

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

Minutes

Date/Time: April 20, 2006, 1:30-3:30 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, R. Haines, M. Khalilzadeh, R. Lepkowski, L. Assefa, K. Baum, K. Hutchison, H. Henriques, L. Sung,

By Phone: K. Keane, B. Rummler, W. Whyte, T. Walsh, T. Sullivan, A. Renshaw, D. Jablonsky, T. vonDeak

FCC Employee Present: A. Roytlat, D. Ibarra, S. Persaud (by phone)

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. **Document Review:**

A. Agenda Item 1.5

Ken Keane introduced a revised proposal for Agenda Item 1.5, including two draft Resolutions, noting a change to add the band 5091-5150 MHz to the Article 9 discussion in the Background section. Majid Khalilzadeh introduced his suggested changes to draft Resolution XXX. Don Jansky had concerns with some of the wording in the background and Resolutions as not being familiar in the ITU, particularly “local”, “legacy”, and “suitable,” and it was agreed that better wording would be found and that “suitable” may need further explanation. There was much discussion about the concept and use of “suitability,” with Kim Baum and others noting that “identification” is used in other places in the ITU Radio Regulations. Ken Keane noted that his approach and the use of “suitable” was a minimalist one designed to give Administrations maximum flexibility in implementation, rather than the more prescriptive approach implied in use of “identification.”

Alex Roytblat and Kim Baum expressed concern that the footnotes no longer contained language about new uses “not precluding” existing/other uses, and preferred to have that text reinstated. While concerned that the “precluding” text might be confusing, Ken offered to add the text back to the footnote. Alex offered that it would be important to retain this text. Don Jansky and Alex also questioned the need for the Article 9 references, expressing the view that they might be superfluous and confusing.

Bill Rummler noted that the document mentions the Fixed Service bands, without discussion of the FS studies, and that ITU WP 9D is working on studies for the June meeting. While Bill indicated that the studies will likely show that sharing is not feasible, Tom Sullivan expressed the view that sharing would be possible with appropriate coordination. It was agreed that additional language is needed to explain the sharing issue better.

There was much discussion on the structure and wording of the Resolutions. Don Jansky expressed a number of concerns with the way the Resolutions were structured and offered suggestions to bring them more in line with ITU convention for “*considerings*” and “*recognizings*.” Likewise, Alex had concern about the terminology for “air-to-ground” and suggested using ITU terminology. Bill Rummler had concerns about the power level in resolves 2, suggesting that it might need to be -28 dBW/MHz not -2.2. This was considered problematic. There was also much discussion of the meaning of “flight test area”, with Alex noting that this is not an ITU term, and only really applied at the domestic level. There was general agreement that even if the words were not exactly right, the concepts were important to capture for those services that might be affected by aeronautical telemetry uses since they served as the basis for the sharing studies.

The Chair summed up modifications that needed to be made, and requested the author to distribute a revised version by Sunday to enable adequate review time and approval by IWG-1 prior to the upcoming WAC. Ken Keane promised to make the changes as soon as possible. The FCC agreed to allow IWG-1 until Wednesday morning to submit an IWG-1 document for WAC consideration.

B. Agenda Item 1.20

Don Jansky and Kim Baum introduced a proposed document giving IWG-1’s comments/edits on the RCS draft proposal for AI 1.20, which addresses Resolution 738 (WRC-03). Don noted that it was essentially the same document agreed just recently in IWG-2, but this portion dealt specifically with terrestrial services, and noted that it should supersede the previous WAC view. Kim particularly noted the need to change hard limits to a requirement for the various services to take reasonable steps to protect EESS (passive), and that power levels should be left in square brackets until final determinations are made. The Chair asked for any objections to the document, there were none, and the document was approved.

C. Agenda Item 1.12

The Chair introduced a document from IWG-2 containing proposed changes to the RCS view on AI 1.12, which had been sent to IWG-1 for concurrence. There were no objections or modifications to the IWG-2 changes, and so IWG-1 concurred with the document as submitted.

4. Other Business

There was none.

5. Next meeting

The Chair stated that there would not be another meeting before the June CITEL. Next meeting date/time has yet to be determined.