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Date: 25 January 2012

**REPORT OF THE WRC-12 AGENDA ITEM COORDINATOR**

|  |
| --- |
| **Agenda Item No.**: 1.21 |
| **Name of the Coordinator ( with Email)**: Christopher David Squires  cd.squires@bigpond.com |
| **Issues:**  Alternate proposals for allocation of parts of the band segment 15.4-15.7 GHz to the Mobile Satellite Service (AI 1.25) and the Unmanned Aircraft System under the Aeronautical Mobile Service (AI 1.3).  Allocation to these services would not be compatible with the Radiolocation service as proposed under AI 1.21. |
| **APT Proposals**: Document 26 Addendum 21  The APT common proposal is to consider a primary allocation to the radiolocation service in the band 15.4-15.7 GHz, taking into account the results of ITU‑R studies, in accordance with Resolution **614 (WRC‑07)**.  The proposal includes examples of new footnotes protecting ARNS and RAS systems.  In addition, the proposal suggests that it is possible that a WRC-12 Resolution (yet to be developed) may also be needed to provide further clarification. |
| **Status of the APT Proposals:**  The APT common proposal was presented by Mr. Squires to the first Working Group session held on 24 January and was confirmed at the first Sub Working Group meeting on 25 January 2012.  The majority of proposals to AI 1.21 working group are in agreement with the APT common position. |
| **Issues to be discussed at the Coordination Meeting:**  Alternate proposals from some administrations are for No Change (NC) to the radio Regulations, with one proposal for a lesser bandwidth allocation. The issue of possible general agreement on an allocation is to be discussed. |
| **Comments/Remarks by the Coordinator**:  At the first sub working group meeting the Chair (Mr. Lemke, USA) sought confirmation of the various positions. Proposals for an allocation across the entire 300 MHz were confirmed by the proponents.  Iran confirmed a preference for Method D (NC).  No speaker was present to confirm Indonesia’s preference for Method D (NC).  When prompted by the chair there was no support from the floor for the method of NC.  CEPT confirmed its proposal for an allocation across a 200 MHz bandwidth. CEPT sees a need for an allocation of 100 MHz between 15.4-15.5 GHz to the UAS for backup terrestrial links under AI 1.3 and stated that they consider a 200 MHz allocation to the RLS as sufficient.  The Chair stated that the work revolves around the method of resolving the differing positions. study provided by the CEPT was inadequate and that e method of NC.d.ably for the RCC, CITEL and the Radio Astronomy Service wh  There was a significant amount of opposition to the CEPT position, notably from the RCC and CITEL. nd did not provide an answeres A representative of the RAS community (Mr. Baan, Netherlands) stated that the sharing study between RLS and RAS shows compatibility however the study between UAS and RAS does not.  Chair asked for a summary on the need for a 300 MHz allocation. USA stated that RES 614 asks for examination of an allocation of 300 MHz. This has been examined in detail and sharing studies conducted showing compatibility with the RAS, and the need is established.  Chair asks whether CEPT would accept a 300 MHz allocation in the event that AI 1.3 was not resolved in favour of an allocation in the 15 GHz band. CEPT not in favour of this proposal and did not provide an answer.  CEPT (Mr.Webber) suggested examination of the commonalities and the Resolution, and leave the bandwidth allocation question until later.  Chair will take an action item to draft some text in this way to be ready for discussion at the next meeting. |