

## Your response

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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree, but note the inclusion of 52 to 54MHz into the UK Amateur license is given a low priority.</p> <p>I should like to see harmonisation of the region1 and region2 50MHz Amateur band and would ask that this be done as soon as resources allow.</p>
<p><b>Question 2: Ofcom is supporting the following three priority bands for IMT identification in the RRs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24.25 – 27.5 GHz</li> <li>40.5-43.5 GHz (as part of a wider global 37-43.5 GHz tuning range)</li> <li>66 – 71 GHz</li> </ul> <p><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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Agree, but care should be taken to avoid modes whose emissions may spread into the 24 to 24.24 Amateur band. A narrow guard band above 24.25GHz would help.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no firm views on this other than to keep any interference to nearby Amateur bands at a minimum.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with Ofcom, no change.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no firm views on this, So have no objection to Ofcom's position.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Question 7: What are your views on the potential removal of the limitations listed above?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Remove the limitations.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with Ofcom's approach.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no firm views on this, So have no objection to Ofcom's position.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I support Ofcom's position on Agenda item 7.</p>
<p><b>Question 11: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.1?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>All ITU regions need to agree frequencies within the stated band for satellite and ground mobile usage to prevent mutual interference.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No immediate concern to the UK, I support Ofcom's position on Agenda item 12</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no views on this.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with Ofcom's position on this question.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>The Iridium system has been in operation for a number of years, so interference to the RAS from Iridium should have been dealt with by now. This is a separate issue to maritime safety.</p> <p>Safety at sea is very important. Should the IMO decide to incorporate Iridium into the GMDSS any upgrades to the system should seek to reduce interference to the RAS.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I would support the view expressed in para 6.13. This is important if usage and scope of AIS devices is set to increase.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no views on this.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with Ofcom's position on this as indicated in para 6.21.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with the view expressed in para 6.25</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with the view expressed in para 6.29</p>
<p><b>Question 22: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.4 concerning radiocommunications for sub-orbital vehicles?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I support the view expressed in para 6.31</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I would like to see harmonisation of this amateur band in all ITU regions. I would like to see primary use by Amateurs for at least 50 to 50.5MHz and preferably 50 to 52MHz. 52 to 54MHz . Please lobby the ITU to remove Broadcasting as the primary usage of the 50 to 54MHz band in region1.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no firm views on this.</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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no firm views on this.</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I have no firm views on this.</p>

<p><b>Question 27: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.15, particularly on the protection needs of passive services?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>It is important that existing users of the spectrum above 275GHz are protected. Radio Amateurs holding a full licence can access this part of the spectrum with an NoV. This allows amateurs to participate in system development and propagation research above 275GHz and this should be encouraged to flourish.</p>
<p><b>Question 28: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.6, particularly on the categorisation of WPT and whether WRC action is required?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>High power radio emissions between 19 and 90KHz may well generate harmonics which will be harmful to spectrum users above these frequencies. No need for WRC action yet, but these systems need to be designed and fully tested to ensure interference to all other spectrum users is negligible.</p>
<p><b>Question 29: Do you have any comments concerning the Standing Agenda Items, where not covered elsewhere in this document?</b></p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>All standing agenda items need to be reviewed to ensure their current relevance. I agree that obsolete footnotes, agenda 8, should be removed. I would hope this will lead to allowing UK amateurs an output power of 20dbW on the 1850 to 2000KHz band</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>	Confidential? – N  I am not aware of any issues in regards to this question.
<b>Question 31: Do you have any comments on Agenda Item 9.3 considering Resolution 80?</b>	Confidential? – N  No comments
<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>	Confidential? – N  I would expect that future WRC agenda items would ensure any changes to spectrum usage do not allow encroachment onto Amateur Radio frequencies.