

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2013/10/24 : CIA-RDP90G00152R000300360004-4

STAT

Page Denied

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2013/10/24 : CIA-RDP90G00152R000300360004-4

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
87-42477

~~UNCLASSIFIED OFFICIAL USE~~



United States Department of State

*Bureau of
International Communications
and Information Policy*

Washington, D.C. 20520

September 3, 1987

TO: SIG Membership on ICIP
FROM: CIP - Diana Lady Dougan, U.S. Coordinator
SUBJECT: Material for September 9 Meeting

I am providing for your consideration a number of documents which will serve as the basis for our discussions at the September 9 meeting.

attachments:

1. Agenda
2. Mobile WARC Scope Paper
3. Mobile WARC Home Team Information
4. Discussion Paper on U.S. Satellite Policy

~~UNCLASSIFIED OFFICIAL USE~~

DCI
EXEC
REG

B601-ik

Agenda
Senior Interagency Group
on
International Communications and Information Policy

Wednesday, September 9, 1987
Deputy Secretary's Conference Room
Department of State

Opening Remarks

Under Secretary Derwinski

Topic I - Mobile WARC

Scope Paper

Chairman Markey

Home Team

Mr. Richards

Topic II - U.S. International Satellite Policy

**Introduction of Separate Satellite
and Transborder Satellite Policies**

Ambassador Dougan

Discussion of Options Paper

**Messers. Earnest and
Firestone**

Topic III - Other Business

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

SCOPE PAPER

World Administrative Radio Conference
for the Mobile Services

International Telecommunication Union

Geneva, Switzerland

September 14 - October 16, 1987

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

CONTENTS

- Introduction and Overview
 - Relationship to other International or Regional Organizations
 - General Objectives
 - General Strategies to Attain Objectives
 - General Preparatory Effort
- Positions on Specific Issues
 - Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)
 - Mobile Satellite Service Frequency Allocations (MSS)
 - Radiodetermination Satellite Service Frequency Allocations (RDSS)
 - Revision of the High Frequency Band
 - Other
 - Operator Certificates
 - Political
 - Other Allocation Issues
 - Future Allocation Conference
 - Other Maritime Matters
 - Geographical Boundaries in the Aeronautical Route Plan
 - Geographical Country Symbols in the Aeronautical Off-Route Plan
 - Radio ID of Non-Combatants and Neutrals
 - Technical Matters
 - Land Mobile Matters

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

INTRODUCTION
AND
OVERVIEW OF ITU MOBILE SERVICES
WORLD ADMINISTRATIVE RADIO CONFERENCE

Introduction

The scope of the Conference is broad, consisting of over 150 agenda items. It covers about two-thirds of the ITU Radio Regulations exclusively reserved to the mobile services and consists of substantive material covered by both the 1974 Maritime Conference and the 1978 Aeronautical Conference. The Conference, to be convened on September 14 for five weeks, will also implement frequency allocation decisions of the 1979 General Conference and carry out resolutions of the 1983 Mobile Conference which was limited to urgent matters, and develop new radio regulations to facilitate improvements in international commerce, open new markets for telecommunications suppliers and contribute to national security interests.

Ships and aircraft travel worldwide. As a result, frequencies for communications between mobile stations and land stations range throughout the frequency spectrum; i.e., high frequencies for long-range communications, medium-range frequencies for distances on the order of 100 miles; very high frequencies for distances on the order of 20-30 miles or less. Satellite frequencies and systems also play an increasingly important role in mobile services communications. Positioning and navigation systems for aircraft and ships also require use of frequencies worldwide. Increasingly, land mobile communications such as long distance fleet dispatch, cellular radio systems and land mobile satellite systems expand beyond the borders of a country. Detailed provisions concerning the mobile services are necessary for well-coordinated operational and technical procedures to assure interoperability among systems worldwide.

The recent HF Broadcasting Conference and MF Broadcasting Conference were planning conferences. Each concentrated on a limited part of the spectrum and on mass communications. The Mobile WARC deals with many frequency spectrum areas as well as terrestrial and satellite telecommunications, and positioning and navigation. For these reasons, Mobile WARC is closer in scope to the 1979 General WARC than any of the recent conferences.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Relationships with Other International Organizations

In preparing for this Conference, the United States and other countries are aware of the relationships which exist with other intergovernmental organizations whose activities affect the preparations for this Conference. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) determines radio equipment carriage requirements for ships on international voyages. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) develops standards and recommended practices for avionics equipment. The International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT) is an operational satellite organization now providing communications services to ships and, in the future, to aircraft. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) - within the NATO Alliance the Allied Radio Frequency Agency (ARFA) is responsible for the development of military radio frequency management. Regional telecommunications organizations include the Inter-American Telecommunications Conference (CITEL) and the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (CEPT). These organizations play a role in coordinating views on matters of common interest.

For example, the CEPT, comprising more than twenty countries, through the encouragement of the European Economic Commission (EEC) has, for the first time, found a wide basis for European common positions. Sixteen common proposals have been submitted, each sponsored by five to eleven European countries. These countries comprise a formidable challenge to the U.S. where our proposals differ from theirs. We have been successful in adopting some common CITEL views, and we expect these will serve to offset some of the CEPT common proposals.

General Objectives

The following broad U.S. goals have been identified from the outset of the preparatory effort more than three years ago:

- to provide up-to-date regulations assuring safety of life and shipping on the high seas and the smooth flow of world maritime communications;
- to provide for safety of life and property in aeronautical services and the smooth flow of aeronautical communications;
- to provide flexibility in the international regulations for ensuring that U.S. future needs are met;

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

- to reduce regulatory, technical and operational barriers, thus permitting introduction of new competitive technologies and creating markets for U.S. exports, for example, for new satellite services.
- to protect national security interests.

