



Mohamed Ali Elmoghazi Ali, M and Whalley, Jason and Irvine, James (2017) International spectrum management regime : is gridlock blocking flexible spectrum property rights? Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance, 19 (2). pp. 1-13. ISSN 2398-5038 , <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/DPRG-08-2016-0039>

This version is available at <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/61399/>

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Unless otherwise explicitly stated on the manuscript, Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Please check the manuscript for details of any other licences that may have been applied. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or private study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the Strathprints administrator: strathprints@strath.ac.uk

International spectrum management regime: is gridlock blocking flexible spectrum property rights?

I. Introduction

For more than a century, radio spectrum has been a unique resource that is essential for delivering wireless services. Reflecting this uniqueness, national regulators have traditionally managed spectrum by designating appropriate uses, technologies, and users in what is called the ‘command and control’ approach (hereafter, C&C). The emergence of the C&C approach, in the early days of wireless communications, created a new regime internationally.

Many emerging issues – such as spectrum shortages due to increasing demand for data services - have resulted in calls for the C&C to be reviewed (Wellenius and Neto, 2005). As a result, different ~~alternatives~~alternative approaches have been suggested to overcome the deficiencies of C&C (Chaduc and Pogorel, 2008). One of these approaches is ~~athe~~ ‘spectrum market’, which calls for treating spectrum assignment in a way similar to any other private property rights so that radiocommunication service allocation flexibility and technology neutrality apply (Cave et al., 2007). Having said that, there have been several national approaches to introduce more flexibility in service allocation where flexible spectrum property rights are traded (Cave and Webb, 2003). ~~The main argument in favour of flexibility is that service harmonisation could lead to restrictions on the use of under- or un-used spectrum for alternative uses, and on the ability to re-farm spectrum for new services (Chaduc and Pogorel, 2008; Indepen and Aegis Systems, 2004). The main argument in favour of flexibility is that service harmonisation could lead to restrictions on the use of under- or un-used spectrum for alternative uses, and on the ability to re-farm spectrum for new services (Indepen and Aegis Systems, 2004, Chaduc and Pogorel, 2008).~~ Therefore, Cave (2002) argues that harmonisation should be time-limited until it enables manufacturers and operators to deliver a cost effective service. After that, the market should be opened up to other services. However, most of these approaches have not been successful due to difficulties in implementation, or have been limited in effect (El-Moghazi et al., 2014).

Similarly, internationally, there have been only ~~a~~-few attempts to bring more flexibility ~~to~~into the international service allocation framework including reorganising the radio regulations (RR), introducing new composite service and changing service definitions ~~(ITU-R, 2007)~~(ITU-R, 2007). Cave (2002) argues that international co-ordination is a constraint on the ability of a single country to introduce more flexibility into its spectrum use. It has also been argued that applying flexible spectrum use that is not in conformity with the ITU regulations would require extensive coordination with neighbouring countries (Indepen, 2001). Nevertheless, huge resistance from most of the international stakeholders has faced all of these attempts (El-Moghazi et al., 2012).

While this paper does not intend to address the concept of spectrum property right per se, it aims to examine the influence of the international spectrum management regime on introducing flexibility in ~~radio-communications~~radiocommunication service allocation nationally. To achieve this, the paper will address the main elements of the international spectrum management regime to determine to what extent they restrict flexibility nationally. It should be noted that the main motivation for this paper is that most of the previous studies that address spectrum property rights focus on national circumstances, (see, for example, ~~(Cave and Webb, 2003; Deffains, 2013; Weiser and Hatfield, 2008)~~Cave and Webb, 2003;

1
2
3 | [Deffains, 2013; Weiser and Hatfield, 2008](#)) while the influence of international regulations is
4 largely overlooked.

5
6 The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The following section explores the
7 methodological stance adopted while Section 3 focuses on the spectrum market approach.
8 Section 4 focuses on the process of ~~radio-communications~~[radiocommunication](#) service
9 allocation, and then Section 5 addresses the interaction of international spectrum regime and
10 national spectrum management approach regarding ~~radio-~~
11 ~~communications~~[radiocommunication](#) service allocation. Sections 6 to 10 examine the
12 different main elements of the international service allocation framework namely, decision
13 making procedures, footnotes, three regions system, a priori planning and ~~MIFR~~[the ITU-R](#)
14 ~~Master International Frequency Register (MIFR)~~. Conclusions are drawn in the last section of
15 the paper.
16

17 18 II. Methodology

19 We adopt a qualitative inductive methodology in this paper that examines the different
20 elements of the international radiocommunication service allocation framework with a focus
21 on the influence on national decisions affecting service allocation. The paper is based mainly
22 on primary data collected from sixty-six semi-structured interviews with the main
23 stakeholders from the three ITU-R regions including mobile operators and manufactures,
24 broadcasters, national regulators, and regional organisation. ~~Moreover, interviewees were~~
25 ~~partially identified based on the participation of the first author for several years in ITU-R~~
26 ~~activities, and a list of different topics and related questions were prepared and selected for~~
27 ~~each group of interviewees based on their background. In addition, most interviews were~~
28 ~~recorded upon permission of the interviewees and notes were taken during the interviews.~~
29 ~~The names of the interviewees are not disclosed for confidentiality reasons. Nvivo is used for~~
30 ~~the data reduction of the interviews' transcriptions in order to identify the most important~~
31 ~~themes (Bazeley, 2007).~~
32

