triggers coordination.

As a result, even though not having given its agreement, the “victim” network may find itself with reduced protection due to a network to which it has not given its agreement.

Proposal

To avoid this, the reference situation of the “victim” network should be updated only after the agreement has been given.

To achieve this, Norway proposes that the WRC-15 clarifies in the minutes of one of its Plenary meetings that when a network enters the List under § 4.1.18 or 4.2.21A of Appendix 30 or 30A, the reference situation of the “victim” network shall only be updated if the Bureau is informed that the agreement has been obtained (i.e. similar to the current practice of Appendix 30B).
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