General Strategies to Attain Objectives

The U.S. draft proposals were distributed widely over a year ago with the exception of the mobile satellite proposals. The U.S. document has been examined carefully by other countries in preparing proposals and positions to the Conference. As a result, we have identified in advance some broad areas of agreement. We have also identified some troublesome areas with implementing the global maritime distress and safety system (GMDSS) and HF communications but have determined these to be manageable for the most part. Bilateral consultations have been held with key Pacific, East and West European, and American countries. Opportunities at multilateral meetings (IMO, ICAO, ARFA (NATO's Allied Radio Frequency Agency), INMARSAT, CITELE, CEPT) have been used to advance U.S. proposals.

Cables have been sent worldwide, to regional areas, and to specific countries. We have used our posts abroad to explain our proposals, obtain comments and provide feedback so that other country thinking is factored into our proposals and position papers.

There is continuing difficulty around the world for acceptance of global allocations for mobile satellite service and radiodetermination satellite service. Jointly with Canada and its private sector (most recently in Mexico) we have explained the needs and benefits of MSS, in particular for Region 2. Consultations will continue through the Conference. Canada agreed to concentrate on some countries (e.g., Venezuela, Colombia), the U.S. on others (e.g., Argentina, Chile). Brazil, a key country in the Western Hemisphere, and a major obstacle to general mobile satellite allocations, will require continued attention.

General Preparatory Effort

U.S. preparations for the Mobile WARC began in 1983. Under the direction of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) subcommittee on Mobile WARC (Ad Hoc 194), whose membership included representatives from all Government agencies initially reviewed the entirety of the Radio

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

regulations to prepare U.S. views on the scope and agenda of the Conference. Once the international agenda was agreed, the Ad Hoc group developed proposals on the conference issues. The Federal Communications Commission, through its public advisory committee, was the primary means for determining private sector needs. This extensive private sector effort consisted of representatives of users, manufacturers and service providers. The Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy in the Department of State, in early 1986, designated an Executive Director to coordinate the overall preparatory efforts for the Conference. Through close cooperation of private sector and the Government, draft U.S. proposals were completed in June 1986 and distributed widely at multilateral and bilateral meetings.

In October 1986, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce David Markey was named Chairman of the U.S. Delegation with the rank of Ambassador and has since held regular meetings with key individuals from State, Commerce, the FCC, NASA, Defense, FAA and the private sector. In March an initial delegation was nominated. The delegation has since been working on position papers addressing issues that will arise at the Conference. These papers address in detail fallback positions.

Except for the mobile satellite proposals, the U.S. distributed its draft proposals in June 1986, well in advance of others, seeking to gain their acceptance before other countries formalized proposals. The mobile satellite proposals were late developing because domestic decisions on frequency re-allocation did not occur until September 1986. The U.S. proposals, some 250 pages, were sent to the ITU in March 1987.

Beginning in early 1987, Ambassador Markey and members of the delegation undertook an extensive round of bilateral and multilateral consultations with developed and developing countries. Based on experience gained from foreign consultations, the delegation completed additional technical information papers to further explain our proposals, in particular, our satellite proposals.

Positions on Specific Issues

The major part of the agenda is considered to be straight-forward. Technical and operational provisions for maritime and aeronautical services are detailed, and in some respects contentious, but expected to be manageable. The issues of major importance to the United States are: implementing the global maritime distress and safety system (GMDSS), including the treatment of the current distress system; mobile satellite service (MSS) frequency allocations;

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

radiodetermination satellite service (RDSS) frequency allocations; and the overall revision of the high frequency bands which will have a great effect on maritime radiocommunications.

Other issues which will have greater importance to other countries include geographical boundaries in the aeronautical route plan, country symbols in the aeronautical off route plan, radio identification of non-combatants, land mobile matters and other allocation issues.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)

General - The development of a GMDSS was initiated within the International Maritime Organization (IMO) in 1978 for SOLAS Convention ships. It is a ship-to-shore distress system rather than a ship-to-ship distress system and will introduce significant new technology. The U.S. strongly supports the GMDSS and has been extremely influential in forming IMO recommendations on the subject. The Mobile WARC will incorporate the GMDSS within the Radio Regulations (RR) system, including its technical and operational procedures. Developing countries are reluctant to give up the current system, which is still a mandatory part of the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Convention, and introduce the new system because of economic, political and social factors, as well as a perception that the new equipment needs to be fully tested before its full implementation. As a result, an issue the U.S. will face is the period and method of transition from the old system to the new system; it is unlikely that the Conference will accept the IMO recommendation in this regard.

Objectives - The U.S. considers that the implementation of the GMDSS in the ITU Radio Regulations is important for two reasons. First, it is necessary to provide regulations using currently available communication techniques which represent a marked improvement in advanced technology over the current manual Morse system. This new system will significantly improve the safety of life and property at sea. Second, economic benefit will accrue to the U.S. Government and non-government maritime community by virtue of the use of more automated communication means which are less labor intensive. The U.S. goal is to provide the international regulatory framework which facilitates the introduction of the GMDSS. Specifically, our proposals were patterned after recommendations of the IMO. We create a new chapter containing provisions for the GMDSS, modify the existing Chapter IX to continue provisions to maintain the current 2182 kHz and 156.8 MHz, maintain an effective distress system during the transitional period, continue the regulatory framework for the maritime distress system of non-SOLAS Convention ships, and provide adequate flexibility so that administrations will not be required by the Radio Regulations to operate two parallel distress systems (the current 500 kHz system and the GMDSS).

Issues - The main U.S. issue is that, after we have implemented the GMDSS in the U.S., we do not want to be forced to additionally operate the current 500 kHz distress system. Accordingly, we have proposed termination dates in the existing

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Chapter IX and a new Resolution A8 to prevent this. Problems may be expected from countries which desire to continue with the current distress system indefinitely for national purposes. However, objections should abate as these administrations realize our proposals permit a flexibility in distress and safety system choices during and after the transition period.

Strategies - Proposals to change the current distress system to remove mandatory provisions from the Radio Regulations will receive strong opposition. There will be heated discussions between the countries adopting the IMO position and those wishing to continue the existing distress system. The modified position adopted by the U.S. could be an acceptable alternative. For that reason, we should not be taking the lead on this matter until both sides decide that a compromise is in order. That is to say, strategically, our best chance of having our proposals accepted is for opposing extremes to adopt them as a compromise to their own positions.

