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# Executive summary

Under Part 4 of Chapter 3 of the *Legislation Act 2003*, most legislative instruments ‘sunset’. They are automatically repealed on 1 April or 1 October that first occurs
10 years after they are registered. This is an automatic process applying to most legislative instruments, regardless of their content.

The Radiocommunications (Public Safety and Emergency Response) Class Licence 2013(the 2013 class licence) is due to sunset on 1 October 2023. The 2013 class licence allows public safety bodies (PSBs) to deploy a range of high-speed radiocommunications services in the 4940–4990 MHz band, otherwise known as the 4.9 GHz band.

In June 2023, we consulted on remaking the 2013 class licence. Our preliminary view was that the 2013 class licence is operating effectively and efficiently. As such, it continues to form a necessary and useful part of the legislative framework.

The ACMA also proposed that the 2013 class licence be augmented to enable PSBs to use cellular mobile technologies (currently those based in the 5G suite of technologies), in addition to the existing technologies that can be used under the conditions of the licence.

Subsequent to feedback from the consultation process, we have decided to proceed with the remaking of the 2013 class licence, under section 132 of the *Radiocommunications Act 1992* (the Act). The new (augmented) licence, named the Radiocommunications (Public Safety and Emergency Response) Class Licence 2023 (the 2023 class licence), will commence on 1 October 2023.

No responses to the consultation opposed remaking the 2013 class licence. For the most part, responses were supportive of the additional arrangements for cellular mobile technologies. However, some submitters cautioned that use of such technologies could degrade the 4.9 GHz band’s use by systems currently authorised by the 2013 class licence. Other submissions suggested that the ACMA should expand the proposed allowance for cellular technologies.

We consider that the arrangements for the use of cellular mobile technologies in the 2023 class licence represent an appropriate balance between enabling use of cellular mobile technologies while keeping the potential for interference into other authorised radiocommunications devices manageable. The retention of existing technical arrangements in the class licence means that PSBs can choose not to deploy newly authorised systems if they have no operational need to do so.

Coordination of PSB operations in the band was a common theme raised in responses to the consultation. A significant number of submissions called for the class licence
to mandate the appointment of a manager to assist in managing access to the
4.9 GHz band.

The ACMA considers that PSBs may be able to coordinate among themselves without the need for the class licence to make provision for a manager to be appointed. However, we are willing to consider this suggestion further if PSBs were to prepare a coordinated, detailed proposal.

Some submissions also suggested apparatus licensing as an alternative means of authorising the operation of radiocommunications devices. This could enable appointment of a ‘band manager’, by issuing that (presumably area/jurisdiction-wide) apparatus licence to the manager.

The manager could then authorise PSBs to operate devices under the licence, under section 114 of the Act, and in doing so coordinate those bodies’ use of the relevant spectrum. We do not consider apparatus licensing to be an appropriate alternative, given the general agreement that the class licensing model remains fit-for-purpose, affords the necessary flexibility to support public safety and emergency response operations, and does not involve the payment of any taxes or charges.

# Introduction

The ACMA [consulted on a proposal to remake the 2013 class licence](https://www.acma.gov.au/consultations/2023-06/proposal-remake-public-safety-and-emergency-response-class-licence) in June/July 2023. The consultation package comprised:

a consultation paper

a draft of the proposed updated class licence

a proposed revocation notice for the 2013 class licence.

This outcomes paper should be read in conjunction with the consultation paper for details of the new elements of the 2023 class licence. In summary, the 2013 class licence provided for the use of the following in the 4.9 GHz band:

localised wireless broadband services (e.g., Wi-Fi)

fixed devices (e.g., point-to-point links)

mobile devices (e.g., land mobile)

airborne payload devices (e.g., helicopter-to-ground downlink).

The prescribed PSBs would be:

the Australian Federal Police or the police force of a State or Territory

any Commonwealth, state or territory body that is not covered above, and that performs functions relating to the investigation or prevention of terrorism, serious crime or corruption

any Commonwealth, state, territory or other body that provides an ambulance, fire-fighting, search or rescue services

the Australian Defence Force.

The substantive new elements included in the 2023 class licence expand on the established provisions to enable the use of cellular mobile services – e.g., 5G base stations, ‘cells on wheels’ (COWs) and associated user equipment (UE).

The consultation paper requested comment on a number of issues pertaining to the need, current use, fitness for purpose and conditions for operation of existing and proposed new authorised services. Responses to those questions are summarised in this paper.

