**Decisions of past WRCs concerning the application of the Radio Regulations**

Discussions at Radio Regulations Board meetings have shown the importance of decisions taken by the plenary meetings of past World Radiocommunication Conferences which may have a bearing on the application of the Radio Regulations (RR).

Since WRC-95, world radiocommunication conferences have adopted such decisions. These decisions were compiled by the Bureau shortly after the end of each conference, starting with WRC-12 (see Circular Letters [CR/333](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0333/en), dated 2 May 2012 (WRC-12 decisions), [CR/389](https://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0389/en), dated 29 January 2016 (WRC-15 decisions) and [CR/456](https://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0456/en), dated 6 March 2020 (WRC-19 decisions)). The Board decided to reflect these decisions as notes in the Rules of Procedure and/or confirmed that they have been implemented properly.

To this end, the following table contain a compendium of these decisions since 1995.

Decisions by past WRCs may be categorised, in general, as follows:

* Approval of the extension of the notified date of bringing into use of frequency assignments to a satellite network or of the date on which suspended assignments to a satellite network should be brought back into regular use beyond the regulatory time limits; all such decisions had the unanimous approval of the relevant conferences and have been taken with the agreements of all parties involved.
* Decisions on an ad hoc basis of a transitional nature; all such decisions have been implemented accordingly.
* Requests for development of Rules of Procedure by the Board; all such requests have been implemented and relevant rules of procedure have been approved by the Board.
* Decisions with the status of an authentic interpretation of the RR, including endorsement of the Bureau practices; such decisions, emanating from the body empowered to adopt the RR, have the highest level of interpretation of the RR, are binding on the Bureau, and therefore need to be taken into account by the Bureau. Such decisions may be candidates for rules of procedure.

In view of the extensive changes made to the RR after 1995, the Bureau did not consider it worthwhile to investigate decisions by WARCs prior to 1995.

**Compendium of WRC decisions not reflected in the Radio Regulations**

|  | WRC | Reference | Decision | Follow-up by WRC/Council/RRB/legal adviser |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | WRC-95 |  | None |  |
| 1 | WRC-97 | 10th Plenary[Doc. 391](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-97/docs3/391.html) | Article S5 (MOD Table 54.25 - 71 GHz)**5.3** The **Chairman of Committee 5** drew participants' attention to [Document 363](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-97/docs3/363.html). Committee 5 had approved the modifications relating to Article **S5** that would allow the frequency bands around 60 GHz to be alleviated from intense use by the inter-satellite service with a view to protecting space science systems in that important spectrum range for meteorological observations. At the final meeting of Committee 5, it had been confirmed by BR that advance publication information had been received prior to WRC‑97 for a limited number of systems that used bands around 60 GHz for non-GSO inter-satellite links and that those systems would no longer be in conformity with the frequency allocations modified as a result of the Committee 5 decisions. In order not to penalize administrations which had already submitted information for advance publication of non-GSO systems using inter-satellite links in the 60 GHz band, it was suggested that the Conference instruct the Bureau in the following course of action: *when examining amendments to the systems mentioned in the second paragraph of Document 363, which sought to shift the frequencies originally submitted to another band allocated to the inter-satellite service, administrations responsible for those systems would not be required to apply the provisions of RR [1043]/S9.2 (recommencement of advance publication)*.**5.4** The **Chairman** proposed that the Plenary should instruct the Bureau to follow the procedure described.**5.5** It was so **agreed**.**5.6** On the basis of that decision, MOD Table **54.25** ‑ 71 GHz was **approved**. |  |
| 2 | WRC-2000 | 2nd Plenary [Doc. 268](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/200-299/268.html) | 4 Request by Spain to maintain HISPASAT 2 frequency assignments in the Appendices S30 and S30A Plans4.1 The **Chairperson of Working Group 1 of the Plenary**, introducing [Document 178](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/100-199/178.html), said that a decision needed to be made on the request by Spain to maintain HISPASAT‑2 frequency assignments in the Appendices **S30** and **S30A** Plans. Describing the background to the request by Spain, as outlined in section A of the document, he said that there had been differences in the interpretation of Resolution **533** **(WRC‑97)** by the BR and RRB on the one hand and the Administration of Spain on the other, owing to ambiguity between the text of *resolves* 2 of Resolution **533** and that contained in sections **11.1** and **9A.1** of Articles **11** and **9A** of Appendices **S30** and **S30A**, respectively. Working Group 1 of the Plenary therefore recommended that two actions be taken: first, that Spain’s request be approved by the present meeting, and second that, in order to remove the ambiguity and avoid further difficulty in the future, Resolution **533** be amended. The working group was not yet ready to suggest an amendment but would do so at a later stage. 4.2 The **delegate of Morocco** proposed that the request by Spain should be approved, and that the revised version of Resolution **533** should be made available prior to approval.4.3 It was so **agreed**. | Res.**542 (WRC-2000)** included HISPASAT-2 frequency assignments in the ListRes.**533 (Rev.WRC-2000)** was revised to remove the ambiguityRes.**533** was then supressed by WRC-12. |
