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Working Party 2

**APT VIEW AND PRELIMINARY APT COMMON PROPOSAL**

**on WRC-19 agenda item 9.1 (issue 9.1.5)**

**Agenda Item 9.1, Issue 9.1.5:**

*Resolution* **764 (WRC- 15)** *- Consideration of the technical and regulatory impacts of referencing Recommendations ITU-R M.1638-1 and ITU-R M.1849-1 in Nos. 5.447F and 5.450A of the Radio Regulations.*

**1. Background**

Resolution **764 (WRC‑15)** resolves to invite ITU-R:

1 to investigate the technical and regulatory impacts on the services referred to in Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A** that would result from referencing Recommendation ITU R M.1638-1 in place of Recommendation ITU R M.1638-0 in those footnotes, while ensuring that no undue constraints are imposed on the services referenced in these footnotes;

2 to investigate the technical and regulatory impacts on the services referred to in Nos **5.447F** and **5.450A** that would result from adding a new reference to Recommendation ITU R M.1849-1 to these footnotes, while ensuring that no undue constraints are imposed on the services referenced in these footnotes.

The following approaches were suggested as regulatory examples in the CPM Report for WRC-19 agenda item 9.1, issue 9.1.5, as long-term solution that would avoid reopening the issue of technical and regulatory impacts of referencing new versions of Recommendations ITU-R M.1638-1 and ITU-R M.1849-1 in RR Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A**:

* Approach A: To delete the second sentence of the footnotes RR Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A**, where the Recommendations are referenced, and introduce the sentence “Resolution **229 (Rev.WRC-12)** applies”;
* Approach B: To delete the references to the Recommendations in both footnotes RR Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A**, and refer to footnote RR **No. 5.446A** instead.

Relevant ITU-R Reports/Recommendations and ongoing studies are as follows,

* Recommendation ITU-R M.1638-0 - Characteristics of and protection criteria for sharing studies for radiolocation, aeronautical radionavigation and meteorological radars operating in the frequency bands between 5 250 MHz and 5 850 MHz
* Recommendation ITU-R M.1638-1 - Characteristics of and protection criteria for sharing studies for radiolocation (except ground based meteorological radars) and aeronautical radionavigation radars operating in the frequency bands between 5 250 and 5 850 MHz
* Recommendation ITU-R M.1849-1 - Technical and operational aspects of ground-based meteorological radars

**2. Documents**

* Input Documents: APG19-5/INP-17 (NZL), INP-37 (IRN), INP-43(Rev.1) (AUS), INP-50 (INS), INP-66 (CHN), INP-80 (J), INP-106 (MLA, THA), INP-128 (KOR)
* Information Documents: APG19-5/INF-01 (WMO), INF-18 (CEPT), INF-19 (ATU), INF-20 (CITEL), INF-22 (RCC)

**3. Summary of discussions**

**3.1 Summary of APT Members’ views**

**3.1.1 New Zealand** - **Document APG19-5/INP-17**

New Zealand supports Approach A by referencing Resolution **229 (Rev. WRC-12)** in RR No. **5.447F** and **5.450A** as a long-term solution that would avoid reopening the issue of re-assessing technical and regulatory impacts when referencing new versions of ITU-R Recommendations in the future.

**3.1.2 Iran** - **Document APG19-5/INP-37**

This Administration supports Approach A of the CPM Report.

Reason: This approach is a long-term solution that would avoid reopening the issue of technical and regulatory impacts of referencing new Recommendation versions in RR Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A**. This should in particular be seen in the light of the fact that, in practice, the coexistence between WAS/RLAN and radars is not driven by those two footnotes but by Resolution **229 (Rev.WRC-12)** that defines the conditions for the mobile service to operate in these bands.

**3.1.3 Australia -** **Document APG19-5/INP-43 (Rev.1)**

Australia supports a long-term solution that requires less regulation should Recommendations ITU-R M.1638 or M.1849 be updated again in the future, while creating no additional constraints to the mobile service, and also ensuring protection of the radiolocation service.

Australia supports the CPM Report Approach A.

**3.1.4 Indonesia -** **Document APG19-5/INP-50**

Indonesia is of the view to support **Approach A** to satisfy Agenda Item 9.1 (issue 9.1.5) of WRC-19 which delete the second sentence of the footnotes RR 5.447F and 5.450A, where the Recommendations ITU-R M.1638-0 and ITU-R RS.1632-0 are referenced, and clarify that the provisions of Resolution **229 (Rev.WRC-12)** apply in this case.

**3.1.5 China -** **Document APG19-5/INP-66**

After investigating the two approaches, China considers that both Approach A and Approach B could satisfy this issue, meanwhile avoid the need to address this topic again at future WRCs if Recommendations ITU-R M.1638 and M.1849 were updated in the future, i.e., a long-term solution.

Moreover, China believes that the reference to No. **5.446A** in Approach B provides an indirect reference to Resolution **229 (Rev. WRC-12)** and it would be clearer and more transparent if the reference directly points to Resolution **229 (Rev. WRC-12)** instead of No. **5.446A**.

**3.1.6 Japan -** **Document APG19-5/INP-80**

In the case of Approach A, when a meteorological radar is harmfully interfered by wireless access systems (WAS) including radio local area networks (RLANs), the radar may impose on the mobile service more stringent protection criteria than those stated in Resolution **229 (Rev.WRC-12)** based on RR No. **5.43A**. On the other hand, the radar cannot impose more stringent technical and operational limits upon the mobile service other than those in Resolution **229 (Rev.WRC-12)** in the case of Approach B.

Therefore, Japan supports Approach A in terms of protection of meteorological radars from WAS/RLANs.

**3.1.7 Malaysia, Thailand -** **Document APG19-5/INP-106**

Malaysia and Thailand support long-term solution that requires less regulation should the Recommendations ITU-R M.1638 or M.1849 be updated again in the future, while also ensuring protection of the services to which the band is allocated including those which are referenced in RR Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A** and creating no additional constraints to the mobile service.

Malaysia and Thailand support Approach B in the CPM Report in addressing this Issue.

**3.1.8 Korea -** **Document APG19-5/INP-128**

The Republic of Korea supports Approach B provided in the CPM Report to update both footnotes of RR Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A** by removing the references to the Recommendations and replacing them with references to RR No. **5.446A**.

**3.2 Summary of issues raised during the meeting**

During the drafting group sessions, some issues have been raised by APT Members as below:

* Although some APT Members support Approach B or modified Approach B, these Members do not oppose Approach A as the PACP for this issue. With this understanding, Approach A was agreed to be the PACP for this issue.

**4. APT View(s)**

* APT Members support Approach A by referencing Resolution **229 (Rev. WRC-12)** in RR No. **5.447F** and **5.450A** as a long-term solution that would avoid reopening the issue of re-assessing technical and regulatory impacts when referencing new versions of ITU-R Recommendations in the future, while creating no additional constraints to the mobile service, and also ensuring protection of the radiolocation service.

**5. Preliminary APT Common Proposal(s)**

****