Possible Fallback - The goal in our proposals is to incorporate the operational provisions for the GMDSS in the Radio Regulations while assuring that the U.S. does not have to maintain two parallel 500 kHz maritime distress systems. We can achieve this objective through flexibility in the Radio Regulations, recognizing that there is more than one way to accomplish our goals. Our primary objective is to assure the implementation of GMDSS and this is vitally important. As a fallback, we can accept a limited period beyond the end of the transition date, during which the existing 500 kHz system is continued. The period of dual system operation should be for the shortest time acceptable to the Conference.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Mobile Satellite Service (MSS) Frequency Allocations

General - In the United States and Canada there is a strong interest in providing domestic satellite communications to mobile users, in particular to land and aeronautical users. International maritime users are already served by INMARSAT. Recent domestic regulatory actions in both Canada and the U.S. have reallocated spectrum from exclusive aeronautical mobile satellite services, AMSS(R), to a mobile satellite service (MSS) allocation which could be used by systems offering aeronautical, land and maritime services. Licensing of systems using this spectrum is underway in the United States.

In order to provide for introduction of such systems worldwide and to protect U.S. systems from interference under the ITU Radio Regulations, the U.S. is proposing to reallocate spectrum from the maritime mobile satellite bands (presently used by INMARSAT) and the aeronautical mobile satellite (R) bands (presently unused) to mobile satellite. This proposal, though more encompassing than our domestic allocation, is consistent with the U.S. domestic decisions.

The U.S. faces significant resistance to the MSS proposal, particularly from ICAO members because the aeronautical interests wish to protect their existing exclusive allocation. ICAO has been organizing its membership worldwide to oppose the mobile satellite proposals at 1.5/1.6 GHz in order to retain this spectrum for an aeronautical mobile satellite system. Opposition is also coming from Europe because the U.S. mobile satellite proposals are seen to be potentially harmful to economic interests of INMARSAT. In addition, a low-cost MSS providing land mobile in Europe is viewed as a potential threat to a European-wide terrestrial mobile service because of competition for revenues as well as spectrum. Except for Canada, we were unable to get significant regional support at the recent CITELE meeting. Canada, Australia and Japan have shown the most active interest in the land mobile satellite services. The CEPT, with INMARSAT's agreement, claims that only 500 kHz of spectrum is needed for land mobile satellite service (for low speed data services) in Europe. Voice requirements would require much greater bandwidth.

Objectives - 1) Provide for the implementation of mobile satellite service systems worldwide by allocating sufficient spectrum for this service, so that U.S. entities can provide services with international protection; 2) ensure ITU allocation status for the mobile satellite service in order to obtain international recognition and protection from interference; 3) encourage the development of economic and

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

efficient aeronautical mobile satellite services by sharing the development and operational expense with other MSS user groups; 4) discourage regulatory encumbrances in implementing MSS systems; and 5) assure priority access and pre-emptible capability for aeronautical mobile satellite (R) communications.

Issues -

Overcoming EC opposition based on perceived difficulties with plans for a terrestrial mobile system.

Overcoming the organizational opposition by ICAO to the introduction of mobile satellite systems in spectrum presently allocated exclusively to the aeronautical service.

Overcoming the opposition of the CEPT countries which is based upon potential economic harm to the INMARSAT system and the lack of requirements in Europe for this service.

Overcoming many administrations' preference to making provision for satellite aeronautical public correspondence in systems using AMSS(R) bands.

Strategies - The U.S. can argue that if land mobile satellite is not needed in certain areas, the allocation to MSS is flexible such that other services can be offered. The U.S. has pushed the flexibility of MSS, particularly the benefits to INMARSAT, and will continue to do so. We will also assure other Administrations of our commitment to a strong INMARSAT and minimum changes to current maritime services. We will characterize MSS as a long term logical development in most Administrations' interest, but that at least U.S. and Canada need immediate allocation recognition. Information papers on MSS have been prepared for distribution at the Conference.

We will steadfastly oppose proposals that introduce any communications other than safety and regularity of flight into the AMSS(R) service. We will stress the point that aeronautical public correspondence can be accommodated without diluting the definition of AMSS(R) Service by providing an appropriate allocation such as a mobile satellite allocation.

Some Administrations may link RDSS and MSS for negotiation purposes. We will try to avoid this.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Possible Fallbacks - Some fallbacks include a multi-regional allocation with country exceptions, a Western Hemisphere-only allocation, the U.S. domestic (split-band) arrangement for worldwide use, a multi-administration note, a resolution or other statement encouraging the development of MSS by Administrations, and flexibility on the maritime band proposals. There are also other variations and combinations of these fallbacks that can be considered.

Unacceptable elements would include allocations subject to agreement or coordination which would in effect give other Administrations a veto over the U.S.

In any event, dynamics of the Conference will influence detailed fallback positions. The U.S. delegation will recommend a course of action and obtain Washington concurrence.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Radiodetermination Satellite Service (RDSS) Allocations

General - Entrepreneurs in the United States have introduced the concept of a satellite service which provides the ability to locate a mobile platform which would find broad application in the transportation industry and to individuals requiring positioning information. The U.S. table of frequency allocations has been modified to permit this concept to be implemented. Licenses were granted to four U.S. companies to move toward an operational system in the U.S.

Recently, a European consortium has been formed to provide a service, using the U.S. concept. Support for this type of service has been expressed in feasibility studies in Australia, China and India. These countries intend to include this capability in their next generation of domestic satellites.

The Radio Regulations permit a portion of the band proposed by the U.S. for RDSS to be used for radio relay links in the Federal Republic of Germany. Some of this use is by the U.S. military under the Status of Forces Agreement.

Objectives -

- 1) To gain recognition in the Radio Regulations for the Radiodetermination Satellite Service concept by allocating sufficient spectrum for this service. Such allocations would permit this service to begin operation initially in North America and would permit its orderly expansion globally;
- 2) Ensure the allocation status for the Radiodetermination Satellite Service in order to obtain international recognition and protection from interference from other systems; and
- 3) Provide an opportunity for U.S. entities to compete in the international marketplace to provide this service.