| 3 | WRC-2000 | 2nd Plenary [Doc. 268](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/200-299/268.html) | 8 Request for BSS allocation for East Timor8.1 The **representative of the Radiocommunication Bureau** said that, in response to a request from the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), Working Group 1 of the Plenary proposed that provision of a beam of the smallest size for East Timor should be included in the BSS replanning exercise.8.2 It was so **agreed**. | WRC-2000 included TMP00000 in the Plans, which subsequently was renamed TLS00000 |
| 4 | WRC-2000 | 8th Plenary [Doc. 537](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/500-544/537.html) | 6 Consideration of draft Resolution [COM4/9] on the use of Appendix S4 in lieu of Annex 2 in application of Appendix S30B (Document 484)6.1 The **Chairperson of Committee 4** recalled that Working Group 1 of the Plenary had proposed using Appendix **S4** for filings submitted under Appendices **S30** and **S30B**. Approval of draft Resolution [**COM4/9**] would thus make it possible to harmonize the structure of data relating to space services.6.2 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** asked why the resolution was addressed to BR and not direct to RRB.6.3 The **delegate of Morocco** said that, during consideration of the matter, his country’s delegation had said that it was not necessary to prepare a resolution for that purpose but that it was sufficient to record the conference’s decision on the matter in the minutes of a Plenary Meeting. He therefore proposed that the text of the *resolves* of the draft resolution be included in the minutes of the present meeting, to read as follows: “The conference instructs BR to develop a Rule of Procedure for adoption by RRB which would require administrations to use Appendix **S4** when furnishing the basic data relating to stations in the fixed-satellite service subject to Appendix **S30B**”.6.4 RRB would then be able to take the measures it deemed necessary and administrations would be free to state their opposition.6.5 The **Chairperson** proposed that the Plenary should adopt the text read out by the delegate of Morocco, thus avoiding the adoption of a resolution on the subject.6.6 It was so **agreed**. | The 20th Meeting of the RRB(11-15 September 2000) adopted a new Rule of Procedure requiring administrations to use Appendix **S4** when furnishing data relating to stations in the fixed-satellite service subject to Appendix **S30B** ([CR/151](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0151/en))Annex 2 of AP**30B** was replaced by Appendix **4** to the RR atWRC-03 |
| 5 | WRC-2000 | 9th Plenary [Doc 538](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/500-544/538.html) | 3.38 The **representative of the Radiocommunication Bureau** said that the tasks assigned to the Radiocommunication Bureau by the conference under Article **6** would entail a considerable amount of work. So as not to increase the workload any further, BR would not be examining requests for coordination, notification and publication for assignments to terrestrial networks on a retroactive basis, in other words received prior to the closure of the conference on 3 June 2000. In order to make that quite clear he suggested that § 6.2.1c) should be amended to read: “assignments for which the procedure of Article **4** of this Appendix has been initiated, as from 3 June 2000, for which the complete Appendix **S4** information under §§ 4.1 and 4.2 has been received”.3.39 The **delegate of Morocco**, while recognizing the problem faced by the Bureau, said that he feared the proposed amendment might be interpreted as meaning that the situation was different with regard to other articles. He therefore suggested that instead of amending the text of § 6.2.1*c*), it should be placed on record that, except where otherwise specified in the Final Acts, the procedures adopted by the conference should apply to requests for coordination, notification or publication received after 3 June 2000. The **delegate of the United States** endorsed that suggestion.3.40 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 6 | WRC-2000 | 10th Plenary [Doc. 539](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/500-544/539.html) | 10.116 The **delegate of Algeria** requested the Secretary‑General to assess and appraise all decisions taken by the present conference that had a direct bearing on WRC‑03 and to submit a report to the Council in order to ensure that all the decisions of WRC‑2000 were taken into account in the work for the next conference.10.117 The **Secretary-General** said that that would be done. | Council documents[C2000/35-E](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/gs/council/c00/docs/35.html) and[C2001/35-E](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/gs/council/c01/docs/035.html) |
