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WRC-19 Agenda Items:
1.5, 1.13, 10, 9.1.7
Optimizing the Use of Existing Satellite Spectrum to meet growing demand for new satellite services
GSC Position:
Establish provisions for aeronautical, maritime, land ESIM operations within GSO FSS networks at 17.7-19.7 GHz & 27.5-29.5 GHz, with technical & regulatory protection mechanisms for the FSS, FS, MSS & EESS operations

Resolution 156 adopted at WRC-15
Recognizes the need for global broadband mobile-satellite communications

ESIMs communicating with FSS space stations

AI 1.5 (Resolution 158)
Regulated operation of ESIMs to meet increasing demand for mobility applications

AI 1.5 ESIMs in the FSS Ka-band
Demand for satellite mobility applications

Aeronautical Market:
• 100+ commercial airlines offer IFC = a $40B opportunity for airlines by 2035
• 8200+ commercial aircraft connected
• Connecting passengers. Reducing fuel consumption & delays. Improving route planning.

Maritime Market:
• 20 000 VSAT enabled vessels (75000 by 2028)
• Drivers: crew & passenger connectivity, more sensors/applications for operational vessel monitoring, route planning & vessel tracking, autonomous vessels.
AI 1.5 ESIMs in the FSS Ka-band

Proposals from regional groups: CITEL (doc 11); RCC (doc 12); CEPT (doc 16); APT (doc 24); ATU (doc 46); ASMG (doc 29) + various multi-country and individual country proposals

Common elements:

⇒ General support for new Resolution to address ESIM in 17.7-19.7 GHz & 27.5-29.5 GHz
⇒ Operation of ESIM within envelope of GSO FSS network characteristics & verification of compliance with envelope by BR (based on CR/C or notified network data)
⇒ 70km off-shore distance for maritime ESIM in which prior agreement from coastal state is needed to operate
⇒ Sharing between GSO ESIMs & non-GSO FSS or non-GSO MSS feeder links to be based on existing coordination procedures

Some elements still need to be resolved
1/ Technical requirements for A-ESIM (pfd limit values, possible altitude limit)

- GSC supports “Option 1” pfd limits (based on results of sharing studies with terrestrial services, including 5G)
- Altitude limit is not necessary, provided Option 1 pfd limits are adopted & notifying administrations provide a commitment of compliance.
- GSC has major concerns with feasibility for BR to run compliance check with pfd limit. Compliance should be a condition of ESIM authorization.

2/ Reference bandwidth for ESIM EIRP limits (1 MHz reference bandwidth or 14 MHz reference bandwidth)

- GSC supports 14 MHz reference bandwidth: smallest bandwidth for terrestrial service receivers. Hence the EIRP limit towards the horizon for M-ESIM is 24.44 dB(W/14 MHz). A-ESIM pfd limit should be expressed in 14 MHz reference bandwidth to avoid unnecessarily restrictive limits on A-ESIM operation.
3/ Conditions for sharing with non-GSO FSS and non-GSO MSS feeder links

- GSC supports inclusion ESIM power limits only in 27.5-28.6 GHz, coordination under 9.11A in 28.6-29.5 GHz

4/ Annex 3 guidelines (possible inclusion of guidelines to the Resolution)

- Annex 3 is unnecessary: ideas already clearly defined in main body of Resolution.

5/ Status of the protection limits for terrestrial services (Annex 2 of the Resolution)

- Maritime & aeronautical ESIMs meet pfd limits/minimum off-shore distance, to avoid unacceptable interference to the terrestrial services operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations within line-of-sight and on a co-frequency basis

- Compliance with these limits should be a necessary **and** sufficient condition for ESIM to meet its requirements with respect to terrestrial services
**STUDY ASSUMPTIONS:**

**AI 1.13 in 26 GHz vs ESIM in 28 GHz**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>AI 1.13 26 GHz STUDIES MS INTERFERENCE INTO FSS</th>
<th>AI 1.5 OPTION 2 PFD MASK ESIM (FSS) INTO MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of interference evaluation method</td>
<td>Statistical (Monte Carlo) ITU-R M.2101</td>
<td>Worst-case (deterministic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and operational characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network loading factor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>ESIM duty cycle not considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDD activity factor</td>
<td>BS:80%, UE:20%</td>
<td>Not considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE body loss</td>
<td>4 dB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenna pointing</td>
<td>BS antenna beam not pointed toward the horizon</td>
<td>BS antenna beam pointed towards horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutter loss</td>
<td>ITU-R P.2108 (up to 20-30 dB)</td>
<td>0 dB clutter loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarisation loss</td>
<td>3 dB</td>
<td>0 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INTERFERENCE REDUCTION CONSIDERED</td>
<td>&gt;20 dB</td>
<td>&gt;20 dB APPLICABLE, BUT NOT CONSIDERED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 degree elevation limitation (red)
GSC Position
Agenda Item 1.13 - IMT

ISSUE
Identification of frequency bands, among candidate bands listed in Resolution 238, for future development of IMT
... while preserving access to satellite spectrum for existing & future users
Additional spectrum for IMT

- A huge amount of spectrum has been studied
- More than enough to find ‘more spectrum’ for IMT
- New identifications should only be made against certain key principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency band(s)</th>
<th>Band(s) CPM Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.25-27.5 GHz</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8-33.4 GHz</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40.5 GHz</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.5-43.5 GHz</td>
<td>D &amp; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.5-47.2 GHz</td>
<td>F &amp; G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.2-50.2 GHz &amp; 50.4-52.6 GHz</td>
<td>H &amp; I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-71 GHz</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-76 GHz &amp; 81-86 GHz</td>
<td>K &amp; L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 33.25 GHz