33
34 The difference between unstructured and semi-structured interview is that the former is
35 similar to a conversation and could contain one question, while the later compromises a list
36 of questions on specific topics (Bryman and Bell, 2007). ~~Structured interviews have a rigid~~
37 ~~structure that cannot be easily modified (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Interviews were selected~~
38 ~~for a variety of reasons~~[Interviews were selected because they enable the researcher to build](#)
39 [on their responses, and as personal contact assures achieving more response rate](#) (Saunders et
40 al., 2009).
41

42 ~~Interviewees were partially identified based on the participation of the first author for~~
43 ~~several years in ITU-R activities, and a list of different topics and related questions were~~
44 ~~prepared and selected for each group of interviewees based on their background. In addition,~~
45 ~~most interviews were recorded upon permission of the interviewees and notes were taken~~
46 ~~during the interviews. The names of the interviewees are not disclosed for confidentiality~~
47 ~~reasons. Nvivo is used for the data reduction of the interviews' transcriptions in order to~~
48 ~~identify the most important themes (Bazeley, 2007).~~ ~~Firstly, they enable the researcher to~~
49 ~~build on their responses. Secondly, personal contact assures achieving more response rate as~~
50 ~~interviewees may hesitate to provide sensitive data or to spend time explaining their answers.~~
51 ~~Other data collection methods were also considered such as questionnaires. However,~~
52 ~~questionnaires have the disadvantage of a potentially low response rate, and they also require~~
53 ~~knowing all the possible answers for each question. Questionnaires are also not a flexible~~
54 ~~collection data method (Saunders et al., 2009).~~ The paper also draws on secondary data
55 illustrating the different ITU-R publications regarding radiocommunication service allocation.
56
57
58
59
60

III. Spectrum Market

The origin of the market approach could be traced back to Coase's seminal contribution, 'The Federal Communications Commission', in which he suggested that spectrum assignments should be treated in a way similar to property rights. Coase (1959) ~~argued~~argues that the aim of the regulator should be to ~~maximize~~maximise the output and not to ~~minimize~~minimise the interference and that interference should not be an issue as long as the gain from it is much more than the harm it produces (Coase, 1959). ~~Coase subsequently generalises his argument in his Nobel Prize article, 'The Problem of Social Cost'~~ Coase (1960); subsequently generalised his argument in his Nobel Prize article, 'The Problem of Social Cost', and suggests an approach toward dealing with harmful effects on others that is based on comparing the total societal product yielded by alternative social arrangements.

In general, the market approach is based on designing well defined exclusive property rights to the use of the spectrum that could be auctioned and traded while allowing maximum flexibility (Baumol and Robyn, 2006). Such flexibility could be provided through two elements, namely, radiocommunication service allocation flexibility and technology neutrality (Chaduc and Pogorel, 2008). Although there have been several theoretical attempts to define spectrum property rights, none of them have been adopted in practice (~~Cave and Webb, 2003; Vany et al., 1969, Cave and Webb, 2012; Cave and Webb, 2003, Vany et al., 1969; Cave and Webb, 2012,~~ Vries and Sieh, 2012).

Several approaches to develop spectrum property rights have emerged nationally. For instance, Ofcom designed a model called 'Spectrum Usage ~~Rights~~Rights' (SUR) as a way of defining spectrum property right. SUR specifies the maximum level of interference that can be caused, rather than the power that can be transmitted (Ofcom, 2008). However, there were some difficulties associated with SUR with the result that the model was eventually applied in only a limited number of cases (~~Eurostrategies and LS-Telecom, 2007). The FCC studied an approach to define spectrum property rights called Interference Temperature~~(Eurostrategies and Ls-Telecom, 2007). The FCC studied an approach to define spectrum property rights called 'Interference Temperature' where transmission is permissible as long as the resulting interference at any unintended receiver does not exceed a certain level (Evcı and Fino, 2005). The approach was quite complex, a factor that no doubt led the FCC to decide in 2007 to abandon it, as it ~~is not practical~~was impractical and may ~~increase~~have increased interference levels (Weiser and Hatfield, 2008).

Furthermore, in 1996 Guatemala applied a private property rights approach to spectrum management where spectrum rights define ownership by specifying parameters such as the band or frequency ranges, hours of operation, geographical coverage area, and the maximum field strength or signal strength at the border of the coverage area (Hazlett and Muñoz, 2006). In El Salvador, a liberal approach to spectrum management was ~~applied~~adopted in 1997. Spectrum assignments were technology neutral, and although the regulator allocates specific service to each spectrum band, users can deviate from such allocation without a penalty being imposed (Hazlett and Muñoz, 2006). However, it is difficult to assess the influence of these approaches considering the relatively small size of these two countries.

In Australia, spectrum property rights are defined by maximum transmit power, maximum out-of-band interference, and the maximum out-of-area interference (Cave and Webb, 2003). Cave and Webb (2003) point out that although there have been few cases of interference; the rights are not flexible enough to accommodate multiple different uses. In Europe, a concept called Wireless Access Policy for Electronic Communication Services

(WAPECS) was introduced to enable more flexibility within the EU spectrum management framework by allowing using the spectrum on a technology and service neutral basis within certain technical requirements to avoid interference (~~RSPG, 2005~~)(RSPG, 2005). The service term in WAPECS is different than the radiocommunication service term used by the ITU-R and, therefore, WAPECS cannot be considered as fully flexible in terms of the ITU-R radiocommunication service allocation.

IV. Radiocommunication Service Allocation

The international spectrum management regime was created in line with the formulation process of national spectrum management. The main principles of the regime are the sovereign right of each state to assign its frequencies to any service or station (Lyll, 2011), and that all radio stations must not cause harmful interference to other stations, which operate in accordance with the provisions of the ITU Radio Regulations (RR) (~~ITU-R, 2008b~~)(ITU-R, 2008b). The radio sector of the ITU (ITU-R) is the administrative cooperation body responsible for setting the regime's rules through the RR and the ITU-R resolutions, recommendations and reports. The RR have international treaty status, and they are binding on all ITU-R countries (Maitra, 2004).

