**Informal bilateral meeting on AI10 between APT and CEPT**

Time :   17:15 to 18:45 pm, Nov. 11th  
Venue :  Room G1 (in Varembé )

Participator :

* CEPT(Mr. Wesley Milton from UK as the coordinator from CEPT, Mr BUCKWITZ Karsten from Germany, Mr. EMMANUEL FAUSSURIER from France);
* APT(Dr.Alan Jamieson from NZL as APG Chair, JIAO JIAN from CHN& Mr. Hyoungjin Choi from Korea & Ms. Yumi Ueda from Japan as the coordinators from APT, Ms. Zhukeer and Mr. Changruoting from CHN, Mr FUJITA Kazushige from Japan, madam Kim and Mr. Kuhn kim from Korea, Mr HOSE Christopher from AUS)

Chair : Mr.Jiao Jian

Summary

1. **Opening remarks**
   1. Dr. Alan Jamieson made the opening remark.
2. **Introduction one-by-one**
   1. Participators introduced each other.

**3. Exchange views and discuss the proposals supported by both APG and CEPT**

Chair : How can we push our proposals supported by both APG and CEPT? Maybe we can explain our proposals at first and try to get further consensus building on them.

1. **IMT above 6 GHz**

* APT: APT and CEPT have some common frequency band for IMT, such as the bands above 31 GHz slightly different. APT has no strong view how to deal with current situation. We need further internal discussion also.
* CEPT: We share views a lot most positive until we get down below 30 GHz, especially for the bands Lower than 26 GHz. We have a lot of pressure from industry. APT proposal 66 GHz no issue, 30-50 GHz, amount of spectrum between 30 to 50 GHz proposed by APT is too big. We need a focused agenda item around 50 GHz for the bandwidth about 3-4 GHz on this frequency range. What is the most realistic spectrum we need to determine instead of go greater? We can discuss more. We would like to discuss the risk for having too large bandwidth. Very high 70-80 frequency range, industry is the ones using the frequency ranges. There exists no standard and no technology for higher frequency range. That is why we want to explore the lower frequency range. We chose bands for some reasons, including MS allocated already, avoiding JTG (39-47 GHz may need to have JTG because of SG 4 and 7) and so on. We did comprehensive compatibility study as well. In Europe, 24.5-27.5MHz does not work from scientific community point of view. We have spread the burden of sharing on this band. This is more robust than CITEL proposal.
* Chair: We can support some bands which both sides can support. We still have different views like stated above. We need to discuss further offline meetings.
* KOR: KOR submitted the new proposal of the way forward. I already put that in the share folder. If we don’t try to identify bands, we would lose. We need to get bands to study as many as possible.
* AUS: 40-50 GHz is the CEPT proposal. That is enough spectrums as you said. Easy to find the contiguous range in high frequency ranges, we need bigger room to study in the future. Otherwise we may lose if we target for narrow range, not large range..
* Germany: We should identify spectrum for future evolution not current. Biggest issue which band could be studied. Our bands tailored for this use. This can be really used for IMT.
* CHN: CEPT excluded 28 GHz band. This is for ESOMP new Agenda Item from CEPT. FSS and IMT cannot compatible each other.

1. **GADSS**

* CEPT: Our two proposals are very similar and wide open proposal. RCC opposed.
* APT: We both support this resolution although ICAO does not have clear picture.

1. **Identification by footnote for mobile and fixed services above 275 GHz**

* CEPT and APT are already discussing about drafting the text. We are very close to agree on our proposal.

