AGREEMENT between the administrations of ...
on the co-ordination of frequencies between 29.7 MHz and 39.5 GHz
for fixed services and land mobile services
[Vienna Agreement](Berlin 2001), Meeting on data exchange
Berlin, 03.-05.12.01

Report of the Meeting on Data Exchange.

Berlin, 03 - 05 December 2001

**1 Welcome and opening of the meeting;
Approval of the agenda**

Mr. Hans-E. KNAB opened the meeting and welcomed all the participants in Berlin in the name of the Regulierungsbehörde für Telekommunikation und Post. Participants were coming from administrations of France, Germany, Luxembourg and The Netherlands (List of participants → Annex 1). He regretted that Belgium apologised (→ Doc.1) not be able being present; consequences of this absence should be discussed at the relevant agenda items.

This meeting was organised to discuss problems concerning the exchange of files with topographical and border-line data and of test files with frequency entries, although the conditions agreed upon the last meeting on these topics were not met completely.

The draft **agenda** (→ Annex 2) was **adopted** unanimously. The list of documents is given in Annex 3.

**2 Reports from the last meetings
(HOL, BEL, LUX, F, D)**

According the **report from Brussels**, Nov. 2000, which is existing in two versions, there was no need for more discussion.

The **report from Luxembourg**, May 2001, was **adopted** after a short discussion as it was sent from LUX. Referring to agenda item 4 (4th para.) D remarked that every administration has to bear the risks of wrong calculation results caused by having mistakes in its own frequency file.

**3 Digital Terrain Data: Status, discussions and exchange
(HOL, BEL, LUX, F, D)**

Digital Terrain Data of BEL, D, HOL and LUX are available from the same source and therefore there is no need to exchange them. Nevertheless they can be exchanged with every other administration under the terms of the licence agreements, which do not limit the number of users.

In the relations of BEL – D - HOL – LUX on the one hand to F on the other hand Digital Terrain Data are available for F, and in the process of comparison and suiting in CZE; the exchange for unlimited use for every other administration is not yet possible because F has no license for that. LUX can accept a limited license, HOL and D not, because they need and can give an unlimited license in the sense of equivalency. F needs new negotiations with the "Institut Géographique National".

4 Border-lines : Status, comparison and exchange (HOL, BEL, LUX, F, D)

In all relations of BEL – D - HOL border-line data are available, compared, suited and exchanged under the terms of the licence agreements, which do not limit the number of users.

The border-lines of F are available in all relations to the affected countries, but should be completed by straight lines on seas in order to have a closed border-line. The exchange may be possible under the terms of the licence agreement, which has to be checked by F. LUX can accept a limited license, HOL and D not, because they need and can give an unlimited license in the sense of equivalency under the terms of the licence agreements.

The border-lines of LUX are available in all relations to the neighbouring countries; they have to be compared, suited and exchanged for free use for every affected countries.

The administrations wish to have border-line data for the use for operators also.

According to **all border-line data,** Mr. Peter BENNER declared that he would be ready to collect them, to fix the 3-country-points with the affected countries and to propose the necessary x-km-lines. This was welcomed and **agreed** by all.

5 Frequency test files: Status , New problems occurred since the last meeting, comparison, tolerances, discussions and exchange (HOL, BEL, LUX, D)

HOL declared to be very disappointed by the letter of BEL ($\rightarrow$ Doc. 1) for several reasons. After the date of this meeting had been known for a long time, HOL see it inappropriate that BEL indicates only some days before the meeting that they will not participate in this meeting. Additionally it is hard to continue the work without BEL, who had not taken part for two meetings, because BEL had promised to work out a comparison program [1] which do not run on any computer of the present participants; the required assistance was not given. It is felt also very strange that on the one hand BEL had sent his files for the first time just before the meeting and on the other hand states that the files of other countries "still contain a substantial amount of formatting errors, thus making them unsuitable for comparison". This would have been proved to be wrong (see further down). This declaration was supported by D and LUX.

The examination of the error report from BEL referring to the German files brought the following result referring to the different classes of messages:

message	reason	comment by D	necessary action by D
13z not alphanum	character "="	is allowed [2]	none
1a wrong unit	empty	is allowed for receivers [3]	none
2c wrong value	00000000	is not allowed	change to empty (21 entries in file D__-BEL, 6 entries in file D__-HOL, 18 entries in file D__-LUX)
4c wrong format	empty	is allowed [4]	none

---

[1] "Mr. Peter VAN HUFFEL promised to continue his work on the development of the comparison program and distribute it among the partners."
[2] Ann2, §3.1
[3] Ann2, App4, Field 1A
[4] Ann2, App4, Field 4A: If 4C is empty , 4A indicates (not "has to be") "INTR"

6a wrong value	"MO"	is allowed [5]	none
6b wrong or unusual value	"EX"	is allowed [6]	none
4a -> INTR because 4c empty	several regions	is not allowed	shift 4A to 13Z, set 4A="INTR" (58 entries in file D__-BEL, 1 entry in file D__-HOL, 3 entries in file D__-LUX)
8b1 -> 0	empty	is allowed for receivers [7]	none

The rate of errors is 1,7% / 0,15% / 0,8% according to BEL / HOL / LUX respectively.

The matters of comparison of the files and the definition of tolerances could not be treated because the comparison program could not be made operational .

6   Establishment of work program with time-schedule (HOL, BEL, LUX, D)

It was agreed that the following steps should be taken in the listed order, on the basis of the already agreed scheme:
1. Correction of the files as shown before and distribution.
2. Correction of the validation program as shown before.
3. Preparation and distribution of the validation and comparison program for running on the PC of the participants.
4. Comparison of the test files.
5. Procedure to deal with the differences.

7   Co-ordination according [Vienna Agreement] (Berlin 2001): Discussion of problems (HOL, BEL, LUX, D)

Nothing to discuss

8   Any other business

F, HOL and LUX would like to have the texts of the agreement available on the website as promised in Berlin. They also asked kindly for the texts of the agreement and the HCM-programs and their documentation on CD-ROM. They also asked kindly Mr. Hans-E. KNAB to put forward this question to the managing administration.

9   Next meeting ; Closure of the meeting

BEL was asked by phone to attend the next meeting and to prepare the validation and comparison program as shown above. It promised to do so and offered to have the next meeting in BRUSSELS 09 – 11 Jan. 2002; this was accepted by the participants with great thanks to BEL.

Mr. Hans-E. KNAB thanked the participants for their attendance to the meeting. The next meeting will only be successful if the exchange of the corrected test files has taken place and the validation and comparison program is available. In this next meeting the agenda items 5 - 6 will be discussed again.

---

[5] Ann2, App6, data dictionary contains "MO"
[6] Ann2, App7, data dictionary contains "EX"
[7] Ann2, App4, Field 8B1