Allocating spectrum to the different services is the main responsibility of the ITU-R. In particular, the ITU-R table of frequency allocation divides the frequency band from 9 kHz to 400 GHz into smaller bands that are allocated to more than 40 radiocommunication services (~~ITU-R, 2001~~)(ITU-R, 2001). Dividing the spectrum according to the type of service and global harmonisation of spectrum allocations are the ITU historical methods to mitigate harmful interference. More specifically, the level of protection required by one type of service, may not be suitable for another type of service (~~ITU-R, 1995~~)(ITU-R, 1995). The ITU-R divides the world into three regions in terms of spectrum allocation¹.

Decisions relating to spectrum allocation are taken during ITU-R World Radiocommunication Conferences (WRCs). Within WRCs, four main aspects of the spectrum are discussed:

- ~~type~~Type of radiocommunication service (for example, fixed, mobile);
- ~~type~~Type of access (primary and secondary);
- ~~allocation~~Allocation geographical areas (globally or regionally); and,
- ~~technology~~Technology characteristics (for example, maximum transmitted power).

The WRC resolutions and recommendations are part of the RR, and thus have international treaty status. Significantly, the agenda of the current conference is determined by the previous one. Items that could be part of the agenda include revisions to the RR and any other question of a worldwide character that falls within the remit of the conference (~~ITU, 2011~~)(ITU, 2011).

In case spectrum use nationally is in conformity with the primary or secondary services in the ITU-R RR, this use is protected against interference from primary and secondary services allocated in the same band, or from secondary services but cannot claim protection from primary services in the same band respectively (Indepen, 2001). Otherwise, a country cannot claim protection from primary or secondary services in the same band but

¹ Region 1 comprises Europe, Africa, the Middle East west of the Persian Gulf including Iraq, the former Soviet Union and Mongolia. Region 2 covers the Americas, Greenland and some of the eastern Pacific Islands. Region 3 contains most of non-former-Soviet-Union Asia, east of and including Iran, and most of Oceania.

could operate on a non-protection non-interference basis according to the ITU-R Article 4.42. In addition, a band could be indicated in a footnote of the ITU allocation table as being allocated to a particular service on a primary or secondary basis in an area smaller than a Region, or in a particular country (~~ITU-R, 2008a~~)(ITU-R, 2008a). However, other neighbouring countries may block such use if it will restrict their own use.

In addition to footnotes, countries can register their important frequency assignments with the ITU. There are two types of registration (Ryan, 2005):² The first is called a priori planning which enables a guarantee of access to the spectrum where each country submits its requirements at a world or regional planning conference. An example of this is the ITU Regional Radio Conference of 2006 (RRC-06). This conference planned to allocate the 470-862 MHz band for digital broadcasting in Europe, Africa, the Middle East and Iran in what is called the Geneva-06 agreement (GE-06) (O'Leary et al., 2006). ~~Following the RRC-06, the WRC-07 and WRC-12 approved having~~(O'leary et al., 2006). ~~Following RRC-06, WRC-07 and WRC-12 approved having the~~ primary allocation in the 790-862 MHz and 694-790 MHz respectively for mobile service in addition to the broadcasting service (Beutler, 2012). Although WRC-15 discussed the possibility of having additional primary mobile allocation in the 470-694 MHz band, it was not possible to agree on the allocation due to significant resistance from most countries in Region 1.

The second type isof assignment registration in the non-planned bands is on a 'first come, first-served' basis in the ITU-R ~~Master International Frequency Register (MIFR)~~.MIFR. Such registration requires conformity with the ITU-R service allocation table and not causing harmful interference to existing assignments in other countries (Lyll, 2011).

The WRC-12 discussed how to enhance the international spectrum regulatory framework, where prior to the conference the ITU-R studies approached the issue from two perspectives. ~~The first perspective focused only on convergence between fixed and mobile services, while the second addressed spectrum allocation issues more generally (ITU-R, 2011). Eventually WRC-12 decided not to change current spectrum allocation practices with regard to the two issues (ITU-R, 2012b). Nevertheless, it was decided to continue the studies on revising the definitions of fixed service, fixed station and mobile station until WRC-15 (ITU-R, 2012a). During WRC-15, it was evident that there is no intention to amend these long standing definitions and it was decided to no change to the RR during the first week of the conference ((ITU-R, 2014; ITU-R, 2015)).~~The first perspective focused only on convergence between fixed and mobile services, while the second addressed spectrum allocation issues more generally (ITU-R, 2011). Eventually WRC-12 decided not to change current spectrum allocation practices with regard to the two issues (ITU-R, 2012b). Nevertheless, it was decided to continue the studies on revising the definitions of fixed service, fixed station and mobile station until WRC-15 (ITU-R, 2012a). During WRC-15, it was evident that there is no intention to amend these long standing definitions, and it was decided to no change to the RR during the first week of the conference (ITU-R, 2014, ITU-R, 2015).

V. Interaction of International Spectrum Management Regime and National Spectrum Management Approaches

² The RR Article 4.4 states that "Administrations of the Member States shall not assign to a station any frequency in derogation of either the Table of Frequency Allocations in this Chapter or the other provisions of these Regulations, except on the express condition that such a station, when using such a frequency assignment, shall not cause harmful interference to, and shall not claim protection from harmful interference caused by, a station operating in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, the Convention and these Regulations".