# Responses to consultation

The ACMA received [12 submissions](https://www.acma.gov.au/consultations/2023-06/proposal-remake-public-safety-and-emergency-response-class-licence) to the consultation process from respondents representing:

the PSBs (including state government agencies responsible for management of PSB communications)

equipment/service providers (and consultancies)

the telecommunications service provider sector

the radioastronomy sector.

The telecommunications service provider sector’s responses were high-level in nature and only addressed the first 2 of 13 questions, and radioastronomy sector’s submission only pertained to question 13. The breakdown of respondents by
sector are:

PSB sector:

NSW Fire and Rescue Service

NSW Police Force

NSW Telco Authority

Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads

Equipment/service provider sector:

Amber Technology

ARCIA

Hypha

Motorola Solutions

Nova Systems

Telecommunications service provider sector, including mobile network operators (MNOs):

AMTA

Optus

Radioastronomy sector:

CSIRO.

### Question 1

Is the class licence still needed? Why or why not?

### Submissions received

The ongoing necessity of the 2013 class licence was universally agreed by respondents from the PSB and equipment/service provider sectors. Respondents cited the flexibility afforded by class licensing, which allows for ad hoc deployment of a range of technologies, as being beneficial for public safety operations. In some cases, PSBs argued that ongoing access is vital for those operations. Some respondents argued that the 2023 class licence should contain amended provisions with respect to time limits on fixed point-to-point link operation and band management/coordination (see responses to questions 11 and 2, respectively, for further discussion).

Telecommunications service provider sector responses pointed out that the 4.9 GHz band continues to be listed under the ‘monitoring’ stage in the ACMA’s current draft Five-year spectrum outlook (FYSO), and therefore they wished to be kept abreast of developments concerning the band. One respondent supported remaking the 2013 class licence but flagged that this position may change pending international developments or changes to the status of the band in the FYSO.

### ACMA response

The ACMA agrees that the 2013 class licence is still needed, and notes that use of the 4.9 GHz band by PSBs is increasing.

### Question 2

Is the class licence operating effectively and efficiently? Why or why not?

### Submissions received

In general, responses (except one, see below) from across all sectors were of the view that the 2013 class licence is operating effectively and efficiently. However, a broad theme emerged from a significant number of PSB and equipment/service provider respondents, who argue that there needs to be an appointed/mandated band management function.

One respondent from the equipment/service provider sector suggested that the 2013 class licence is notoperating efficiently and effectively without a band management function. That respondent, in response to subsequent questions around technical conditions for access to the 4.9 GHz band, suggested that such conditions would be unnecessary if a band management function was mandated. This is because the band manager would be able to undertake coordination to meet protection requirements.

### ACMA response

The ACMA agrees that coordination across PSBs is necessary to optimise the efficiency of use under the 2013 class licence, and manage interference between operators. We note that some, but not all, jurisdictions have appointed or legislated authorities that are responsible for the deployment and management of government/emergency services radio networks. This includes, in some cases, access to associated spectrum holdings.

We consider that PSBs may be able to coordinate among themselves without the need for the 2023 class licence to make provision for a manager to be appointed. However, the ACMA is willing to consider this suggestion further if PSBs were to prepare a coordinated, detailed proposal.

We would expect that such a proposal would be universally agreed among relevant PSB/emergency management authorities. How this agreement is gained and articulated would be a matter for those authorities.

### Question 3

How are PSBs currently using the class licence? Are the current authorised services fit-for-purpose?

### Submissions received

A number of current use cases, either supporting/augmenting other PSB communications functions or operating as standalone networks, were reported by PSB sector respondents. Some equipment/services provider sector respondents provided details of their own technologies. Use cases reported included:

mesh networks (including mobile ad hoc networks (MANETs)

mesh Wi-Fi and associated temporary reticulation links) for incident response, coverage extension or operations in coverage-denied areas

wideband air-to-ground networks (including video uplink/downlink)

temporary fixed point-to-point links.

One response from the equipment/services provider sector suggested there was no evidence of fixed point-to-point use and that those provisions could be removed from the 2023 class licence.

### ACMA response

The ACMA notes the use cases reported.

### Question 4

Is the current class licensing model fit-for-purpose? Why or why not? How would any interference protection or hybrid class / apparatus licensing arrangements work?

### Submissions received

Responses from the PSB sector were mixed on this issue. There was general support for the flexibility afforded by the class licensing model, but again, the issue appointing a band manager to manage access/interference between PSBs was raised.