Issues -

- 1) Overcoming concerns expressed by NATO members concerning sharing frequency allocations at 1.6 GHz between the Radiodetermination Satellite Service and the Fixed Service. The Federal Republic of Germany has argued that radio relay systems used by NATO under RR 730 will be adversely affected.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

2) Overcoming concerns expressed by members of the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (CEPT) concerning the need for such a service internationally. INMARSAT claims that it can provide this service.

3) Overcoming concerns expressed by CEPT members that Radiodetermination Satellite Service includes communications services and has safety connotations. The FRG has stated that it opposes an allocation for the Radiodetermination Satellite Service since a significant use is for low data rate communications. Other CEPT countries feel that RDSS has safety connotations, and should not be allocated spectrum on a co-equal basis with a non-safety service.

4) Overcoming concerns expressed by CEPT members as to why a Radiodetermination Satellite Service could not operate on a secondary basis.

5) Overcoming concerns expressed by CEPT and others concerning the competency of the Conference to suppress allocations for other radio services presently allocated in the bands.

6) Overcoming concerns expressed by U.S. Radiodetermination Satellite Service entities that allocations for Radiodetermination Satellite Service should not be subject to the coordination and agreement procedures. These procedures require agreement of another administration before notification and recording in the Master International Frequency Register of frequency assignments.

7) Overcoming concerns expressed by the radio astronomy community about sharing in the 1610.6-1613.8 MHz band for deep space observations. The U.S. proposal for sharing between the Radiodetermination Satellite Service and Radio Astronomy Service may not be satisfactory for all administrations.

Strategy -

Apart from the U.S. proposals, three additional conference documents have been developed which cover in detail the operation, technical aspects and sharing criteria which answer most questions we expect to face. Our delegation will seek out experts from the CEPT countries, INMARSAT administrations, and other delegations which have shown reluctance to support Radiodetermination Satellite Service allocations to explain in

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

detail our proposals and how they accommodate their stated concerns. We will cite favorable recognition for Radiodetermination Satellite Service from the Special Meeting of CCIR Study Group 8, and from the Resolution adopted by the CITEP Permanent Technical Committee. IMO and the ICAO have also indicated that RDSS would be beneficial. An African resolution favoring RDSS has also been adopted by a regional civil aviation group.

U.S. delegates will work closely with delegates from India, China and the administrations represented by the European Radiodetermination Satellite Service consortium to gain support from administrations not yet committed on the allocation issue. The U.S. delegation member from the National Science Foundation will seek out radioastronomers to discuss potential sharing arrangements for their particular location. A specific radio astronomy sharing proposal has been presented to the Soviets during bilateral discussions and will be followed by discussions in Geneva.

To answer the concerns expressed by the FRG (acting on behalf of their guest NATO forces), U.S. delegates representing DOD agencies will seek out counterparts in the FRG, UK and other NATO countries to assure them that the U.S. will not propose suppressing Radio Regulation 730. Working with our NATO allies, we will attempt to persuade them not to object to the RDSS allocation.

Possible Fallbacks - The goal is to retain sufficient recognition in the Radio Regulations to enable U.S. companies to raise sufficient capital to implement and RDSS Service in the U.S. We also intend to provide sufficient flexibility in the international frequency allocation table for future interational development consistent with our domestic allocations.

During the Conference an effort will be made to develop as much recognition of RDSS as possible that can be agreed. There will be some who will not accept any allocation due to particular national problems existing in these bands. What is expected to evolve during discussions is a package for Radiodetermination Satellite Service implementation which may introduce fully acceptable allocations in some areas or regions and less than fully acceptable allocations or no provision in other areas or regions, or exception footnotes against the allocation by some Administrations. The delegation will have to consider other compromises which may evolve. Acceptability of any compromise would in the end be based on the extent of any restrictions to be placed on the service.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

For example, unacceptable elements would include allocations on a secondary basis or allocations subject to coordination and agreement which would in effect give other Administrations a veto over the U.S. It would be acceptable to defer action to suppress allocations for Fixed, Mobile, and Radiolocation Services in the 2.5 GHz band until a subsequent competent conference if RDSS allocations can be obtained on a co-equal basis. In this case, the delegation should work for the development of a resolution for a future competent conference to review the desirability of suppressing the allocations to those services.

In any event, dynamics of the Conference will influence detailed fallback positions. The U.S. delegation will recommend a course of action and obtain Washington concurrence.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Revision of the High Frequency Band

General - Since propagation characteristics in the range of the spectrum between 4 and 27.5 MHz enable long-range communications, traditionally, communications to ships at sea have been carried out in these bands. This reliance has not diminished, and in some respects, is increasing. The 1979 WARC, in recognition of this fact, reallocated certain frequency bands in this range of spectrum to the maritime mobile service. The Mobile WARC will rearrange an existing table of assignable frequencies to take account of the new spectrum made available in 1979. The U.S. proposals contain a very detailed plan on how this rearrangement should take place. Most objectives should be realized without significant problems except for the 4 and 8 MHz bands. To accomplish goals in these bands it will be necessary to use maritime mobile frequency spectrum shared with the fixed service, as provided by WARC 1979. We have received no support for our approach, either within the Region, Europe, or the Pacific, except for the USSR. We will have to take advantage of their support if we are to achieve success in the 4 and 8 MHz proposals.

The revision of the HF bands represents a major task on the agenda. Since the last revisions, many problems have risen, creating a crisis in maritime mobile HF communications. Technological advances in narrow-band direct printing and in other services have changed the way mariners communicate. Outmoded frequency arrangements and a shortage of spectrum are preventing the desired expansion of maritime communications services and are creating a severe congestion. To deal with these deficiencies, the 1983 Conference adopted a resolution as a guide to the 1987 WARC to revise the HF maritime mobile bands.