Consider ONLY bands of Res. 238 (WRC-15)
Harmonisation of spectrum is key
IMT identification with reasonable sharing conditions between IMT & satellite services
The GSC recommends IMT identifications at WRC-19 stay within:

◆ **26 GHz**: 24.25-27.5 GHz globally (3.25 GHz)
◆ **40 GHz**: 37-40 GHz in Region 2 and 40.5-43.5 GHz in Regions 1 and 3 (3 GHz)
◆ **66 GHz**: 66-71 GHz globally (5 GHz)

⇒ with reasonable sharing conditions & measures to ensure co-existence between IMT & satellite services:

- Power / pointing conditions on IMT base stations to protect FSS receivers, with no undue constraints on IMT
- Assistance to administrations in defining measures for future FSS earth station deployment

**11.25 GHz** above 24 GHz for IMT in each ITU-R Region
Proposed power and pointing conditions for IMT base stations do not put undue constraints on IMT.

Max power level provided by IMT, TRP limit proposed and RR 21.5

- IMT base station TRP levels (dBm/200 MHz)
  - 37 dBm/200 MHz (= assumption + margin)
  - + 12 dB margin from ITU studies
  - 25 dBm/200 MHz (= assumption provided by IMT for ITU studies)
Proposed power + pointing conditions for IMT base stations do not put undue constraints on IMT

IMT base stations all transmit below horizon, with a downtilt angle

No transmissions towards the sky

All transmissions with downtilt angle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37-39.5 GHz</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.5-40 GHz</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-40.5 GHz</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.5-42 GHz</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-43.5 GHz</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
<td>HDFSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bands should not be identified for IMT in a Region where it is not intended for use by IMT.

Global economies of scale for IMT equipment can be achieved through identification of 3 GHz of spectrum for IMT in each ITU Region.

There is no need for a global 6 GHz wide band for IMT.

Handsets used today are can already support multiple frequency bands AND can accommodate regional band differences.
GSC Position
Agenda Item 10
(C-Band)

Crucial Issue

- Can IMT replace the services that will be displaced?
- Do alternatives exist to provide these services?
C-band usage varies around the world

Every region has unique needs ⇒ One size does not fit all
Amount of spectrum licensed in 2014 since 2014

Less than 50% of licensed spectrum is actually being used by IMT today

Source: “Worldwide Licensing and Use of IMT Spectrum”, LS telcom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Distribution</td>
<td>C-band is used to deliver high quality content via cable and other distribution networks to hundreds of millions of viewers and directly to tens of millions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Networks</td>
<td>C-band offers reliable backhaul for mobile networks in remote areas and provides capacity for large regions. In Indonesia between 6 and 15 million mobile subscribers are served via C-band, representing a total market value of up to $558 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>C-band is crucial where service level agreements set high reliability requirements. 75,000 antennas use C-band to dispense $400 million per day from Indonesian ATMs alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas, Mining and Resources</td>
<td>C-band supports mission-critical operations in remote areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Navigation, Flight Tracking,</td>
<td>C-band is used for networks which require wide coverage and very high reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>Global C-band coverage is crucial for vessels operating in remote regions or on long routes and for Safety of Life at Sea services. C-band is also of increasing importance for large vessels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemedicine</td>
<td>C-band supports the remote delivery of healthcare services, reaching otherwise underserved rural populations. 150,000 people a year are treated with the support of C-band in India alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-government</td>
<td>C-band solutions facilitate efficient delivery of services to underserved and unserved areas across Asia Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Programmes</td>
<td>C-band offers connectivity for field offices, programme deployment and disaster management in remote areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-existence between FSS and 5G in adjacent bands must be carefully managed

- Satellite earth stations are very sensitive to terrestrial interference
- 5G signals can interfere with FSS receive earth stations in two ways:
  - Saturate the LNB of the earth station, even if the 5G signal is adjacent to the satellite signal
  - Out-of-Band-Emissions (OOBE) and Spurious Emissions (SE) of the 5G signal can cause in-band interference to FSS signals
- OOBE levels specified in 3GPP standards do not protect FSS signals in adjacent bands
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Issue

◆ Can IMT replace the services that will be displaced?
◆ 33 GHz has just been studied, should even more spectrum for IMT really be studied?
The GSC is of the view that there is **no need** for any additional spectrum to be identified for IMT:

- **WRC-19**, under AI 1.13, is expected to identify **many GHz** of new spectrum for IMT
- **Significant** amount of unlicensed or unused spectrum is **already** identified for IMT –
  - ⇒ Around the world, less than 50% of available spectrum is licensed
- **6-24 GHz range covers core bands for the satellite industry**: C-, X, Ku- and Ka-band
  - ⇒ Many satellites operate in these bands => heavily used for applications e.g. broadcasting DTH, VSAT, SNG, broadband, security, etc.

**Any identification of IMT in the 6-24 GHz range will:**

- Interfere with existing satellite services
- Negatively impact existing investments
- Harm competition by limiting the ability of satellite operators to meet the growing demands of satellite users, including government
To address concerns raised with unauthorised earth stations while preserving regulatory certainty & flexibility
The GSC recognizes the concerns of administrations affected by unauthorized operation of earth stations terminals:

- Re Issue 2a (Annex to Resolution 958 WRC-15): GSC supports Option 1 *NO CHANGE* to Radio Regulations (international regulatory measures already addressed appropriately with Art 18)

- Additional *Regulatory Measures will not resolve this problem* of illegal transmissions

Thank you!