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1. **Agenda Item 7 Issue G - Updating the AP30/30A reference situation**

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)**, in order to facilitate rational, efficient and economical use of radio frequencies and any associated orbits, including the geostationary‑satellite orbit.

1. **APT Common Proposals and APT Views for WRC-19 (which has been submitted to WRC-19)**

APT Members do not support Method G2 in the CPM Report.

APT Members could not agree on a common view and decided not to develop Preliminary APT Common Proposal (PACP) for Agenda Item 7 Issue G.

1. **Topics proposed by other regional Groups or ITU Members which are not included in no. 2 above**

CITEL supports Method G3 (NOC) for Region 2.

RCC and Japan supports Method G3 (NOC).

CEPT, ASMG, ATU, Indonesia, Vietnam, Singapore and Samoa support Method G1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Method in CPM Report** | **Proponents of Methods of APT Members at APG19-5 / WRC-19** |
| Method G1 | Indonesia, Vietnam, Singapore, Samoa, Australia, Malaysia, Korea |
| Method G2 | - |
| Method G3 | Japan, China |

1. **Progress of discussion during WRC-19 on the Agenda Item**

*This is the Final Report for Agenda Item 7 Issue G.*

The meeting agreed to the modified Method G1 as follows:

4.1.18*bis* When requesting the application of § 4.1.18, the notifying administration shall undertake to meet the requirements of § 4.1.20 and provide to the administration in respect of which § 4.1.18 is applied, with a copy to the Bureau, a description of the steps by which it undertakes to meet these requirements. Once an assignment is entered in the List provisionally under the provisions of § 4.1.18, the calculation of the equivalent protection margin (EPM)[[1]](#footnote-1)9 of an assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 List or for which the procedure of Article 4 has been initiated and which was the basis for the disagreement shall not take into account the interference produced by the assignment for which the provisions of § 4.1.18 have been applied. When the recording of an assignment entered into the List is changed from provisional to definitive in accordance with § 4.1.18, but there is still continuing disagreement between the administrations, the Bureau shall consult with the administration responsible for the assignments which were the basis for the disagreement in determining the appropriate course of action as regards any update to the EPM for the assignments which were the basis for the disagreement.     (WRC‑19)

Most administrations except CITEL, RCC, Japan support Method G1. In SWG5B1, Japan proposed to modify 4.1.20 of AP30/30A in addition to Method G1 (modification of 4.1.18bis). The draft modification of 4.1.20 was discussed but did not obtain the agreement. Thereafter, the Chairman proposed to incorporate the current practice of BR into the modification of 4.1.18bis. The administrations including RCC and Japan agreed this proposal.

1. **Issues which require discussion at APT Coordination Meetings and seek guidance thereafter**

None.

1. 9 For the definition of EPM, see § 3.4 of Annex 5.     (WRC‑03) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)