1
2
3 In general, the interviews revealed two trends regarding the dependence of countries on the
4 RR in terms of their radiocommunication service allocation. The first is that some countries
5 tend to make changes to the RR in order to introduce changes nationally. This trend is usually
6 favoured by developing countries, which would wait for the ITU-R approval ~~to adopt before~~
7 adopting a particular service allocation. This is not because they are forced to do so, but
8 mainly because it is advantageous for them to follow the ITU-R service allocations. The
9 second trend is to introduce changes in the ITU RR following the success of changes in
10 service allocation nationally. Countries that adopt such trend are those with large populations
11 (for example, the United States) or in isolated geographical locations (~~for example, such as~~
12 Australia and New Zealand).

13
14 In addition, it was argued by several interviewees that such influence depends on the
15 interpretation of each country of the RR. For instance, Japan adopts a very literal
16 interpretation of the ITU-R regulations and recommendations. On the other hand, the RR
17 article 4.4 is a key element in US spectrum policy. The influence is also related to the
18 population distribution of the country. For instance, in the US, relatively little of the
19 population lives along the Mexican border while this is not the case for the Canada / US
20 border. Such influence also depends on the size of the market, which, in turn, determines the
21 ability of a country to deviate from the RR.
22
23

24 Regarding the influence of the RR on introducing more flexibility into
25 radiocommunication service allocation nationally, most of the interviewees (33)
26 ~~indicate indicated~~ that any country can do whatever it wants as long as it is not causing
27 interference ~~to with~~ its neighbours. This implies that, in practice, there are only restrictions on
28 borders area. The issue of spectrum property rights is a national issue while the RR provide a
29 global framework for the ~~harmonized harmonised~~ use of the spectrum. The ITU framework
30 promotes sharing, as it accommodates three categories of service allocations - primary and
31 secondary and permitted use - according to the RR Article 4.4. In addition, the RR allow
32 multiple service allocations in the same spectrum band and, therefore, flexibility could be
33 introduced by having additional service allocation.
34
35

36 Moreover, the RR accommodate several examples where there are forms of flexible
37 spectrum property rights. One case of this is the identification of the International Mobile
38 Telecommunication (IMT) in the 3.5 GHz band where technical conditions of Power Flux
39 Density (PFD) level were included in the RR so that mobile service could operate in a band
40 where there are allocations to other radiocommunication services. Another interviewee
41 explained that conditions associated with technical conditions of spectrum property
42 ~~right rights~~ at the national level could be incorporated in the RR by footnotes. The following
43 quote from one of the interviews could be considered as a summary of the view that the RR
44 provide enough flexibility: *“The artist Picasso once said, “form liberates”...so it creates
45 certain constraints, but it also leaves a lot of freedom within those bounds”*.
46

47 On the contrary, there were views that there are specific spectrum bands where there
48 could be restriction from one radiocommunication service on another such as the case of the
49 UHF band where there are co-primary allocations between mobile and broadcasting services,
50 or the case of special radiocommunication services such as satellite or radiolocation.
51 Moreover, compatibility studies conducted in the ITU-R on allocations to be discussed at
52 WRCs may to a degree influence national decision regarding service allocation.
53

54 Regarding the influence of the RR on the limited application of the spectrum market
55 approach in practice, there were two views among interviewees. The first is that the
56 limitation of spectrum trading was more due to the view that the market environment does
57 not encourage spectrum trading rather than any regulatory structure. The second is that the
58
59
60

1
2
3 traditional rigidity of the RR in terms of definitions of use did influence negatively the
4 spectrum market, which requires certain fungibility where one spectrum use can be replaced
5 by another use.
6

7 VI. Radiocommunication Service Definitions

8
9 One element that is worth examining is the current radiocommunication service definition in
10 the ITU-R RR on national regulators' flexibility. We shall focus on three
11 radiocommunication services: fixed, mobile and broadcasting. This is important considering
12 that convergence could enable application to operate under more than just one
13 radiocommunication service.
14

15 The data analysis showed two distinct views on the issue. The first is that the current
16 ITU-R definitions are not restricting flexibility for the following reasons. Firstly,
17 convergence is happening on the application level where different equipment under different
18 services can provide similar services to those provided by other services. However, this is not
19 happening at the radiocommunication service level. For instance, while mobile networks are
20 carrying content, this happens within a mobile environment, which is different than a
21 broadcasting environment from a radiocommunication service viewpoint. In other words,
22 convergence on the application level does not necessary mean convergence in
23 radiocommunication service allocations. Therefore, flexibility is already provided in the
24 current ITU-R service structure, as the different application could be provided through
25 different type of radiocommunication services.
26

27
28 In addition, separation between services is needed to conduct sharing studies as
29 radiocommunication services have different sharing criteria. Hence, combined or hybrid
30 services will make sharing more difficult, as it is unknown what which radiocommunication
31 service you have to share the spectrum with. Besides, concerns were expressed in case of
32 changing the definitions. For instance, the flexibility in the interpretation of the RR
33 definitions may create a problem in licensing, since the operators are also
34 categorized categorised as mobile or fixed. Secondly, there would be a need to change several
35 ITU-R recommendations and reports. Moreover, it was clarified that the ITU-R services are
36 not necessarily mutually exclusive, which means that there are common areas between the
37 different radiocommunication services (for example, Wi-Fi is lies between the fixed and
38 mobile services). This enables the current definitions to accommodate convergence.
39