Objectives - U.S. objectives are to carry out the revision of HF maritime frequency spectrum called for by that resolution, tailored to our specific national needs expressed by Government and non-government elements in the development of our proposals. Summarized, our objectives are:

- (1) to introduce new spectrum allocated by WARC 1979 and incorporate the 4 and 8 MHz shared bands into the table of assignable frequencies;
- (2) to revise the HF maritime bands and provide additional radiotelephone and narrow-band direct-printing (NBDP) channels;
- (3) to provide the necessary HF GMDSS frequencies, continuing, as far as practicable, the same assignments currently in the Radio Regulations;

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

(4) to begin an orderly phaseout of (nondial) manual Morse telegraphy channels while still providing adequate spectrum for continuing use of Morse telegraphy;

(5) to preserve, without reduction, the same amount of spectrum now sub-allocated for coast station wideband telegraphy;

(6) to unite and increase, where practicable, the ship wideband sub-allocations which are now separated in frequency;

(7) to support oceanographic requirements; and

(8) to establish a complement of HF narrowband direct printing channels for high seas marine safety information broadcasts.

Issue - The chief issue is that the Conference may revise these bands on different principles than the U.S. For example, the WARC could maintain Morse telegraphy channels in greater quantity than we would like to see. A large number of developing countries will push this view, based on economics.

Strategy - Our major problem at the Conference will be those Administrations, such as within CEPT, which propose an arrangement which does not use the 4 and 8 MHz shared bands and which also reduces wideband telegraphy spectrum, either for ships or coast. Canada and Japan also present problems because they oppose use of the shared bands. The USSR, so far, is the only country proposing use of the shared bands. Along with Canada, it is also the only other country joining us in preserving unchanged the coast wideband spectrum.

Satisfactory agreements on numbers of channels, format of sub-allocations, oceanographic channels and phasing out CW over an extended period appear to be attainable. Use of the shared bands and retention of coast wideband spectrum will have the strongest opposition; however, these issues should be treated as non-negotiable. We will be taking the lead in pressing for these two objectives. The USSR should support us as they have made, in principle, the same proposals. We may have to use as a bargaining chip the regulatory provisions that affect the shared bands in order to obtain concessions to gain support for the use of the shared bands. South American countries and Canada should be supporting us in proposals to retain the coast wideband spectrum.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Fallback - Our fallback position will be turned toward accepting the USSR proposals because their proposals are the closest to ours in use of the shared bands and maintenance of coast station wideband spectrum.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Operator Certificates

Issues - Shipboard Radio Operators.

There are two sub-issues related to shipboard radio operators under discussion at MWARC:

- a) Should radio operators aboard ship in the GMDSS be dedicated full-time to the radio control's position, or can the radio operating duties be shared with other shipboard duties such as the navigating watch? and
- b) Should a full-time radio equipment maintenance individual be mandated aboard any or all SOLAS vessels?

Simply stated, the two above sub-issues can be rephrased as "What are the acceptable safety requirements aboard ship for radio operators?"

In today's manual Morse radiotelegraphy distress system, a radio operator having maintenance knowledge is mandated by the SOLAS and the Radio Regulations. The U.S. does not believe that it is necessary, under the agreed framework of the GMDSS, to require either a full-time radio operator, or a radio equipment maintenance individual in the future. There are no circumstances under which a full-time radio operator can be justified in the GMDSS. There are some circumstances under which a full-time equipment repair individual could be usefully employed, but these will vary from vessel to vessel, and from voyage to voyage. The IMO has tentatively agreed to a number of available GMDSS operator/maintenance options that would provide the flexibility necessary for the world's shipping industry, at the level of safety needed, without over-extension of requirements. The U.S. strongly supports the tentatively agreed IMO strategy.

Strategies - It is critical that the administrations at MWARC not undo what is tentatively agreed by the world's major shipping countries at IMO. The issue has been long-fought at IMO. It is in fact, the last major issue of the GMDSS and has only been recently, albeit tentatively, agreed within IMO. It will be considered again at the January 1988 and April 1988 sessions of the IMO Radiocommunications Sub-Committee and the Maritime Safety Committee, respectively. We know that, unfortunately, certain administrations (i.e., Greece, Spain and Romania) may try to undermine IMO agreements and try to achieve at MWARC what has not been possible at the IMO, viz., required carriage of a full-time radio operator or radio equipment maintenance person. The United States shipping industry, and cognizant Government agencies (USCG, FCC, MARAD) have made

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

quite clear that such a result is unacceptable as a requirement of international law. We will attempt to ensure coordination with the IMO countries during the WARC.

Possible Fallback - A U.S. reservation with the MWARC final protocol may be needed to preserve the IMO-identified options for the U.S. Congress with respect to anticipated amendments to the Communications Act.

Political

At every ITU Conference since 1981, Cuban delegations have raised Radio Marti or U.S. interference to Cuban radio systems, usually in a Protocol Statement but sometimes on the floor of the Conference. At the 1983 Mobile WARC, the Cubans complained about harmful interference from stations in the U.S. to the Cuban coastal network. As on previous occasions when these extraneous political issues have been raised, the U.S. delegation will seek instructions from the Home Team with a view to responding forcefully to any initiative by the Cuban Delegation.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Other Allocation Issues

In addition to the major allocation proposals made by the United States described above, other Administrations have proposed several significant allocation changes. Some of these may present substantial policy questions as the Conference progresses.

Feederlinks for Mobile Satellite -

Feederlink frequencies are required for mobile satellites to communicate between ground gateway stations and the satellites (the mobile satellite frequencies connect the mobile station to the satellite). Feederlink requirements have been satisfied in the Fixed Satellite Service and no special allocations have been made for this purpose. However, several Administrations are proposing to make special provision for feederlinks, particularly for INMARSAT. The U.S. opposes special recognition for mobile satellite feederlinks and intends to use FSS band frequencies for our own MSS. Allocation status for mobile satellite feederlinks would affect the FSS and possibly other U.S. requirements. If necessary, we will ask that this item be discussed at WARC ORB 88.

Terrestrial aeronautical public correspondence with aircraft -

Along with public correspondence to aircraft services from satellites, the U.K. has proposed an allocation for a terrestrial system which would provide public correspondence (similar to the U.S. Airfone system). The U.S. opposes the U.K. proposal because it conflicts with our RDSS allocation proposal. The U.S. has not identified suitable bands for a terrestrial air-ground public correspondence system. The U.S. will attempt to postpone consideration of this topic but, if necessary, can agree to future consideration of frequency bands, including the bands around 900 MHz, for this purpose.

