Your response

Question	Your response
Question 1: Do you agree with the prioritisation of the agenda items, as shown in Annex 5, and if not why?	Confidential? – N Yes
Question 2: Ofcom is supporting the following three priority bands for IMT identification in the RRs: **24.25 – 27.5 GHz** **40.5-43.5 GHz (as part of a wider global 37-43.5 GHz tuning range)** **66 – 71 GHz** **If you don't agree with any of these bands, or think we should be promoting other bands, please provide justification for your views.**	Confidential? – N So long as this does not affect my experimental work in the 24GHz and 47GHz amateur primary allocations, I am content with this approach
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?	Confidential? –N No view

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.	Confidential? – N I am already finding problems in my narrowband weak-signal experimentation at 5760MHz with noise from various types of system. Any changes should protect the weak-signal amateur allocation to allow continued experimentation and moonbounce (EME) working
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)?	Confidential? – N no view
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?	Confidential? – N no view
Question 7: What are your views on the potential removal of the limitations listed above?	Confidential? – N no view

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 no view
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 My only concern is that no regulatory changes should result in additional noise and traffic in the 47GHz amateur allocation for weak-signal and wideband data/TV experimentation
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 no view
Question 11: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.1?	Confidential? – N no view
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 no view

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 no view
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 no view
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 no view
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 no view
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 no view

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 no view
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 no view
Question 20: What are you 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 no view
Question 21: What are you 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 no view
Question 22: What are you views on Agenda Item 9.1.4 concerning radiocommunications for sub-orbital vehicles?	Confidential? – N no view

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?	Confidential? – N Colleagues are interested in reduced-bandwidth television in an extended band, but this should not be prioritised over protection of weak-signal amateur allocations in other areas of spectrum above 1GHz
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?	Confidential? – N no view
Question 25: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.3, particularly on any limits required to protect terrestrial use?	Confidential? – N no view
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?	Confidential? – N no view

Question 27: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.15, particularly on the protection needs of passive services?	Confidential? – N I intend to carry out experimental work in the permitted bands above 275GHz as technology becomes available. Any such work would be short range and highly directional, so I do not think additional protection of passive services are required
Question 28: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.6, particularly on the categorisation of WPT and whether WRC action is required?	Confidential? – N WPT appears to be a wasteful and RF-polluting service with no benefits other than not requiring a cable to be plugged in. It should definitely be treated as a radio service and subject to very very strict controls over spurious transmissions, harmonics and broadband noise
Question 29: Do you have any comments concerning the Standing Agenda Items, where not covered elsewhere in this document?	Confidential? – N As a regular user of the 1.810 to 2.0MHz band, I believe a review of the power limits for the entire band, and an extension down to 1.800MHz should be considered as commercial uses of this band are now minimal.

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 no
Question 31: Do you have any comments on Agenda Item 9.3 considering Resolution 80?	Confidential? – N no
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 none