| 7 | WRC-2000 | 11th Plenary [Doc. 540](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/500-544/540.html) | Appendix S5 (ADD Table S5-1)7.37 The **delegate of Canada**, referring to MOD Table **S5-1A**, said that Committee 4 had not had time to make all the necessary updates. Two options were possible: either the table could be maintained for “historical” reasons, even though it was no longer in conformity with the most recent edition of the Radio Regulations, or it could be deleted, which appeared to be the option favoured by many delegations.7.38 The **representative of the Radiocommunication Bureau** said that the table would be updated and included in the Rule of Procedure on No. **S9.11.A**; it could therefore be deleted from Appendix **S5**.7.39 The **Chairperson** proposed deleting the table and, at the request of the delegate of France, instructing the Radiocommunication Bureau and Radio Regulations Board to prepare a rule of procedure allowing the table to be updated.7.40 It was so **agreed**. | The 24th Meeting of the RRB (10-18 September 2001) adopted a modified Rule of Procedure relating to **S9.11A** including tables on applicability of Nos. **9.11A**-**9.15** and **9.16** ([CR/171](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0171/en))The tables in the Rule of Procedure have been then regularly updated after subsequent WRC modifications to concerned allocations. |
| 8 | WRC-2000 | 11th Plenary [Doc. 540](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/500-544/540.html) | 11.16 The **delegate of Luxembourg** said that during preparation of the text of those provisions ([Document 493](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/itu-r/archives/wrc/wrc-2000/docs/400-499/493.html)) in Working Group 1 of the Plenary, it had been decided to insert a text in the minutes of the Plenary meeting which considered them. The text read as follows:“In adopting the provisions **S23.13A, S23.13B** and **S23.13C**, it is understood that these procedures are separate from the procedures of Article **S9** and Article **4** of Appendix **S30** and consequently they are not taken into account in the application of Article **5** of Appendix **S30** and Article **S11**. It is also to be noted that in the case of the broadcasting-satellite service planned bands, when any of the test points is in the territory of the objecting administration the notifying administration shall have the opportunity to move test points or to add additional test points to ensure that the rest of the service area is not adversely affected.”11.17 The **Chairperson** proposed that the Plenary should take note of that text.11.18 It was so **agreed**. | The 24th Meeting of the RRB(10-18 September 2001) adopted a modified Rule of Procedure relating to **S23.13** ([CR/171](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0171/en))The 27th Meeting of the RRB (3-7 June 2002) adopted a new Rule of Procedure relating to **S23.12B** and **S23.13C** ([CR/181](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0181/en))The 28th Meeting of the RRB (9-13 September 2002) supressed the adopted new Rules of Procedure relating to Rule of Procedure relating to **S23.13** ([CR/187](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0187/en)) |
| 9 | WRC-03 | 4th Plenary[Doc 319](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0319/en) | 6.15 The **representative of BR** drew attention to agenda item 3, according to which the Conference was to consider such consequential changes and amendments to the Radio Regulations as might be necessitated by the decisions of the Conference. The Conference had just approved Resolution **27** but there were several references in the Radio Regulations to previous versions of that Resolution. The Conference might authorize the Bureau to update those references.6.16 The **Chairman** suggested that the Conference should authorize the Radiocommunication Bureau to make the consequential changes to the Radio Regulations subsequent to the approval of Resolution **27 (Rev.WRC‑03)**.6.17 It was so **agreed**. | The BR updated the references to the new version of Resolution **27(Rev.WRC-03)** through the RR |
| 10 | WRC-03 | 5th Plenary [Doc. 398](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0398/en) | ***HF  distress and safety calling frequencies*** 3.2 Introducing the second report from Committee 4 to the Plenary ([Document 315](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0315/en)) concerning agenda item 1.14, he said that Committee 4 had considered the proposals concerning modifications of Appendix **15** under agenda item 1.14 and had come to the conclusion that on HF DSC distress and safety calling frequencies the safe loading level might already have been exceeded. It had been decided that no change should be made to Appendix **15** under agenda item 1.14 but that instead the following note should be included in the minutes of the Plenary Meeting:“It was noted with concern that some HF coast stations, participating in the GMDSS, may have traffic on the DSC distress and safety calling channels which already exceeds the safe loading levels contained in Recommendation ITU‑R M.822‑1, i.e. 0.1 Erlang. Committee 4 decided that ITU‑R Study Group 8 should review the current situation with respect to DSC distress and safety calling channel loading. The assumptions made for traffic use in developing the loading studies need to be validated and current levels of traffic verified. If this reveals that the safe levels are in fact exceeded, then Study Group 8 should take appropriate action to modify the operational use of these channels for testing. ITU‑R should advise the International Maritime Organization of this situation and keep them advised of progress.”3.3 The above conclusions of Committee 4 were **approved**. | Former ITU-R WP 8B studied the DSC traffic loading issue and developed two new annexes 3 and 4 to the Rec. ITU-R M.493 in collaboration with IMO and IEC-TC80. Working Party 8B was disbanded in October 2007. Its responsibilities were taken over by Working Party 5B. |
