

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

PLENARY MEETING

Addendum 8 to
Document 6(Add.21)-E
5 October 2015
Original: English

United States of America

PROPOSALS FOR THE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE

Agenda item 7(H)

7 to consider possible changes, and other options, in response to Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference, an advance publication, coordination, notification and recording procedures for frequency assignments pertaining to satellite networks, in accordance with Resolution **86 (Rev.WRC-07)** to facilitate rational, efficient, and economical use of radio frequencies and any associated orbits, including the geostationary-satellite orbit;

7(H) Issue H – Using one space station to bring frequency assignments at different orbital locations into use within a short period of time

Background

No. 11.44B and No. 11.49 of the Radio Regulations were revised at WRC-12 in order to clarify issues regarding the bringing into use, or resumption of use after a suspension, of frequency assignments associated with satellite networks.

While adopting these revised provisions WRC-12 recognized that the issue of using one space station to bring frequency assignments at different orbital locations into use within a short period of time was not the intent of these revised provisions. WRC-12 also noted, “There are legitimate reasons why an administration or operator may need to move a spacecraft from one orbital position to a new orbital position, and care should be taken not to constrain the legitimate use of fleet manoeuvres and management.” In its plenary meeting, WRC-12 also requested the BR, until ITU-R studies are completed, to query to administrations as to the last previous orbital location/frequency assignments brought into use with that satellite and make such information available, where an administration brings into use frequency assignments at a given orbital location using an already in-orbit satellite.

In practice, multiple examples exist of cases where a single satellite may be required to bring into use frequency assignments at different locations in a short period of time. These cases include where the timing of events may change the evaluation of whether a case is considered “justifiable” or not. What does seem to emerge from consideration of all of the cases in the CPM Report is that

the possibility for misuse of the BIU and suspension provisions only seems to arise for cases of an in-orbit satellite bringing into use frequency assignments at multiple orbital locations within a short period of time, while at the same time leaving one or more of the previously occupied orbital locations vacant for some period of time. However, even under these circumstances, there do appear to be cases where such actions could be justified as reflected in the CPM Report. As such, it is not possible to construct specific regulatory provisions to address the case of a single satellite bringing into use frequency assignments at multiple orbital locations within a short period of time. At best, it may be possible to require Administrations, in certain cases, to provide additional information when declaring that frequency assignments have been brought into use using an in-orbit satellite.

Proposal

The United States supports Method H2, no change to Article 11 of the Radio Regulations, as the Radiocommunication Bureau can already query an administration in those cases where an in-orbit satellite is used to BIU an orbital location.

NOC **USA/6A21A8/1**

ARTICLE 11

**Notification and recording of frequency
assignments^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7bis} (WRC-12)**

Reasons: It is not possible to address unjustifiable cases of satellite hopping without potentially constraining the legitimate use of satellite fleet manoeuvres and management.