Some responses were in favour of some apparatus licensing in the band. One respondent favoured segmentation of the band whereby part of the band could be authorised by area-wide apparatus licences (AWLs). This would enable fixed station deployments of longer than 6 months duration (see below discussion in response to question 11 regarding providing clarity around these matters). Another respondent suggested having a state-wide apparatus licence issued to enable a band-management role in that jurisdiction (this respondent also maintained that class licensing is fit-to-purpose but suggested the management under an apparatus licensing model as a potential alternative approach to authorisation).

Similarly, responses from the equipment/services provider sector were generally in favour of the existing class licensing model. However, again, some suggested that a band management function was needed. One respondent was in favour of limiting fixed point-to-point deployments to a maximum 6-month duration under the 2023 class licence, with the option to apparatus licence longer-term deployments. Another was not in favour of co-frequency apparatus licensing. One respondent noted that the
4.9 GHz band is subject to both international harmonisation through the Radiocommunications Sector of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU-R) and standardisation through 3GPP. They suggested it would be useful to follow the United States’ Federal Communications Commission’s example of enabling the use of 3GPP-based technologies (this relates more to the following questions).

### ACMA response

At this stage, the only case envisaged for apparatus licensing in the band is to support reasonable use cases that the 2023 class licence cannot support, such as fixed point-to-point link deployments of longer than 6-month duration. This is necessarily on a ‘by exception’ basis as to not degrade the utility of operations in the band under the 2023 class licence that might result from excessive co-frequency apparatus licences being issued.

The proposal to allocate jurisdiction-wide apparatus licences to a band manager would be an ‘either/or’ proposition, in that it would be difficult to envisage how such an arrangement could co-exist with the 2023 class licence in that jurisdiction. This model was proposed as an extension to the proposal (discussed in the response to
Question 2) to appoint a jurisdiction-wide band manager. The ACMA does not consider the apparatus licensing proposal necessary if the 2023 class licence was to be amended to mandate frequency assignment through that (hypothetical) band manager. The end state would be the same: the band manager is essentially the licensee who controls/coordinates access by PSBs within their jurisdiction, regardless of the authorisation mechanism. Moving to apparatus licensing for this purpose would be a big step given the general agreement that the class licensing model is fit-for-purpose (either in its current form or to give effect to a future, hypothetical band management function). The ACMA does not consider apparatus licensing to be an appropriate alternative given the general agreement that the class licensing model remains fit-for-purpose, affords the necessary flexibility to support public safety
and emergency response operations, and does not involve the payment of any taxes or charges.

See response to Question 2 regarding appointment of a band manager.

### Question 5

Should specific provisions for cellular mobile technologies be included in the class licence? Why or why not?

### Submissions received

PSB sector responses noted the potential benefits of cellular mobile technologies for PSB operations. However, one respondent cautioned that facilitating them should not come at the cost of additional interference/access degradation to other PSB use. The need for technology neutrality (which is the intent of the proposal, noting the retention of the established provisions) and limiting cellular use to PSBs (also the intent of the proposal) was also stated by submitters.

Most equipment/services provider sector responses were supportive of the proposal, with some reiterating the need for it to be accompanied by some form of centralised band management function. One cautioned that it should not come at the cost of technology neutrality. Another respondent that provided an alternative solution questioned the benefits of cellular mobile technologies and further suggested that there should be a 25 MHz bandwidth limit on devices operating in the 4.9 GHz band.

### ACMA response

Regarding technology flexibility, we consider that such flexibility is facilitated by retaining the established, more general provisions alongside the proposed new provisions. This allows for cellular mobile technologies which otherwise do not fit neatly within the general provisions.

Concerns around degradation of the band for other uses resulting from cellular deployments are only likely to arise where networks of significant scale are deployed, using large parts of the band without communicating/coordinating with other PSBs operating in the area. We remain of the view that coordination between PSB operations in the 4.9 GHz band should continue. The decision to deploy one technology or another sits with authorised bodies. There is always scope for mutually beneficial arrangements such as asset/network sharing if PSBs do in fact cooperate with one another.

These are matters for emergency management authorities, rather than the ACMA.

There was broad support for the proposed new provisions in responses, and we intend to implement them as proposed.

See response to Question 2 regarding appointment of a band manager.