| 11 | WRC-03 | 7th Plenary[Doc 403](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0403/en) | 3.38 The **Chairman of Committee 6** read out the following statement agreed by Committee 6, the purpose of which was to assist BR in implementing Resolution [**COM6/1**]:“Committee 6 confirmed that in application of *resolves* 3 and 5 of Resolution [**COM6/1**], after the publication of its circular letter mentioned in *resolves* 5, the Bureau shall reopen the 30‑days period to adjust the submitted system as specified in the Rules of Procedure relating to § 6.12, for the submission under examination in accordance with those Rules but not yet entered into the List as of 5 July 2003.Committee 6 concluded that the current BR implementation with respect to the 0.05 dB tolerance in *C/I* calculations applied for Appendix **30B** analysis is appropriate.Committee 6 also concluded that there is no need to mention Resolution **49** in the body of Appendix **30B**.”Those statements would be included in his report to the Plenary Meeting ([Document 370](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0370/en)).3.39 The **Chairman** said that, in the absence of any objection, she took it that the meeting wished to endorse those statements.3.40 It was so **agreed**. | 30 days:Implemented for the first publication (**AP30B**/49) after [CR/201](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0201/en) (updated reference situation) of 27 August 2003.0.05dB tolerance:The tolerance has been applied.It was integrated in Annex 4 of Appendix **30B** by WRC-07.Reference to Res.**49**:Superseded by the decision of WRC-07 (note 2 to Article **6** of Appendix **30B**). |
| 12 | WRC-03 | 7th Plenary [Doc. 403](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0403/en) | ***Resolution 144 (WRC-03)***4.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced [Document 322](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0322/en), which provided information on his consultation with the Chairman of RRB on issues related to agenda item 1.12 (Resolution **723**, *resolves* 1), on which the Administration of Finland had placed a reservation. As a consequence of the responses received from the RRB, Finland had agreed to lift that reservation. Furthermore, he drew attention to Annex 2 to [Document 322](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0322/en), which contained the following statement by the Chairman of Ad hoc Group 5 (Small countries) agreed by Committee 5 after its approval of Resolution **144** [**COM5/15**] **(WRC‑03)**:“Following the approval of this Resolution, Committee 5 accepted the recommendation of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group 5 (small countries) that the ITU‑R studies referred to in the Resolution should be conducted in ITU‑R Study Group 4 and that this conclusion should be recorded in the minutes of the Plenary.”4.2 The Chairman said that, in the absence of any objection, she took it that the meeting wished to approve Committee 5’s conclusion.4.3 It was so **agreed**. | The studies requested in resolves 1 of Resolution **144** are contained in Recommendation ITU-R S.1712 “Methodologies for determining whether an FSS earth station at a given location could transmit in the band 13.75-14 GHz without exceeding the pfd limits in No. **5.502** of the Radio Regulations, and guidelines to mitigate excesses”.  |
| 13 | WRC-03 | 9th Plenary [Doc. 405](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0405/en) | *Modifications of Article 11 (DbiU)*2.60 The **representative of BR** said that in view of the changes that had just been approved with regard to the date of bringing into use for satellite networks, there were some networks for which administrations had sent the advance publication information after 22 November 1997 and for which the rule in force until the end of WRC-03 regarding the implementation of Nos. **11.44** and **11.48** was not to exceed the five-year period and then to request an extension of two years. Some networks of that type currently under coordination, with a five-year deadline, would undoubtedly be the subject of a request for a two-year extension. In order to cover all of those networks for which the Bureau had received, or would have received, the advance publication information between 22 November 1997 and 5 July 2003, the Bureau was proposing the application of the extension to all satellite networks for which it would have received the information referred to in No. **9.1** after 21 November 1997, an extension which would increase to seven years the total period between the date of receipt of that information and the date of bringing the network into use. The administrations concerned would no longer have to request an extension, which would be granted automatically by the Bureau, simplifying matters for all concerned. …2.66 The **Chairman** suggested that the changes that had just been