40
41 With respect to the convergence between fixed and mobile services, it was indicated
42 by the interviewees that this is not an issue, as in most cases there is a common allocation
43 between fixed and mobile. Moreover, having merged fixed and mobile services would lead to
44 more coordination and less effective use of the spectrum, because in such case you will there
45 would be a need to consider the worst case of non-directional antenna of the mobile service
46 while the fixed service creates less interference outside its directional beam. Regarding
47 convergence between broadcasting and mobile, it was expressed that it is difficult to
48 implement services of high power next to bidirectional telecommunications services like
49 mobile services as they have different technical characteristics. Another interviewee, a
50 broadcaster, argued that the definitions are valid as the broadcast concept is point-to-area and
51 not point to multi point, so there is a clear difference between mobile and broadcasting
52 service. Moreover, there is a topological difference between broadcasting and mobile in
53 which the broadcasting network has the topology of high power and high tower, although, of
54 course, mobile networks can broadcast TV content.
55

56
57 On the other hand, there were views that some of the radiocommunication service
58 definitions are old and do not correspond to the current state of affairs. More specifically,
59
60

some radiocommunication services that are supposed to be fixed are used in reality as mobile, which creates problems in registering these definitions in the ITU-R MIFR. Another example ~~are~~ mobile networks where the downlink frequencies could be used for delivering linear TV while it is not categorised under broadcasting service according to the ITU-R.

There was also another view that there is a need to refine the definitions specifically to address the difference between point-to-point and point-to-multi-point applications. In particular, it was pointed out that there are deficiencies in the fixed service definition regarding the case of point to multi-points communication, which gives the impression that nomadic services belongs to fixed services. One other view was that there should be a move towards non-specific allocation as individual platform can now carry a multiplicity of services. In addition, there is a move from high power/large cell to ~~smaller-cell~~ low power/small cell and this makes the ITU-R approaches less essential. Furthermore, the service definitions for the mobile and fixed services are out-dated, because there are technologies that fall in between. Therefore, it was suggested that nomadic use could be part of the mobile part service.

VII. Decision Making Procedures

Regarding the influence of ~~the~~ service allocation decision-making procedures at the ITU-R on national regulators' flexibility, there were two views. The first is that these procedures do not restrict flexibility, as they have been able to accommodate many different types of technology developments over numerous years. The ~~ITU-R~~ working methods of the ITU-R are determined by ITU-R's member countries ~~themselves~~. Regarding the long cycle between the conferences, it was argued that while some may find it not time efficient, it has also a ~~protecting role~~ protection against the technology gap that exists between developed and developing countries. In addition, the decision system is based on reaching consensus, and it inevitably takes time to agree on a decision. As expressed by one of the interviewees: "*WRC restores my faith in humanity in that a hundred and ninety countries can get together albeit they are with competing either national or regional interests, and yet at the end of 4 weeks of hard work they can actually arrive at an agreement*".

Besides, quicker decisions increase the risk of making the wrong decision that needs to be changed afterwards. Furthermore, WRCs are sovereign and modification of the agenda can be done at the plenary of the conference. It was also argued that there should be a balance between regulatory certainty to encourage investment and flexibility in order to cope with the pace of technology ~~pace~~. More specifically, these stringent and clear rules are important to foster regulatory certainty internationally. It was also mentioned that although WRC is a treaty making conference, countries may legally deviate from it. More specifically, while the final act is signed by the member states, they can at the time of signature record their reservations towards particular propositions that ~~may~~ conflict with their national interest legislation.

On the other hand, there was a view that the current ITU process may limit ~~countries~~ the capabilities of countries to introduce flexibility into their spectrum use. In particular, countries cannot make decisions until the time of a WRC. Moreover, more frequent meetings of WRCs may be needed as decisions can only be taken every three or four years and seven to eight years to have a new issue on the agenda of the conference. It was also expressed that technology does not wait for the ITU to meet and that the process is slow "*in six to eight years GSM went from nothing to be the major mobile technology*". Therefore, it was suggested to hold conferences that relate to the particular issue.

VIII. Footnotes

1
2
3 | There ~~are~~ were two distinct views on the influence of footnotes on radiocommunication
4 service allocation flexibility. On one hand, there was a view that footnotes provide flexibility
5 to deviate from the RR, as they could be used to respond to the particular request of the
6 country in order to have international protection for them and a legal basis to coordinate. In
7 addition, footnotes could provide flexibility via additional or alternative service allocation or
8 to be exempted from a service (for example, developing countries want to use the C-Band for
9 IMT while in island countries, fixed satellite service is more attractive). Moreover, when a
10 new allocation is made at the conference, some countries may need time to re-farm some
11 radio spectrum bands in order to adopt this new use. In such easecases, footnotes could be
12 used to indicate that in this particular country there will be a specific additional allocation at
13 least until the next WRC.
14

15
16 Another use of footnotes is using them as part of negotiations with neighbouring
17 countries. In other words, they could be used as part of the trading positions regarding other
18 agenda items in WRCs. One other use that was mentioned by interviewees is that footnotes
19 may be used by countries that have some special interest. For instance, the WRC may decide
20 to allocate a specific band for maritime mobile service but a land-locked country may not
21 have access to the sea. Hence, such a country may use the band for another use (such as land
22 mobile). One other useful usefeature is that footnotes could provide flexibility when it is hard
23 to reach a compromise and they could be also considered as a starting point for harmonised
24 allocation in the RR “*it gives the opportunity it to build confidence and then expand that out*”.
25 One example of such footnote is the mobile footnote in the C-Band, which was argued to be
26 useful for the mobile community as the footnote has large number of countries participating
27 so that it has similar effect to regional allocation in the RR.
28

