

WRC-07 ADVISORY COMMITTEE
INFORMAL WORKING GROUP 1 (IWG-1)

April 6 Minutes

Date/Time: April 6, 2006, 2:00-3:30 p.m.

Location: Lockheed Martin, 1550 Crystal Drive, 4th Floor, Crystal City, Virginia

Committee Present: J. Warren, (Chair), D. Drazenovich, D. Jansky, J. Siverling, D. Wye, D. Reed, K. Keane, R. Haines, J. Conner, M. Khalilzadeh, R. Lepkowski

By Phone: L. Assefa, K. Baum, B. Kaufmann, B. Rummler,

FCC Employee Present: A. Roytblat, D. Ibarra, Allen Yang

1. Introductions: The meeting was open to the public, and all participants identified themselves.

2. Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved without modification.

3. Report on International Meetings: Alex Roytblat advised that a report on the recent APT meeting was available on the website, and will be available in hard copy at the WAC meeting on April 27. The report covered agenda items within the terms of reference of the IWG-1.

4. Review of RCS Documents:

a. Agenda Item 1.20. In regard to the NTIA RCS proposal, Mr. Roytblat advised that IWG-1 should be sensitive to terrestrial and aeronautical aspects of the proposal, and urged AFTRCC and aeronautical licensees to consider the proposal closely. Jennifer Warren urged parties to review the document for consideration at the next IWG-1 in May. Noting that it would be unlikely that this would be treated prior to the upcoming WAC meeting, which Mr. Roytblat indicated would be the last before CITEL, the Chair sought FCC/NTIA comment on whether this proposal required action at this WAC. The FCC noted its concerns regarding the Agenda Item 1.20 proposal, but agreed that it need not be resolved by the April WAC. Mr. Roytblat

referenced the potential impact of hard limits on terrestrial services, and the precedent it could set for further efforts to limit licensed uses in bands adjacent to the passive bands. He advised that the FCC is also concerned regarding the method by which the band limits were developed, *i.e.* that there has been no showing that the passive services would suffer harmful interference.

Rob Haines then introduced the details of the NTIA proposal. He stated that NTIA is concerned about unwanted emissions into the passive bands from five specific bands.

Jennifer Warren urged Bill Rummeler and Kim Baum to look at any terrestrial implications. Kim Baum asked how the bands were selected that are the subject of the proposed hard limits. Mr. Haines advised that NTIA has been clear that these are the only bands that NTIA is concerned about, and that those concerns date back some years; however, it was noted that even though the U.S. may not have plans to add other bands, that would not prevent other administrations from seeking to do so.

b. Iridium presented its contribution on the NTIA proposal for the future Conference Agenda (7.2), Don Jansky, on behalf of Iridium, advised that the NTIA proposal sought to add a primary space research allocation from 22.55-23.55 GHz. The Iridium concern was that anyone could use the allocation, and that the proposal spans up to 500 MHz. Iridium proposed a modification to apply to the lower part of the band, 22.55-23.05 GHz, in order to avoid conflict with Iridium inter-satellite service links. It was suggested and agreed that the proposal be re-phrased in terms of “existing services” instead of “existing systems.”

Brad Kaufmann clarified that the NTIA proposal was intended to cover a wide range of future missions such as to the Moon and Mars. He stated that NASA is comfortable with the proposed Iridium amendment. He further stated that, as an uplink could impact systems of other nations, it needed to be addressed internationally, rather than treated as just a domestic issue.

Don Jansky and Alex Roytblat discussed possible coordination issues for this proposal. The Iridium modification to the proposal was approved. Darlene Drazenovich advised that NTIA would still need to give final approval in the reconciliation process with the FCC.

5. Status of Current Documents: Not covered

6. Review of New Documents

Ken Keane introduced AFTRCC's Agenda Item 1.5 proposal noting that it was still a work in progress. Majid Khalilzadeh introduced and obtained agreement on his proposed clarifications to the proposal, which clearly limited it to flight testing. Others raised concerns about approving a proposal that contained reference to proposed Resolutions, the text of which was not yet developed; it was agreed that the proposal was not sufficiently complete for the IWG-1 to approve at this point. Ken Keane agreed to provide a more complete proposal within a week

Bill Rummler expressed difficulties with the proposal, stating that Working Party 9D had yet to respond to the liaison statement, and therefore conclusions could not be drawn about sharing with the Fixed Service. Ken Keane observed that this was the second time that WP9D had seen the AMT studies; that, as the result of an earlier liaison statement, the AMT studies had been revised to incorporate the methodology which WP9D itself had recommended; that that methodology had been used in the new studies; and that the only reason the study had been sent back to WP9D was out of an abundance of caution, for a final check.

Alex Roytblat emphasized that the IWG and WAC processes were not tied to the ITU Study Group processes, and that US domestic interests could and should talk to determine the US position on this matter, irrespective of the status of WP9D. The Chair, NTIA and the FCC urged off-line discussions among interested parties in order to bring the matter to a prompt closure.

7. Other Business:

It was agreed that another IWG-1 meeting prior to the WAC meeting should occur to address Agenda Item 1.5.

8. Future Meetings:

The next meeting will be April 20 at 1:30 p.m. EDT.