UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DRAFT PRELIMINARY VIEWS ON WRC-11

AGENDA ITEM 7: to consider possible changes in response to Resolution 86 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference: "Advance publication, coordination, notification and recording procedures for frequency assignments pertaining to satellite networks", in accordance with Resolution 86 (Rev.WRC-07)

ISSUE: Application of Nos. 9.51 and 9.52 with respect to coordination under No. 9.7

BACKGROUND: For sake of discussion assume that the coordination request of a network of administration A has been published and that administration B has been identified by the Bureau under No. **9.7** as one of the administrations with which coordination has to be effected.

Then, according No. **9.51**, administration B, within four months of the publication of the coordination request, shall "either inform the requesting administration of its agreement or act under No. **9.52**", with the latter meaning that administration B will express its disagreement, i.e. the need for coordination.

In the vast majority of cases, administrations respond in accordance with No. **9.52** without providing any reasons for their disagreement. It is certainly the easiest and safest way to proceed.

It follows from the above that the required formal answer under Nos. **9.51** or **9.52** has lost its value in the framework of GSO to GSO coordination. An improvement to this aspect of the process can be realized by lifting the mandatory nature of this requirement for coordination requests made under No. **9.7** (GSO vs. GSO).

In an improved process, after the coordination request of a satellite network of administration A is published together with the initial list of administrations and corresponding provisional list of satellite networks with which coordination has to be effected, administrations would review this list. In case an administration wants to add or remove itself and/or a network, then it would send this request to the Bureau, as well as to administration A, within four months of the date of publication of the coordination request. However, if an administration agrees with the initial list of administrations and provisional list of corresponding networks published by the Bureau, no action would be required. In particular, an administration already included in the list would not be removed from the final list due to lack of response under No.**9.52** as such lack of a response would be understood by the Bureau to mean that this administration believes that coordination with one or more of its networks is required. Removing the requirement to respond under No. **9.52** will eliminate a significant amount of

correspondence that in most cases does not contribute in any way to expedite coordination process.

Consequential changes to Article 9 of the Radio Regulations will be required in order to implement these proposals.

U.S. VIEW: The United States is of the view that changes to Article 9 of the Radio Regulations are required so that: (1) if an administration, in respect to a coordination request from another administration, is not in a position to give its agreement under No. **9.51** then this administration would not need to respond to such a request; and (2) the lack of such a response would be understood by the Bureau to mean that this administration believes that coordination with one or more of its networks is required.

_____