29
30 | On the other hand, there was a view that footnotes could be used to constrain
31 spectrum use. For instance, they could be used to provide priority to the incumbent service or
32 to reduce flexibility in case they remove an allocation out of the RR. Moreover, the flexibility
33 provided to some countries may reduce the flexibility to a neighbouring country. Finally, it
34 was clarified that the large amount of footnotes complicates the understating of the RR, and
35 that global harmonisation would mean fewer footnotes.
36

37 IX. Three Region System

38
39 Regarding the influence of the three regions system on radiocommunication service
40 allocation flexibility, one view was that while the ITU-R is trying to achieve harmonisation
41 between the three regions, the system per se does not restrict flexibility. Moreover, by having
42 three regions, it is easier to decide on a flexible allocation within each region. More
43 specifically, it allows for having different frequency plans in different regions and the
44 division of the three regions makes it less problematic to reach consensus. In other words, the
45 division makes it possible to get an agreement in one region, as the alternative would be to
46 block the whole agreement globally. It was also expressed that the division is unavoidable
47 due to the different interests and requirements that exist between countries. This may be
48 related to geographical circumstances; for example, in tropical countries they often need the
49 C band because of propagation conditions.
50

51
52 On the other hand, it was argued that the division creates problems when the same
53 spectrum bands are used for different services between the three regions. Some interviewees
54 argued that the three regions are, in practice, six regions and that for ~~region two~~ Regions 2 and
55 three3, flexibility is much better than region one where you have got four smaller regional
56 groups - CEPT, ASMG, ATU, and RCC - that all have to agree. Moreover, countries on the
57 borders between the regions - such as Iran, which lies in Region 3 but share borders with
58
59
60

1
2
3 Region 1 - face additional challenges. Therefore, it is argued that the three regions system
4 does not restrict flexibility for regions but it restricts flexibility for countries located on the
5 borders of the regions.
6

7 X. A Priori Planning

8
9 The analysis of the interviews revealed that the GE-06 agreement already accommodates
10 flexibility, because it has not included the very detailed frequency planning and has not set up
11 a specific situation with geographically fixed data. Accordingly, the values of the
12 coordination trigger used in GE-06 provide sufficient flexibility for countries to make use of
13 their international spectrum use with regard to their neighbours. Another interviewee
14 explained that flexibility depends on a country's ~~positions~~position, and how diverse use by
15 their neighbours is. Therefore, GE-06 could provide flexibility to introduce mobile service if,
16 for example, that is the common approach adopted by neighbour countries. Furthermore, the
17 plan can accommodate new broadcasting standards, such as DVB-T2 although the plan was
18 originally based on DVB-T.
19

20
21 There was a contrasting view that a priori planning conferences cannot anticipate
22 technologies and, as a result, they always need to be updated. The development of new
23 services has made the life cycle of such agreements much shorter compared to previous
24 agreements. Another argument against a priori planning conferences is that these conferences
25 take a lot of time and effort and coordination is still needed. It was also mentioned that it
26 would have been easier if, during RRC-06, the decision of WRC-07 to allocate the band 790
27 to 862 MHz for mobile service had been taken into consideration. In addition, these
28 conferences could be a restrictive because they are regional conference, which means in
29 practice that only a regional conference can make any modifications to the agreement.
30

31 XI. MIFR

32
33 In general, it was indicated during the interviews that a country's dependence on MIFR is
34 related to its geographical position and its relationship with neighbouring countries.
35 Therefore, in cases where it is difficult to register assignments due to neighbouring countries,
36 there would be a need to have bilateral agreements with them. Another important issue that
37 was raised by one of the interviewee is that if there is no registered assignment in a particular
38 band, this may provide an indication that band should be reallocated to another service. An
39 example of this is related to the C-band where today many FSS stations are registered in the
40 MIFR. However, before WRC-07 where IMT identification in the band was discussed, not
41 that many stations were registered but then the satellite community invited countries and
42 operators to register their stations to provide an indication of the actual use of the band.
43

44
45 Regarding the influence of MIFR on ~~the~~ flexibility, one view was that MIFR is not
46 related to flexibility but to international recognition of the spectrum used in a country with
47 respect to other countries. In addition, changing the assignments could be conducted at any
48 time unlike the case of footnotes where you have to wait for ~~an~~ WRC to amend them.
49 Moreover, it was pointed out that while MIFR may formally ~~MIFR may~~ impose a restriction
50 because all the data about the assignments must be submitted it does not, however, restrict
51 them in practice. This is due to many countries do not registering their assignments.
52

53
54 On the other hand, it was argued that registering assignments might restrict
55 neighbouring countries' flexibility. In particular, it could restrict countries registering their
56 assignments in the future in cases where changes have occurred. Therefore, one interviewee
57 argued that it is better to have good agreements than to do it through the ITU-R because it is
58 restricting possibilities for countries that register their assignments as well. It was also argued
59
60

1
2
3 that there is a trade-off between flexibility and protection where in cases there is a need for
4 flexibility, international protection would not be provided by the MIFR. More specifically, if
5 the national assignments are flexible enough, they will not be registered in the MIFR, which
6 has specific rules so that it would be possible to register the assignment under one allocation.
7

8 One point that was raised during the interviews is that there should be a filter to
9 distinguish real assignments from assignments that are not deployed in practice. Some
10 countries register assignments and even after these assignments become unused and out-dated,
11 they ~~could~~ do not withdraw such assignments. Moreover, there is no good mechanism to
12 delete these entries and, therefore, ~~it, this~~ could be a restriction as the ITU does not have any
13 means of determining real deployment and in case countries claim some deployment, the ITU
14 have to accept such claim as true.
15

