

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? – Y / N</p>
<p>Question 2: Ofcom is supporting the following three priority bands for IMT identification in the RRs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <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>We have concerns about the 40-42 GHz band being made available for IMT outside of regions 1 and 3. In Region 2, this band is identified in the Radio Regulations for High Density Fixed Satellite Services. There have been no studies to demonstrate that widely-deployed HDFSS user terminals can share with IMT. It is critical that satellite operators have access to adequate spectrum globally, including Region 2 for this use. Accordingly, any such identification should be limited to Region 1 and 3.</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>[Brennan]</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>No comment</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>No comment</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>No comment</p>
<p>Question 7: What are your views on the potential removal of the limitations listed above?</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>We support the proposed approach and urge Ofcom to ensure that there are sufficient protections to enable the continued use of this spectrum for non-ESIM services</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>We support this approach. GSOs must have adequate protection [Fernando to flesh out]</p>
<p>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)?</p>	<p>We support an approach that provides reasonable milestones for NGSO systems to meet their bringing into use requirements.</p>

<p>Question 11: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.1?</p>	<p>The UK should support a no change position. As demonstrated during the study cycle, sharing issues should be addressed on a bilateral basis. There are appropriate mitigation techniques that can be taken by both MSS and MS to minimize any potential interference issues.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>We agree.</p>

<p>Question 15: What are your views on the need for additional fixed satellite service allocations in the band 51.4 – 52.4 GHz?</p>	<p>We support additional FSS spectrum being made available. EchoStar’s affiliates are currently building a satellite in the Ka band and V band for launch in 2020. It is clear that increasing demand for satellite broadband services require access to additional spectrum. This additional 1 GHz, which is adjacent to the 50.4-51.4 GHz band, will provide a start to making such capacity available.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>Question 17: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.9.1, particularly the need to respect the current integrity of the AIS?</p>	<p>No Comments</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No comments</p>

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?	No comments
Question 22: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.4 concerning radiocommunications for sub-orbital vehicles?	No comments
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?	No Comments
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?	No comments
Question 25: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.3, particularly on any limits required to protect terrestrial use?	No Comments
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?	We support reasonable access on an unprotected short duration satellites
Question 27: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.15, particularly on the protection needs of passive services?	No comment
Question 28: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.6, particularly on the categorisation of WPT and whether WRC action is required?	No comment

Question 29: Do you have any comments concerning the Standing Agenda Items, where not covered elsewhere in this document?	No
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?	No
Question 31: Do you have any comments on Agenda Item 9.3 considering Resolution 80?	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?	Satellite broadband usage continues to increase. As we consider items for future conferences, we urge that Ofcom consider supporting [add in FAI we created and any others]