**4. Exchange views and discuss the proposals only from APT**

* 1. **GMDSS**
* CEPT: IMO does not provide clear picture.
* Germany: This proposal is to cover the little issue. Before IMO is ready, we cannot help them and push.
  1. **WPT**
* CEPT: Not significant opposition but more suitable to ITU-R study. We will wait for the result of drafting.
  1. **ITS**
* Japan: We created those Recommendations and Reports many years. We want to make it clear ITS in RR.
* CEPT: Strong position using RR to harmonize a band for application. ITS is only an application. Difficult to be as WRC Agenda Item. We have existing Recommendation and this is useful information for the industry. ITU should investigate. There are too many WRC Agenda Items already. Proposal from one administration in CEPT, public hearing aids, has the same issue. We tried to avoid that kind of agenda item in CEPT preparation.
  1. **AIS**
* Germany: We need to be specific. AIS define certain channeling use. Appendix 18 may be same as automatic maritime device. Both is addressing appendix 18.
  1. **Next-generation radiocommunication systems between train and tracksides**
* CHN: We have challenges on Passenger service part. Meanwhile, Japan proposes to include the higher frequency band during security related discussion. We have to discuss how to precede this agenda item inside APT as well. We need WRC agenda item to consider new technology and spectrum requirements. We are concerned about RCC, CEPT and ASMG want to focus on safety. But if mixed with passenger service, it will be more related to IMT. So we need to talk it both inside and outside.
* Alan Jamieson: Similar to UAS, Initial safety and payload is kept separate. You can do the same in parallel manner.
* CEPT: UIC and ERA are trying to replace communication with safety. But passenger service proposed by APT will mix two services. Safety should be supported. Communication can be provided by the existing application. Maybe we should concentrate on safety parts with additional capacity, not consider similar to IMT.
* KOR: We need to very strictly protect from other services? This may be difficult.

**5. Exchange views and discuss the proposals only from CEPT**

1. **Secondary allocation to Amateur Service in 50-54 MHz,**

* CEPT: Global harmonization.
* APT: No position. No strong view.
* KOR: In Region 3 AS is primary.
* France: What is suitable for Region 1 we need to figure out.

1. **Possible allocation to amateur service in 1 800-2 000 kHz,**

* APT: No position. 2 agenda items can be one?
* CEPT: Region 1 matter also.Already working on merging.

1. **Primary allocation to FSS (Earth-to-space) in 51.4-52.4 GHz,**

* APT: Difficult for us. 1st priority for us is IMT or MS on this band.
* KOR: This band is allocated for FS and MS and all the other sat service. Pure MS and FS, so it’s hard to support.
* CHN: In 40 GHz bands there is a quite number of satellite network. They cannot be moved.
* CEPT: 42.5-43.5 (better for IMT) is available but not usable. So we chose 51.4-52.4 GHz. We want more offline discussion.

1. **Regulatory framework related to NGSO FSS systems in 37.5-52.4 GHz,**

* CEPT: Strong demand from satellite operators. There is an existing sharing mechanism. To support the development of this system to facilitate the sharing. PFD limit can be a solution for sharing. But study should not be limited to this mechanism.
* APT: Lower priority from our side. This band for IMT or MS. We don’t need the offline discussion on this.

1. **Possible revision of Annex 7 to Appendix 30,**

* APT : Difficult to support. Some administrations have difficulty. Offline discussion is needed.

1. **Upgrading ESS and Meteorological satellite service (space-to-Earth) in the band 460-470 MHz**

* APT: Difficult to support. Some administrations have difficulty. Offline discussion is needed.

1. **Allocations to the space operation service in the range 137-174 MHz and 230-470 MHz to accommodate small NGSOs**

* APT: No strong view from our side.

1. **Power limits for MMSS, meteorological SS or EESS in 401-403 MHz and 399.9-400.05 MHz**

* APT: No strong view from our side.

1. **Earth stations on mobile platforms in FSS (17.7-19.7 GHz and 27.5-29.5 GHz)**

* APT: Some administrations have difficulty on 28 GHz.
* AUS: 29.5-30 GHz, the band should be excluded for other agenda items. We are open to discuss.

**6. Any other business**

1. **HAPS**

* APT: HAPS is medium priority. Not very strong but support. The problem for some administrations of APT have concerns on the candidate frequency bands proposed by CITEL.
* CEPT: we have same views.
* KOR: 40.5 GHz several bands what band CEPT support?
* CEPT: We will consider internally on this issue.

1. **IOT:**

* APT: No strong position. However it’s application and may be ITU study.
* CEPT: We have not discussed but probably fair assessment

Chair : Thanks for all participators. We may meet each other later if necessary.