Continuation of Radiolocation in the bands 3400-3700 MHz -

Japan has proposed to remove the secondary allocation for radiolocation in the bands 3400-3700 MHz and Note 784 allocating radiolocation on a primary basis in the bands 3400-3600 MHz. The U.S. considers the radiolocation activities in these bands to be critical and cannot accept a change in their status. The U.S. has initiated several high level actions with Japan and other affected Administrations to have Japan withdraw this proposal. We are hopeful that the proposal can be disposed of without a confrontation at the MWARC. If

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

necessary, we can object to the Japan proposal because it is outside the scope of the MWARC agenda. In the event that a detrimental allocation is made by the WARC, the U.S. will take a reservation to this aspect.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Future Allocation Conference -

The CEPT and others have proposed that an allocation conference be held in the early 1990s to consider broad allocation changes. Possibilities include a new worldwide allocation for a wideband digital land mobile system, allocations for public correspondence from aircraft, GMDSS matters, and allocations for MSS and RDSS (assuming they are not accommodated at this Conference). The U.S. is opposed to postponing allocation decisions or making allocations contingent on the actions of a future conference. However, it is recognized that calling for a future allocation conference is an integral part of many Administrations' strategies and it is necessary for the U.S. to have some flexibility on this issue. But, any call for a future allocation conference would need to be considered by the 1989 Plenipotentiary Conference for decision.

Other Maritime Matters -

Other important maritime issues include improving coordination procedures among LORAN-C and other users in the 70-130 kHz band, protecting LORAN-C radionavigation, and revising the VHF channeling plan making port operation and ship movement channels simplex rather than duplex. Revision will improve compatibility of operation between the U.S. and other administrations.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Geographical Boundaries in the Aeronautical Route Plan

General

The high frequency aeronautical route plan was adopted by the WARC on Aeronautical Mobile (R) Service (Geneva, 1978) and came into effect on 1 February 1983. This Plan superseded portions of the ITU Radio Regulations (Geneva, 1959) dealing with the aeronautical services. Of particular interest with these Plans is a description of geographical boundaries for Major World Air Route Areas (MWARA) and the Regional and Domestic Air-Route Areas (RDARA). Viet Nam, during the Plenipotentiary Conference in Nairobi, 1982, entered a statement in the final protocol calling attention to the need to revise the aeronautical route plan at the next competent Mobile Conference. The German Democratic Republic has proposed revisions to portions of the Plan which were superseded by the WARC on Aeronautical Mobile (R).

Objective

To keep the aeronautical route plan off the agenda of this Conference, or to forestall any changes to the geographical boundaries.

Issues

Overcoming a possible desire by Viet Nam and others to discuss modifications to the Plan when the German Democratic Republic proposal is addressed.

Strategy

We will object to any attempt to discuss the aeronautical route plan since it is not on the agenda of the Conference. The proposal of the German Democratic Republic has been accommodated by the adoption of the Plan in 1978 and has been in effect since February 1, 1983.

Fallback Positions

We will attempt to have the WARC Chairman treat any matters concerning the aeronautical route plan between countries concerned outside of the open meetings.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Geographical Country Symbols in the Aeronautical
Off-Route Plan

General

The WARC agenda includes the review of the high frequency aeronautical off-route plan but limited to modification of the symbols for country and geographical areas. In cases where a symbol concerns more than one administration, its revision is subject to agreement by the administrations concerned. Many geographic symbols are out of date in the plan and can be expected to be updated at the Conference. Symbols for the Canal Zone, British West Indies, and British Guyana are symbols which will need to be updated at some point. A long-standing request by China to delete the USA country symbol identifying U.S. use in China has finally been worked out. The U.S. will propose deletion of the country symbol and China will support since it is no longer needed. Other countries may feel a need to propose some further modification during the Conference.

Frequency allotments to the U.S. in this plan in various parts of the world are crucial to U.S. military operations including Central America, the Mediterranean, and the Caribbean areas.

Issue

Avoiding significant deletions of the USA country symbol. Administrations may feel that if they can delete the symbol against their area, it would constitute an allotment change and the frequencies used for aeronautical off-route communications would become available for their domestic use. This would deprive our military access to these channels.

Strategy

We will point out that we do not object to updating the geographical area symbols, provided of course that both parties agree to the change before a modification to the plan can be made. We will also point out that the frequencies in the aeronautical plan are being used extensively and changes will not necessarily constitute an available frequency for that geographical area.

Possible Fallbacks

We intend to agree only to deletions of country symbols for China and the Panama Canal Zone at this Conference. Countries like Cuba may request deletion of active military uses, which we will not agree.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Radio Identification of Noncombatants and Neutrals

Background

A portion of Article 40 of the Radio Regulations describes a signal for use by "Medical Transports", a term defined in the Geneva Convention 1949 for craft, vessels and aircraft when assisting the wounded, the sick and the shipwrecked. Specific requirements for special markings are also called for in that Convention. The term Medical Transports only exists in time of armed conflict. Numerous attempts have been made by the International Red Cross, through proposals from Switzerland, to identify symbols for lifeboats during an armed conflict within both the Intergovernmental Maritime Organization (IMO) and International Civil Aviation Organization without success. Recently an information note from the International Red Cross was distributed to the IMO calling for a symbol to identify rescue craft in Article 40 to afford them some additional protection when participating in a rescue during an armed conflict. The document to IMO indicated that they would seek Swiss support in submitting a proposal for Article 40 modification.

Article 40 in its present form represents a delicate compromise reached from two very divergent viewpoints. A proposal to modify it during the Mobile WARC could cause the U.S. and others to consider a reservation.

Objective

To avoid discussing modifications to Article 40.

Issue

Overcoming support to identify signals for rescue craft during an armed conflict.