### Question 6

Are the proposed emission mask, power limit and equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP) limit for cellular mobile BS appropriate? Does emission mask P, in conjunction with other proposed measures, sufficiently mitigate the risk of adjacent channel interference to other devices authorised under the class licence?

### Submissions received

PSB sector responses were varied, ranging from a desire to limit operation to the existing emission masks, power limits and EIRPs, to proposing relaxation of conditions to align with 3GPP standards. This is generally proposed, albeit with EIRP limited to reflect a ‘medium’ coverage model. A range of responses was also observed from equipment/services provider sector responses, although responses in favour of retaining existing provisions were from providers that are compliant with the existing arrangements.

One submission from the equipment/services provider sector suggested band management would be needed to manage interference that might result from the proposed new arrangements.

### ACMA response

The ACMA sees merit in proceeding with the proposed inclusion of cellular mobile provisions in the 2023 class licence. Part of giving effect to that is ensuring that the parametric limits set out in the 2023 class licence would enable use of standardised equipment, so the adoption of 3GPP-based limits, where possible, is appropriate in this context.

The proposal to adopt parameters based on the medium coverage model is itself intended to mitigate the risk of interference to other services. Suggestions to adopt further expanded provisions, such as higher-power limits, are more geared towards the deployment of wide-scale cellular (commercial-type) cellular networks. This would differ from the types of use cases anticipated under the 2023 class licence, for which we expect the medium power model-based provisions to be adequate.

The 2023 class licence can be reviewed if a case is made that expanded provisions are necessary. It is preferable to adopt the more modest provisions at this point in time and potentially expand provisions later if evidence suggests the potential for interference to other services is low. With that in mind, we are of the view that the proposed cellular base station emission mask and power/EIRP limits strike an appropriate balance between interference management and enabling the use of newer technologies at this point in time.

See response to Question 2 regarding appointment of a band manager.

### Question 7

Are the proposed emission mask, power limit and EIRP limit for cellular mobile user equipment (UE) appropriate?

### Submissions received

Responses to this question mirrored those to the previous question concerning proposed cellular base station operating limits (and were equally as diverse). Additionally, one PSB sector response sought inclusion of high-power UE provisions (as specified by 3GPP for coverage extension in public safety scenarios) and one questioned why the proposed limits are lower than current 5G base station registrations in the 3.5 GHz band (noting that this applies to Question 6, not
Question 7).

Broadly, responses to Questions 6 and 7 demonstrate that there is significant disagreement within the PSB sector on what provisions should be made for
3GPP-based technologies, with some preferring that parametric limits remain as
they are, and others preferring significantly less restrictive limits than proposed.

### ACMA response

Regarding submissions suggesting that the existing limits be retained, there may be some misunderstanding that the existing limits would dissolve in favour of the proposed ones. The proposal was that the new arrangements would apply only to cellular mobile technologies and the existing arrangements would continue to apply for all other technologies. With this in mind, the ACMA has implemented the arrangements as proposed.

### Question 8

Are the emission masks, power limits and EIRP limits for existing services appropriate?

### Submissions received

Most PSB sector respondents supported the existing limits, with the exception of one submission reiterating the need to align with 3GPP specifications. Conversely, most responses from the equipment/services provider sector suggested they were too restrictive, with the exception of one that supported the existing limits. No suggestions for alternative arrangements were provided from that sector.

### ACMA response

The existing requirements were never intended to apply to 3GPP-based systems, so suggestions that they should align with 3GPP specifications were perhaps made in response to a different question (i.e., Question 6 or 7 concerning parameters for use of cellular mobile technologies). Evidence suggests that the existing limits are fit-for-purpose for enabling all but the cellular mobile category of use cases, for which the new arrangements apply. The ACMA, therefore, has retained the existing provisions as they are, to operate in conjunction with the new provisions for cellular mobile services as proposed.

### Question 9

Do the technical parameters proposed in the draft class licence restrict the use of any other technologies required by PSBs?

### Submissions received

Most responses from both the PSB and equipment/services provider sectors did not believe the proposed parameters would restrict the use of any other technologies, although a couple of responses again reiterated the need for the 2023 class licence to make provision for band management. One exception was a response from the PSB sector. It suggested that the introduction of provisions for cellular mobile technologies could introduce new interference scenarios, and reiterated a preference for arrangements to remain as they are.

### ACMA response

See responses to Question 2 regarding band management and to Question 5 regarding concerns around the potential degradation of non-cellular services under the new arrangements. Otherwise, we are satisfied that the new technical parameters do not restrict the use of any other technologies required by PSBs.

