

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>The 50 MHz (6-metre) band has been set a 'Low' priority.</p> <p>If Ofcom lack the resource to fully represent the UK Radio Amateur Community, they should seek support from RSGB volunteers to participate in the UK delegation to ensure the voice of this community is heard.</p>
<p>Question 2: Ofcom is supporting the following three priority bands for IMT identification in the RRs:</p> <p>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> <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>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>There are amateur Primary allocations in adjacent spectrum to some of these proposed allocations. Deployment in future IMT 5G allocations should ensure protection for Amateur radio allocations such as critical masks to ensure that their out of band emissions do not affect the Amateur Primary Allocations</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>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>No Comment</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>Confidential? – Y / N Agree on No Change to protect Amateurs Radio allocations in the 5725-5850 MHz range. The low power indoor use/25mW CEPT outdoor limit would ensure continued protection in particular for weak signal reception.</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>Confidential? – Y / N 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>Confidential? – Y / N Agree</p>
<p>Question 7: What are your views on the potential removal of the limitations listed above?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</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?	Confidential? – Y / N No Comment
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?	Confidential? – Y / N No Comment
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)?	Confidential? – Y / N No Comment
Question 11: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.1?	Confidential? – Y / N No Comment
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?	Confidential? – Y / N No Comment

<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>Confidential? – Y / N 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>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</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>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</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>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</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>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</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>Confidential? – Y / N 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>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</p>
<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?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</p>
<p>Question 22: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.4 concerning radiocommunications for sub-orbital vehicles?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</p>

<p>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?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>The priority of the 50 MHz band has been set a ‘Low’. This should be raised to ensure the band receives appropriate attention.</p> <p>The band is allocated to Broadcasting as a primary user in ITU Region 1, although use for such purposes is confined mainly to countries within the CIS, and should decrease as these nations finalise their television digital switchover.</p> <p>The UK delegation should at least push for the 50-52 MHz range to be given Primary status for Radio Amateur use.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>No Comment</p>
<p>Question 25: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.3, particularly on any limits required to protect terrestrial use?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>No Comment</p>
<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?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>No Comment</p>

<p>Question 27: What are your views on Agenda Item 1.15, particularly on the protection needs of passive services?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N Ofcom should continue to permit access to parts of this frequency range to UK Full Licensees by means of a licence variation</p>
<p>Question 28: What are your views on Agenda Item 9.1.6, particularly on the categorisation of WPT and whether WRC action is required?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N WRC action on WPT most certainly IS required. Such use for potentially high power charging circuits risk interference to other users of adjacent and higher spectrum. Regulation must be put in place to ensure harmonics and other switching products do not impact other users.</p>
<p>Question 29: Do you have any comments concerning the Standing Agenda Items, where not covered elsewhere in this document?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N There should be a review of footnotes that apply to amateur radio spectrum. Many are obsolete or out dated</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N No Comment</p>
<p>Question 31: Do you have any comments on Agenda Item 9.3 considering Resolution 80?</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p>

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?

Confidential? – Y / N

Ofcom should be encouraged to undertake an early consultation for WRC 2023.