Strategy

We will object to consideration of this subject during the Conference. The Department of State has already obtained assurance from Switzerland that no such proposal will be forthcoming. A follow-up with the Swiss officials will be made prior to the Conference.

The U.S. delegation will, if the question is raised, state that this subject is not within the purview of a technically-based multilateral conference, and involves numerous issues for which an ITU conference is not competent to treat.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Additionally, it should be pointed out that some types of rescue craft, if marked as medical transports, are already permitted by the Geneva Convention of 1949, and when so marked and recognized by parties to the conflict, may use the signals authorized for the medical transports.

Fallback Positions

The U.S. delegation will be prepared to consider an appropriate reservation if the Conference approves a proposal to identify rescue craft or neutral transports associated with rescue operations during an armed conflict on the following basis:

1. No internationally agreed definitions of neutrality exists applicable to ships and aircraft;
2. No international agreed regime exists to respond to the perfidious use of neutral status;
3. Rescue craft does not have a generally accepted meaning in international law, and development of such a definition is beyond the scope of this radio conference; and
4. Establishing a new set of signals for rescue craft would create needless confusion.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Technical Matters

The United States has made a number of proposals of a technical nature that can be dealt with at the Conference in the Technical Working Group of the Plenary. Many of the issues previously were considered at the CCIR Special Preparatory Meeting of Study Group 8 held in July 1986. Also, many of the issues have been considered in the IMO. A number of the administrations that participate in the CCIR and in the IMO, as does the U.S., have submitted proposals generally in alignment with the conclusions of those organizations. Differences exist, however, but generally in areas where acceptable compromise should emerge from the negotiations at the Conference in the Technical Working Group. Differences relate to technical parameters, whether technical details of systems should be included in the Appendices to the Radio Regulations, or whether it is sufficient that they be incorporated by reference to relevant CCIR Recommendations, and difference in proposed dates for compliance with changes or new requirements.

The U.S. has proposed the introduction of satellite EPIRBs at 406 MHz and technical improvements for 121.5/243 MHz EPIRBs to enhance their detection by satellite systems. Also, technical proposals have been made to accommodate the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System with regard to single sideband transmitters, digital selective calling transmitter frequency tolerance, addition of the most recent CCIR Recommendation on narrow-band direct-printing systems, technical changes for VHF transmitters and UHF on-board transmitters. Deletion of the technical provisions for the obsolete lincompex system is proposed.

Comprehensive U.S. Information Papers have been submitted to the Conference with considerable technical content, pertaining to the Radiodetermination Satellite Service and the Mobile Satellite Service in support of major U.S. proposals for frequency allocation, regulatory and operational provisions for these systems. New and controversial concepts as viewed by other administrations are expected to require substantial deliberation by the Conference. The Technical Working Group most likely will be designated to deal with the technical considerations of frequency sharing for RDSS and MSS, and system interoperability with priority pre-emption for safety services proposed for MSS, which are essential technical considerations to achieve a satisfactory level of compatibility between the aeronautical, maritime and land mobile satellite services proposed to share the same frequency spectrum.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Land Mobile Matters

The impact on terrestrial land mobile communications is not expected to be significant. However, there is great interest for the U.S. in preserving provisions which allow continued use of land mobile systems in the U.S. and concern that nothing adverse happens which would affect, in particular, use of frequencies by railroads at VHF. These same frequencies are used in many parts of the world for maritime mobile communications.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE



United States Department of State

**Bureau of
International Communications
and Information Policy**

Washington, D.C. 20520

September 3, 1987

TO: SIG Membership on ICIP
FROM: CIP - Diana Lady Dougan, U.S. Coordinator
SUBJECT: Mobile WARC Home Team

The World Administrative Radio Conference for the Mobile Services will be convened on September 14, 1987 in Geneva. This office is now in the process of organizing the home team to guide and support the U.S. Delegation as well as to maintain liaison with all branches of the Government and the private sector on the progress of the Conference.

It is requested that each SIG member indicate (1) whether they should be considered to have a primary or secondary interest in the issues related to this activity and (2) the name and telephone numbers (both office and home) of a Staff Contact person. It would be appreciated if their information was provided to Warren Richards, 647-2592 on or before September 9.

August 31, 1987

Senior Interagency Group - September 9, 1987

Agenda Item #1: U.S. International Satellite Policy -
"Separate Systems" and "Transborder"

ISSUE:

To clarify U.S. policy regarding two areas of activity - use of U.S. domestic satellites for "transborder" service to neighboring countries and use of U.S. international satellite systems separate from the INTELSAT system.

BACKGROUND:

Our "transborder" satellite policy stems from a 1981 letter from Undersecretary Buckley to the Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) (see attachment A). The letter notes that "certain exceptional circumstances may exist where it would be in the interest of the United States to use domestic satellites for public international telecommunications with nearby countries." Such cases would be where INTELSAT could not provide the required service or where it would be clearly uneconomical or impractical for INTELSAT to do so. Nevertheless, the burden of demonstrating the reasons warranting reliance on domestic satellites for international purposes would rest on the proponents.

The letter contemplated consultation pursuant to Article XIV (d) of the INTELSAT Agreement and the concurrence of the foreign governments concerned. In closing, the letter identified pending applications where no national or foreign policy interest prevented FCC consideration of whether the public convenience and necessity would be served by international use of domestic space segment, while acknowledging that future proposals could vary considerably and could require a de novo review.

This letter has become known as the "Buckley letter", and is generally viewed as allowing use of U.S. domestic satellite systems to provide communications to nearby countries covered by the spillover "footprint" of U.S. satellites (and vice-versa). No general review of the policies of the Buckley letter has been conducted to date. It is appropriate to do so at present: while the Buckley letter does not address service restrictions, the

- 2 -

prohibition of interconnection with the public-switched network is a key element in the later policy statements conveyed to the FCC by Secretaries Shultz and Baldrige.

In 1984, a Presidential policy governing U.S. international satellite systems separate from INTELSAT was established. Secretary of State Shultz and Secretary of Commerce Baldrige informed the FCC that any such systems were restricted to providing services not connected with public switched networks; that the services must be provided through sale or long term lease; that they must be consulted with INTELSAT under Article XIV of the INTELSAT agreement; and they must be authorized by foreign authorities in the country(s) of operation (see attachment B).