### Question 10

Do the current definitions of ‘public safety bodies’ and ‘public safety or emergency response function’ remain fit-for-purpose? Do the authorisation arrangements for other bodies remain appropriate? Why or why not?

### Submissions received

Responses from the PSB sector varied between supporting the current definition and suggesting an expansion of those definitions. Those that supported the current definition, or even suggested tightening it to exclude bodies that aren’t necessarily in the ‘first responder’ category, were from operational PSBs. Conversely, state government bodies responsible for the oversight of government radiocommunications networks (including ‘first responders’) suggested broadening the definitions. In one case this was to ensure that the agency could operate radiocommunications devices under the 2023 class licence (in order to then manage access to the band). In another case it was to include other government bodies involved in emergency management and disaster recovery that aren’t necessarily considered ‘first responders’.

Responses from the equipment/services provider sector were generally in favour of limiting access to the 4.9 GHz band to the intended user group. One response strongly argued for not expanding the current definition and limiting access to first responders. They suggested that, where there is a need for bodies outside that group to use the band, existing arrangements for authorising third-party access remain suitable for enabling that use. Another response supported the existing arrangements, and another went further and suggested the current wording needed to be made more explicit to avoid any ambiguity. A registration process for authorised entities was
also suggested.

There was one view from the equipment/services provider sector that the definition should be expanded to include entities not traditionally considered PSBs, including those responsible for restoring services in a disaster recovery scenario.

### ACMA response

Our long-standing policy is that the 4.9 GHz band is intended for public safety and emergency response only. While there may be a need for non-PSB use of the band to support public safety needs (e.g., access by telecommunications service providers to support public safety operations or energy/utilities companies to assist in disaster recovery), the 2013 class licence (reproduced in section 9 of the 2023 class licence) provides that:

 A public safety body may authorise a body to operate a radiocommunications device for the purpose of this instrument… An authorisation must… specify the period, not exceeding six months, during which the radiocommunication device may be operated …

In the ACMA’s view there is no need to expand definitions to enable operation by entities not traditionally considered PSBs. The current provisions would allow them to operate under the authorisation of a PSB covered by the 2023 class licence. We consider it is appropriate that PSBs retain this level of control over other uses of the band. Expanding the standing authorisation without the existing controls in place may result in degradation of the utility of the band for those entities that it is primarily intended to benefit.

With respect to changing the definition to explicitly list state government communications managers, we are satisfied that the existing arrangements provide sufficient authorisation. It is the entity operating the equipment that is authorised – independent of whatever overarching governance arrangements are in place. Retaining the existing definitions also reduces the potential for the 2023 class licence to inadvertently become out of date due to changes in arrangements at the state/territory level.

### Question 11

Is the 6-month limit for fixed point-to-point services appropriate? Why or why not? Does the 6-month limit prevent deployments of networks aligned with the purpose of the class licence?

### Submissions received

PSB sector responses were divided on retaining the 6-month limit on fixed point-to-point services, with 2 in favour and 2 preferring a relaxation of the limit. One response advocating for a relaxation of the limit was on the basis that the band could be needed for longer-term deployments to fill coverage gaps. This would be either as, for example, a deployable PSMB cell, or to allow emergency calling in black spot areas. This response seemed to apply more to fixed-based stations providing mobile coverage, which is not the target of the time limit. We did propose in the consultation to make it clearer that those measures apply specifically to ‘fixed point-to-point’ services and not necessarily stations that are ‘fixed’ in the non-regulatory sense (such as mobile base stations).

One response from the equipment/service provider sector supported making this clarification and noted that there is often confusion when this terminology is used in non-regulatory circles. Otherwise, responses from that sector were universally in favour of retaining the existing time limit, noting the option for apparatus licensing if there is a legitimate requirement for a fixed point-to-point service to operate for longer than 6 months.

### ACMA response

We remain of the view that the utility of the 4.9 GHz band for its primary intended purposes must be preserved, and that a proliferation of long-term fixed point-to-point links risks degrading that utility. This view was supported by most submissions to the consultation.

Despite seeking to provide clarification in the consultation paper that the 6-month limit applies to fixed point-to-point links in the regulatory sense, rather than any station that is physically fixed, there still seems to be confusion as to the intent of the limitation. The ACMA has clarified the intent in the 2023 class licence as proposed, but will retain the 6-month limitation on fixed point-to-point links. In infrequent cases where longer-term links are deemed necessary, the option of seeking apparatus licences remains (and has been used in limited cases in some jurisdictions).

