

Question	Your response
<p><b>Question 1: Do you agree with the prioritisation of the agenda items, as shown in Annex 5, and if not why?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office agrees with the prioritisation as in Annex 5.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 2: Ofcom is supporting the following three priority bands for IMT identification in the RRs:</b>  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  <b>If you don't agree with any of these bands, or think we should be promoting other bands, please provide justification for your views.</b></p>	<p>The Met Office is supportive of the new IMT identification/allocations provided that protection of EESS (Earth-to-space and space-to-Earth) and EESS (passive) is ensured. The Met Office requests that the necessary IMT unwanted emission limits be established to ensure the protection of all current and future EESS (passive) sensors.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office does not oppose new HAPS band identifications provided that studies show a need for identification of additional spectrum for HAPS and that protection of EESS (space-to-Earth), and EESS (passive) is ensured.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The Met Office supports Ofcom’s decision to support the CEPT position of No Change</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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)?</b></p>	<p>Recommendation ITU R M.1849-1 is not currently incorporated into the Radio Regulations but such reference would allow inclusion of the most up to date information on meteorological radars operating in the frequency band. It should be noted that current ITU-R studies show that referencing M.1849-1 in footnote 5.450A would have no technical and regulatory impact on existing services. The Met Office supports any solution that ensures the continued protection of meteorological radars from WAS/RLAN systems operating under the mobile service allocation in the 5470-5725 MHz frequency band.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 7: What are your views on the potential removal of the limitations listed above?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>

<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office agrees with Ofcom’s position to be supportive of the need to protect the radio astronomy service operating in the frequency bands 42.5 - 43.5 GHz, 48.94 - 49.04 GHz and 51.4 - 54.25 GHz, and the protection of the Earth Exploration Satellite Service (EESS) (passive) operating in the frequency bands 36-37 GHz and 50.2 - 50.4 GHz.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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)?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 11: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.1?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this band.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this band.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>

<p><b>Question 15: What are your views on the need for additional fixed satellite service allocations in the band 51.4 – 52.4 GHz?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office does not oppose the possible allocation of the frequency band 51.4-52.4 GHz to the fixed satellite service (FSS) provided that protection of EESS (passive) in the bands 50.2-50.4 GHz and 52.6-54.25 GHz is ensured.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 17: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.9.1, particularly the need to respect the current integrity of the AIS?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 20: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.11, and do you agree that no specific identification for rail communications is required in the Radio Regulations?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>

<p><b>Question 22: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.4 concerning radiocommunications for sub-orbital vehicles?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office supports the establishment of an appropriate set of in band e.i.r.p. limits for non-GSO and GSO satellite operating under the METSAT and EESS (Earth-to-space) allocation to ensure the protection of existing and future use of meteorological operations in the 401-403 MHz frequency band.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Met Office is supportive of Ofcom’s proposal to migrate some of the relatively higher power users (such as satellite earth stations) into bands agreed under agenda item 1.7</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 25: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.3, particularly on any limits required to protect terrestrial use?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office supports the upgrade of the METSAT (space-to-Earth) allocation to primary in the frequency band 460-470 MHz with the use of appropriate power flux density (pfd) limits for GSO and non-GSO satellites to protect terrestrial services.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>

**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?**

The Met Office is supportive of Ofcom's proposal to consider an allocation to SOS in the lower end of the 403-406MHz band. We acknowledge the studies undertaken by Ofcom that show our Met Aids (radiosondes) would be protected under this proposal.

The Met Office would also welcome further discussions into the use of the two additional bands 137-138 MHz and 148-148.9 MHz identified under this Agenda Item.

Confidential? – N

**Question 27: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.15, particularly on the protection needs of passive services?**

The Met Office does not oppose the identification of land-mobile (LM) and fixed services (FS) in part of the 275-450 GHz band provided that protection of EESS (passive) is ensured and the identification is consistent with footnote RR No. 5.565. A number of sharing and compatibility studies between FS and EESS (passive), considering aggregate impact of FS deployments have concluded that sharing would not be possible in a certain number of EESS (passive) frequency bands or portions thereof, in particular the bands 296-306 GHz, 313-320 GHz and 331-356 GHz. Therefore, these bands should not be considered because FS and land mobile services would not be compatible with the EESS (passive).

Confidential? – N

**Question 28: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.6, particularly on the categorisation of WPT and whether WRC action is required?**

The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.

Confidential? – N

<p><b>Question 29: Do you have any comments concerning the Standing Agenda Items, where not covered elsewhere in this document?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office have no concerns with the Standard Agenda Items.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this question.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>Question 31: Do you have any comments on Agenda Item 9.3 considering Resolution 80?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office offers no opinion on this Agenda Item.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>The Met Office supports retention of the preliminary Agenda Items 2.2 (relating to EESS (active) around 45 MHz) and Agenda Item 2.3 (to review studies of the technical and operational characteristics for space weather sensors) on the WRC-23 Agenda.</p> <p>Confidential? – N</p>