

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: Do you agree with the prioritisation of the agenda items, as shown in Annex 5, and if not why?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Agenda Item 1.1 should be regarded as a matter of High Priority.</p>
<p>Question 2: Ofcom is supporting the following three priority bands for IMT identification in the RRs:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">24.25 – 27.5 GHz</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">40.5-43.5 GHz (as part of a wider global 37-43.5 GHz tuning range)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">66 – 71 GHz</p> <p>If you don't agree with any of these bands, or think we should be promoting other bands, please provide justification for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>The Amateur-satellite Service has a primary allocation at 24-24.05 GHz.</p> <p>Out-of-band emissions from the use of 24.25-25.25 GHz would result in a significant increase in the noise floor in the Amateur-satellite Service allocation making the reception of weak satellite signals impossible.</p> <p>The amateur satellite AO-40, launched in 2000, was the first to carry a 24 GHz communications transponder. This allocation is vital to future amateur satellite developments and measures must be taken to preserve the low noise floor.</p>

<p>Question 3: What are your views on the suitability of the currently identified bands for HAPs and do you think there is a requirement for additional spectrum? Recognising that we support 26 GHz as a global band for IMT under agenda item 1.13, what are your views on the bands currently under study for HAPs, both globally and in ITU-R Regions?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>The Amateur-satellite Service primary allocations at 24-24.05 GHz and 47.0-47.2 GHz need protection from out-of-band emissions from HAPs.</p> <p>The Amateur-satellite community put considerable effort into developing a 47 GHz communications payload for the P3E satellite. The 47 GHz allocation will have a significant role in future Amateur-satellite developments.</p>
<p>Question 4: What are your views on the bands within scope of Agenda Item 1.16 and their suitability for Wi-Fi and Wi-Fi like services? Do you agree that Ofcom should support the CEPT position of No Change? If not, please provide evidence to support your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>The 5830-5850 MHz Amateur-satellite Service downlink allocation is used for spacecraft carrying amateur payloads in both Earth Orbit and Deep Space.</p> <p>The unconstrained use of 5725–5925 MHz for Wi-Fi would significantly raise the noise floor making it impossible for amateurs to receive the weak satellite signals.</p> <p>We support the CEPT position of No Change.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you agree that UK support the inclusion of the updated Recommendation M.1849-1 (“Technical and operational aspects of ground-based meteorological radars”) in footnote No.5450A? What are your views on the requirement to include a reference to ITU-R Recommendation ITU R M.1638 1 in footnotes No.5447A and 5.450A and the potential impact upon Wi-Fi (and similar technologies)?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you agree that UK support a position of not making changes to the Radio Regulations to reference specific bands for M2M/IoT usage?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>

Question 7: What are your views on the potential removal of the limitations listed above?	Confidential? – N
Question 8: What are your views on the approach we are proposing to take in respect of ESIMs and are there any additional factors that you think we should take into account?	Confidential? – N
Question 9: What are your views on the establishment of regulatory provisions, in Article 22, that cover non-GSO operation between 37.5 and 51.4 GHz?	Confidential? – N
Question 10: What are your views on the various issues under consideration under Agenda Item 7, particularly in respect of the bringing into use of non-geostationary satellite networks (i.e. Issue A)?	Confidential? – N
Question 11: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.1?	Confidential? – N

Question 12: What are your views on the potential establishment of satellite pfd limits, in the 1 452 – 1 492 MHz band, to protect terrestrial use?	Confidential? – N
Question 13: Do you have any views on the bands being studied and are there any other considerations which you think should be taken into account? What are your views on the appropriateness of the current emission limits in the band 3 700 – 4 200 MHz?	Confidential? – N
Question 14: Do you agree that no changes to the RRs are required, under Agenda Item 9.1.7, and that managing the unauthorised operation of earth station terminals (deployed within its territory) should be addressed by the national administration concerned?	Confidential? – N
Question 15: What are your views on the need for additional fixed satellite service allocations in the band 51.4 – 52.4 GHz?	Confidential? – N
Question 16: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.8, particularly the need to enhance maritime safety, set against the need to respect the international spectrum allocations and the protection of passive services in adjacent bands?	Confidential? – N

Question 17: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.9.1, particularly the need to respect the current integrity of the AIS?	Confidential? – N
Question 18: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.9.2, particularly the need to take into account current national users in the bands defined by RR Appendix 18?	Confidential? – N
Question 19: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.10 and do you think that any changes to the Radio Regulations may be necessary?	Confidential? – N
Question 20: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.11, and do you agree that no specific identification for rail communications is required in the Radio Regulations?	Confidential? – N
Question 21: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.12 and do you agree that there is no requirement for specific identification to ITS in the Radio Regulations?	Confidential? – N

<p>Question 22: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.4 concerning radiocommunications for sub-orbital vehicles?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p>Question 23: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.1, recognising that licensed amateur operators in the UK already have access to parts of the 50 – 54 MHz band?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>AMSAT-UK fully supports the allocation of 50-54 MHz to the Amateur Service in Region 1 and regard it a matter of High Priority. However, while the original proposal included the Amateur-satellite Service this is missing from Agenda Item 1.1</p> <p>The Amateur-satellite Service does not have any allocations between the 28 MHz and 144 MHz bands. An allocation at 50-51 MHz would provide low Doppler and propagation benefits for satellite communications.</p> <p>While such an allocation should be available for both Earth-to-Space and Space-to-Earth communications the alternate of an Earth-to-Space only allocation might be considered.</p> <p>Both amateur Moonbounce and Meteor Scatter communications are permitted at 50 MHz and use power levels significantly higher than would be required for Earth-to-Space satellite communications.</p>
<p>Question 24: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.2 concerning power limits for MetSat, Mobile Satellite and EESS, and the linkage to agenda item 1.7?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>

<p>Question 25: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.3, particularly on any limits required to protect terrestrial use?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p>Question 26: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.7 considering spectrum needs for short duration satellites, noting also the potential linkages to Agenda Item 1.2?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>AMSAT-UK supports satisfying the spectrum requirements for non-GSO satellites with short duration missions within the existing allocations for the space operation service or the frequency ranges identified in <i>invites ITU-R 3</i> of Resolution 659 (WRC-15), unless the satellites are amateur satellites as defined in RR Nos. 1.56 and 1.57.</p>
<p>Question 27: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.15, particularly on the protection needs of passive services?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p>Question 28: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.6, particularly on the categorisation of WPT and whether WRC action is required?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>The Amateur-satellite Service has HF allocations at 7, 14, 18, 21, 24 and 28 MHz. We are concerned that harmonics from WPT would adversely affect these allocations for a considerable area around each WPT(EV) installation. Strict limits are needed to control the level of spurious emissions.</p>

Question 29: Do you have any comments concerning the Standing Agenda Items, where not covered elsewhere in this document?	Confidential? – N
Question 30: Are you aware of any specific issues, not covered elsewhere in this document, which are likely to be raised in this part of the Director’s Report and of which you think Ofcom should be aware?	Confidential? – N
Question 31: Do you have any comments on Agenda Item 9.3 considering Resolution 80?	Confidential? – N
Question 32: What changes to the Radio Regulations have you identified that would benefit from action at a WRC and why? Do you have any proposals regarding UK positions for future WRC agenda items or suggestions for other agenda items, needing changes to the Radio Regulations, that you would wish to see addressed by a future WRC?	Confidential? – N