16 XII. Conclusions

17
18 In general, our analysis has shown that the RR are perceived more as a framework for
19 harmonisation while not constraining the ITU-R countries' flexibility in order to enable the
20 mass production of equipment and to raise the economic value of the spectrum. In other
21 words, while countries are sovereign when it comes to radiocommunication service allocation,
22 they simply follow the RR for the sake of gaining harmonisation benefits and protecting
23 against interference. Moreover, countries are only restricted on the borders with their
24 neighbours and flexibility is already enabled through different measures such as having
25 multiple allocations in the same band.
26

27
28 While the current ITU-R radiocommunication services definitions are not necessarily
29 mutually exclusive, and in most cases there is a common allocation between the different
30 services which provide additional flexibility, some of the radiocommunication service
31 definitions are old and do not correspond to today's circumstances. Additionally, one view is
32 that the ITU-R decision-making procedures do not restrict flexibility, as they were able to
33 accommodate any type of technology developments over numerous years, and ~~they are set by~~
34 ITU-R countries themselves set them. The other view is that these procedures may limit
35 countries capabilities to introduce flexibility to their spectrum use, as they cannot make
36 decisions until the time of a WRC. Regarding footnotes, the interviews revealed that they are
37 considered as a double-edged sword; while they are a relatively adequate tool to introduce
38 flexibility ~~but~~, they may also restrict spectrum use in neighbouring countries.
39

40
41 With respect to the influence of the three regions system on radiocommunication
42 service allocation flexibility, one view was that while the ITU-R is trying to achieve
43 harmonisation between the three regions, the system does not restrict the flexibility except for
44 these countries on the borders between the regions. The examination of the a priori planning
45 conferences highlights the view that while they allow enough flexibility to accommodate
46 other uses and technologies, these conferences could be ~~a~~-restrictive because only a regional
47 conference can make any modifications to regional agreements. Moreover, one view was that
48 MIFR is not related to flexibility but to international recognition of the spectrum used in a
49 country with respect to other countries, registering assignments in the MIFR may restrict
50 neighbouring countries' flexibility.
51

52 In conclusion, it is shown that the international spectrum management regime permits
53 relative degrees of flexibility to ~~the~~ ITU-R countries in terms of radiocommunication service
54 allocation. This flexibility depends mainly on the interpretation of the RR, which is related to
55 a country's national laws and whether what is not allowed is what is not mentioned in the law
56 or what the law forbids. Moreover, several elements of the RR could be used in both ways, to
57 promote countries' flexibility or to restrict ~~others'~~ the decisions of others. Besides, the degree
58
59
60

1
2
3 of flexibility or restriction is related also to the geographical position of countries, size of
4 market, population distribution, and, most importantly, its relationship with its neighbouring
5 countries.
6

7 At the end of the day, it is the ITU-R countries themselves that formulated the
8 different RR elements, and the ITU-R as an entity cannot enforce any country to follow the
9 RR. The nature of some radiocommunication services such as broadcasting or satellite
10 requires a certain degree of restriction to promote efficient use of the spectrum without
11 harmful interference. Furthermore, it seems that the main concerns for countries today is
12 harmonisation even if it is traded off against less flexibility. Last but not least, we have
13 shown that the international spectrum management regime is not one of the reasons for the
14 unsuccessful application of flexible spectrum property rights concept in practice. This leads
15 to the suggestion that there is a need to review whether there still is a need for such concepts
16 given the increasingly importance of global harmonisation and economies of scales.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Info

References

- [BAUMOL](#)Baumol, W. & [ROBYN](#)Robyn, D. 2006. Toward an Evolutionary Regime for Spectrum Governance: Licensing or Unrestricted Entry? Washington, D.C.: AEI Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies.
- [BAZELEY](#)Bazeley, P. 2007. *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVivo (2nd edn.)*, London, Sage.
- [BEUTLER](#)Beutler, R. 2012. Results of the WRC-12 from a European Broadcaster's Perspective. *LS Summit 2012*.
- [BRYMAN](#)Bryman, A. & [BELL](#)Bell, E. 2007. *Business research methods.*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- [CAVE](#)Cave, M. 2002. Review of Radio Spectrum Management, An Independent Review for Department of Trade and Industry and HM Treasury.
- [CAVE](#)Cave, M., [DOYLE](#)Doyle, C. & [WEBB](#)Webb, W. 2007. *Essentials of modern spectrum management*, Cambridge ; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- [CAVE](#)Cave, M. & [WEBB](#)Webb, W. 2003. Designing Property Rights for the Operation of Spectrum Markets. *Papers in Spectrum Trading*, 1, 1-28.
- [CAVE](#)Cave, M. & [WEBB](#)Webb, W. 2012. The Unfinished History of Usage Rights for Spectrum. *Telecommunications Policy*, 36, 293-300.
- [CHADUC](#)Chaduc, J. & [POGOREL](#)Pogorel, G. 2008. *The Radio Spectrum. Managing a Strategic Resource*, London, ISTE Ltd.
- [COASE](#)Coase, R. H. 1959. The Federal Communications Commission. *Journal of Law & Economics*, 2, 1-40.
- [COASE](#)Coase, R. H. 1960. The Problem of Social Cost. *Journal of Law & Economics*, 3, 1-44.
- [DEFFAINS](#)Deffains, B. 2013. Spectrum Property Rights: from Theory to Policy. *17th Annual Conference of The International Society for New Institutional Economics*. Florence.
- [EL-MOGHAZI](#)El-Moghazi, M., [WHALLEY](#)Whalley, J. & [IRVINE](#)Irvine, J. 2012. WRC-12: Implication for the Spectrum Eco-System. *TPRC*. Arlington.
- [EL-MOGHAZI](#)El-Moghazi, M., [WHALLEY](#)Whalley, J. & [IRVINE](#)Irvine, J. 2014. WAPECS: Collision between Practice and Theory. *ITS 2014 Conference*. Brussels.
- ~~[EUROSTRATEGIES AND LS TELECOM](#)~~[Eurostrategies and Ls-Telecom](#) 2007. Study on Radio Interference Regulatory Models in the European Community.
- [EVCİ](#)Evcı, C. & [FINO](#)Fino, B. 2005. Limits and Paradoxes in Radio Spectrum Management. *International Union of Radio Science General Assembly*. New Delhi, India.
- [HAZLETT](#)Hazlett, T. W. & [MUÑOZ](#)Muñoz, R. E. 2006. Spectrum Allocation in Latin America: An Economic Analysis. *George Mason Law & Economics Research Paper*, 6, 261-278.
- [INDEPEN](#)Indepen, A. 2001. Implications of International Regulation and Technical Considerations on Market Mechanisms in Spectrum Management: Report to the Independent Spectrum Review.
- ~~[INDEPEN AND AEGIS SYSTEMS](#)~~[Indepen and Aegis Systems](#) 2004. Costs and Benefits of Relaxing International Frequency Harmonisation and Radio Standards.
- ITU-R 1995. ITU-R Recommendation SM.1133: Spectrum Utilization of Broadly Defined Services. *SM Series. Spectrum Management*.
- ITU-R 2001. ITU-R Recommendation SM.1265-1: National Alternative Allocation Methods. *SM Series. Spectrum Management*.
- ITU-R 2007. WRC-07 Resolution 951: Options to Improve the International Spectrum Regulatory Framework. *Provisional Final Acts - World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-07)*.
- ITU-R 2008a. Article 5: Frequency Allocations. *Radio Regulations*.