DISCUSSION

There are presently petitions before the FCC which are viewed by some as leading to an expansion of the application of the Buckley letter (and its lack of service restrictions) at the expense of the criteria given in the Shultz-Baldrige letter. The Shultz-Baldrige letter criteria were premised on the issues prompted by the then-pending applications before the FCC (largely service across the North Atlantic). The Shultz-Baldrige letter contemplated later review if substantially different proposals were forthcoming. Notwithstanding this review language, the U.S.G. drew upon the interconnection restrictions in the Shultz-Baldrige letter to lessen international concern about the U.S. separate systems policy.

Presently, those satellite systems designed for international use and those designed for domestic use have been relatively easy to distinguish. However, instances will certainly arise in which the two policies overlap into a gray area where it is not clear which policy would apply. Even in those cases where the designated use of a satellite system is clearly discernable, the rationalization for having different criteria apply to potentially identical satellites, providing identical technical capabilities to the same locations is subject to challenge (e.g., a "separate system" and a "transborder system" may currently face different service restrictions on their operations between the United States and the Caribbean).

Several recent developments have increased the necessity for the government to resolve or at least justify the apparent differences between our two U.S. satellite policies. In early 1987, the Federal Communications Commission determined that U.S.

- 3 -

domestic satellite service to Jamaica fell within the 1981 transborder satellite policy as defined in the Buckley letter. The Commission noted that this policy did not restrict satellite service interconnection with the public network. In statements made at INTELSAT's Eleventh Assembly of Parties, the representative of U.S. Party noted that this decision was made in the context of a satellite which was primarily designed for domestic service and met our stated policy goal of promoting efficient use of the orbit. She also noted that other regions have developed satellite systems which provide more than domestic services but which face no restrictions on interconnecting with the public switched network.

COMSAT, the U.S. Signatory to INTELSAT, has challenged the Commission's action in court - as being contrary to the U.S. separate systems policy. Moreover, AT&T has filed with the FCC to provide U.S. domestic satellite services to the Caribbean region. PanAmSat, whose international satellite system covers the Caribbean, has formally commented that AT&T should not be authorized to interconnect with the public network in this region while PanAmSat, operating under the "separate systems" constraints, would be prohibited from such interconnection. Such a result could be considered to be inequitable treatment.

While the FCC may determine to apply the less restrictive "transborder" approach from a U.S. regulatory standpoint, the Executive Branch must consider the matter in the context of statute as well as foreign and national policy since the President, under the terms of the 1962 Satellite Act, shall determine whether a proposed communications satellite system outside INTELSAT is required in the national interest. The current application of the policies is not sufficiently clear to provide the necessary certainty for either commercial or foreign policy purposes.

In summary, the issue is not to reconsider these established policies but rather to clarify the issue of which policy applies to a given specific satellite system serving a given geographical region.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

-- A U.S. domestic satellite system has a coverage zone which extends deeply into South America. Will this system fall under the transborder or separate system policy?

- 4 -

-- The satellite systems can be easily distinguished as either "domestic transborder" or "separate international", however, common countries could be served by both systems. Would a different policy apply to each system?

POLICY OPTIONS:

- o A U.S. international communications satellite policy that would apply the "separate systems" and "transborder" criteria on a geographical basis, rather than on a satellite system basis (i.e., all systems serving a given geographic region would face the same criteria).

In practice, this would formally expand the "transborder" policy to a "regional" policy as is the case in Europe and elsewhere. That is, for hemispheric regional satellite systems analogous to EUTELSAT, ARABSAT and PALAPA, INTELSAT's Article XIV procedures would be considered sufficient to guard against significant economic harm. However, for "trans-regional" separate systems an extra measure of protection for INTELSAT, over and above Article XIV consultation, would be provided: i.e., restriction against interconnection with public switched networks. Clearly, under this option other significant issues, such as definitions of regions, must be determined.

- o Allow satellite systems, whether U.S. "separate systems" or U.S. "transborder", to interconnect with public networks in each country at the request of that country.

If the system elects to restrict itself to customized non-public network services, then this could be considered prima facie evidence of insignificant economic harm to INTELSAT. A greatly simplified and expedited Article XIV process might then apply. If the system elects to interconnect with the public network, then the normal in-depth Article XIV process would be necessary to deal with the issue of significant economic harm.

The SIG Working Group will address the commercial and foreign policy implications of either of the above policy options, or any other options presented to the working group.

SCENARIO FOR SEPTEMBER 9, SIG MEETING

- Under Secretary Derwinski opens the meeting with brief remarks noting: the importance and proven effectiveness of the SIG process in resolving differences and arriving at agreed USG positions; his intention to see that the International Communications SIG plays an active role; and, his willingness to do what is necessary to ensure its smooth functioning.
- The Under Secretary asks the SIG participants to identify themselves and any accompanying members of their staffs.
- The Under Secretary introduces the two agenda items and asks if all participants have copies of the relevant documents. (Additional copies will be available for distribution as necessary.)
- The Under Secretary introduces Mobile WARC delegation chairman David Markey and asks that he briefly discuss the Scope paper.
- The Under Secretary notes the acceptance of the document by the members of the SIG.
- The Under Secretary introduces Warren Richards of CIP who will serve as staff level chairman of the "home team" and asks that he give a brief description of the home team process in backstopping the Mobile WARC delegation.
- The Under Secretary asks Ambassador Dougan briefly to outline the issues involved in the question of "separate systems" and "transborder" satellite policies.
- The Under Secretary asks Richard Firestone of NTIA and Randolph Earnest of CIP/REG to give additional details of the satellite policy issue contained in the distributed discussion paper.
- The Under Secretary requests comments and questions from the SIG members.
- The Undersecretary designates Messrs. Firestone and Earnest as co-chairmen of a SIG working group to study ways of resolving the problems related to the current situation of different policies for the two categories of satellites.
- The Under Secretary asks that this issue be considered by the working group and that the co-chairmen report back to the SIG in December.