### Question 12

Which channel plan should be adopted in the class licence? Why?

### Submissions received

Responses to this question from the PSB sector depended on their existing use and on whether they currently have a need for 1 MHz channels (or aggregations of 1 MHz channels). Those that support the retention of 1 MHz channels (as facilitated in channel plan A as specified in [ITU-R Recommendation M.1826](https://www.itu.int/rec/R-REC-M.1826-1-201911-I/en) *Harmonised frequency channel plan for broadband public protection and disaster relief operations at 4 940 – 4 990 MHz in Regions 2 and* *3*) noted the flexibility of the option to aggregate channels. One respondent didn’t articulate a specific preference, so long as the plan provided flexibility to accommodate all of their needs.

Similarly, equipment/services provider sector responses in some cases depended on the equipment they offer. Others remained neutral, again on the basis that flexibility is key, with one reiterating that the appointment of a band manager would obviate the need to specify a channel plan.

### ACMA response

Noting the need for ongoing flexibility and a need for 1 MHz channels by some operators, and that the provision for unlimited channel aggregation means that, in effect, there would be no barrier to using the discrete channels specified in channel plan B under plan A, we have proceeded as proposed with implementing channel plan A in the 2023 class licence.

### Question 13

### Are the current interference protection measures for radio astronomy sites fit-for-purpose? Are the proposed protection measures from cellular mobile BS and user equipment appropriate?

### Submissions received

In general, the PSB sector was in favour of relaxing the protection requirements for radioastronomy services. One respondent suggested they were too restrictive for their airborne operations, and another reiterated that there could be a role for band management to coordinate access with radioastronomy services. How the protection zones around radioastronomy services sites are communicated was also raised by one PSB sector respondent and by a respondent from the equipment/services provider sector.

Equipment/services provider sector responses were otherwise generally in favour of retaining protection provisions for radioastronomy services. However, one suggested that equipment bandwidths should be limited to 25 MHz, presumably in line with their own technology offerings. It is unclear how this relates to radioastronomy services protection.

A response from the radioastronomy services sector reaffirmed the need for ongoing protection in the 4.9 GHz band, singling out the particular importance of the band for radioastronomy observations at the Paul Wild Observatory in Narrabri, NSW.

### ACMA response

We do not intend to relax the protections for radioastronomy. We note the submission from the radioastronomy sector that those protection limits are fit-for-purpose and will retain the existing provisions in the remade class licence.

With regard to restrictions on operations around radioastronomy sites, the ACMA acknowledges that the protection requirements may present difficulties for airborne operations in some geographic areas. We do note, however, that:

The restrictions apply to frequencies above 4950 MHz, which means
4940–4950 MHz is available for airborne use.

The initial intention for the band was principally to support ground-based
operations, which are far less limited by the radioastronomy protection requirements. The provisions for airborne service were made after consultation
on the 2013 class licence in good faith, on the basis that radioastronomy services would still be protected. This policy has not changed.

Coordination with radioastronomy services site operators, either on an as-needs basis or towards standing provisions, always remains an option. The ACMA can provide relevant contact details as needed.

Operations during emergencies are covered by various provisions of the Act*.* For example, section 196 of the Act contains specific exemptions from penalties otherwise resulting from causing interference arising from radiocommunications operation in support of an emergency operation.

# Discussion of responses and way forward

Upon review of the submissions received, the ACMA has decided to remake the 2013 class licence with the changes proposed in consultation. The new (2023) class licence contains additional provisions for cellular mobile base station and UE transmitters, which collectively will enable the use of technologies based on 4G and 5G standards (and potentially later evolutions of those standards).

Interference minimisation provisions for radioastronomy sites remain in place, as do the previous provisions of the 2013 class licence. The language around limitations on fixed point-to-point services to 6-month deployments has been adjusted to avoid confusion with being applicable to unintended services such as mobile base stations.

We thank those who contributed responses to the consultation process and note that the 2023 class licence is open to review at any time. The appropriate mechanism for proposing modifications to the class licence is through a submission to our regular [Five-year spectrum outlook](https://www.acma.gov.au/five-year-spectrum-outlook) consultative process. This may include, for example, a proposal to prescribe a state or national band manager in the 2023 class licence that has been agreed by all authorised PSBs operating within the relevant jurisdiction.