- 1
2
3 ITU-R 2008b. Preamble. *Radio Regulations*.
- 4 ITU-R 2011. CPM Report on Technical, Operational and Regulatory/Procedural Matters
5 to be Considered by the 2012 World Radiocommunication Conference.
- 6 ITU-R 2012a. WRC-12 Resolution 957: Studies Towards Review of the Definitions of
7 Fixed service, Fixed Station and Mobile Station. *Provisional Final Acts - World
8 Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-12)*.
- 9 ITU-R. 2012b. WRC-12 Weekly Highlights. Available: <http://www.itu.int> [Accessed
10 19/3/2012].
- 11 ITU-R 2014. CPM Report on Technical, Operational and Regulatory/Procedural Matters
12 to be Considered by the 2015 World Radiocommunication Conference.
- 13 ITU-R 2015. *Provisional Final Acts - World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-15)*.
- 14 ITU 2011. Convention of the International Telecommunication Union. *Collection of the
15 Basic Texts of the ITU Adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference (Ed 2011)*
- 16 | [KRASNERKrasner](#), S. 1982. Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as
17 Intervening Variables. *International Organization*, 36.
- 18 | [LYALLLyall](#), F. 2011. *International Communications: The International
19 Telecommunication Union and The Universal Postal Union*, UK, Ashgate Publishing
20 Ltd.
- 21 | [MAITRAMaitra](#), A. 2004. *Wireless Spectrum Management. Policies, Practices, and
22 Conditioning Factors.*, The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- 23 | [O'LEARYO'leary](#), T., [PUIGREFAGUTPuigrefagut](#), E. & [SAMI'Sami](#), W. 2006. Overview of
24 the Second Session (RRC-06) and the Main Features for Broadcasters. *EBU
25 Technical Review*.
- 26 | [OFCOMOfcom](#) 2008. Spectrum Usage Rights: A Guide Describing SURs.
- 27 | RSPG 2005. RSPG05-102 on Wireless Access Platform for Electronic Communication
28 Services (WAPECS) (A More Flexible Spectrum Management Approach). *Radio
29 Spectrum Policy Group Opinions*.
- 30 | [RYANRyan](#), P. S. 2005. The Future of the ITU and its Standard-Setting Functions in
31 Spectrum Management. In: BOLIN, S. (ed.) *Standard Edge: Future Generation*.
32 Sheridan Books.
- 33 | [SAUNDERSSaunders](#), M., [LEWISLewis](#), P. & [THORNHILLThornhill](#), A. 2009. *Research
34 Methods for Business Students (5th edn.)*, Pearson Education Limited.
- 35 | [VANYVany](#), A. S. D., [ECKERTEckert](#), R. D., [MEYERSMeyers](#), C. J., [O'HARAO'hara](#), D. J. &
36 [SCOTTScott](#), R. C. 1969. A Property System for Market Allocation of the
37 Electromagnetic Spectrum: A Legal-Economic-Engineering Study. *Stanford Law
38 Review*, 21, 1499-1561.
- 39 | [VRIESVries](#), P. D. & [SIEHSieh](#), K. A. 2012. Reception-Oriented Radio Rights: Increasing
40 the Value of Wireless by Explicitly Defining and Delegating Radio Operating
41 Rights. *Telecommunications Policy*, 36, 522-530.
- 42 | [WEISERWeiser](#), P. & [HATFIELDHatfield](#), D. 2008. Spectrum Policy Reform and the Next
43 Frontier of Property Rights. *George Mason Law Review*, 60, 549-609.
- 44 | [WELLENIUSWellenius](#), B. & [NETONeto](#), I. 2005. The Radio Spectrum: Opportunities and
45 Challenges for the Developing World. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*.
- 46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60