approved regarding Articles **9** and **11** should be implemented using the method put forward by the representative of BR.2.67 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 14 | WRC-03 | 13th Plenary[Doc 409](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0409/en) | 8 Report by the Chairman of Ad hoc Group 4 of the Plenary (Document 384)8.1 The **Chairman of Ad hoc Group 4 of the Plenary**, introducing [Document 384](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0384/en), said that Annex 1 contained the following text for inclusion in the minutes of the Plenary Meeting: “With respect to frequency assignments which were subject to RR **S5.488/S5.491** (ed. 1998 or earlier) where the notifying administration’s territory was not in the service area of a beam in the region of the allocation under these provisions, the Bureau published, in the relevant Special Section, a note asking the responsible administration to provide evidence of an agreement to be served from an administration in the region of the allocation. The note mandated that this agreement must be provided within three months after the publication of the coordination Special Section. If this agreement was not provided by the end of this three-month period, the Bureau would change its RR **11.31** finding at coordination to an unfavourable finding and the network’s planned frequency assignments in the relevant bands would no longer be taken into account. WRC‑2000 removed the limitation to national or subregional use from Nos. **5.488** and **5.491** but did not make this change retroactively applicable to cases received before 3 June 2000. |  |
|  |  |  |  Two administrations appealed this deadline mandated by the Bureau to the Radio Regulations Board. The Radio Regulations Board supported three times the approach of the Bureau and concluded that they had correctly applied the Radio Regulations and associated Rules of Procedure in force at the date of receipt of the submissions. Several administrations proposed that this Conference address the Bureau’s rule that they considered as not in accordance with the Radio Regulations and the associated Rules of Procedure. Other administrations were of the opinion that the rule reflected the Radio Regulations and the associated Rules of Procedure as they existed prior to the entry-into-force date of the provisions as modified by WRC‑2000. (See Conference |  |
|  |  |  | Documents [12(Add.8)](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0012/en), [43(Add.3)](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0043/en), [123](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0123/en), [124](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0124/en) and [221](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0221/en).) While not taking a decision on the appropriateness of the Bureau rule, this Conference decided to address this matter by instructing the Bureau to treat the filings of the concerned GSO networks, with respect to the national/subregional aspects of the above two mentioned provisions, in the manner described in Annex 2 to this document.”8.2 Annex 2 contained a description of the elements involved in processing the satellite networks in respect of the national/subregional aspect of Nos. **5.488** and **5.491** of the Radio Regulations. Recalling that there had been disagreement on the two footnotes contained in Annex 2 in earlier discussions, he was pleased to report that since [Document 384](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0384/en) had been published, a compromise regarding the two footnotes had been reached: both footnotes should be deleted and replaced with the following footnote: “There were diverging views on whether the equal receipt date treatment should apply to N‑SAT‑127 W vis-à-vis NSS-7”.8.3 The **Chairman** said that, in the absence of any objection, she would take it that the conference decision reflected in the text reproduced in § 8.1 above was acceptable to the meeting, that the proposed new footnote was also acceptable, and that the text of Annex 2, as amended, could be annexed to the minutes of the meeting as proposed (see Annex A).8.4 It was so **agreed**. |  |
|  |  |  | annex ADescription of the elements involved1 The following elements address all frequency assignments in the 11.7-12.2 GHz band in Region 2 and the 12.2-12.5 GHz band in Region 3 to GSO satellite networks in the fixed-satellite service that had their coordination information published in an IFIC Special Section with the three-month deadline (a rule of the Bureau) for providing agreements to establish a subregional system under **S5.488/S5.491** (edition 1998 or earlier) and did not meet the deadline.a) For those frequency assignments for which the Bureau has published an unfavourable finding in a subsequent Special Section before 9 June 2003, the unfavourable finding is maintained.b) For those frequency assignments for which complete coordination information was received by the Bureau with a date of receipt between 1 May 1998 and 2 June 2000 and for which the Bureau has not published an unfavourable finding in a subsequent IFIC Special Section, the Bureau shall apply the provisions of Nos. **5.488** and **5.491** (edition 2001). As a result, these assignments are taken into account by subsequently filed assignments by maintaining their date of priority. c) For those frequency assignments for which complete coordination information was received prior to 1 May 1998 and for which the Bureau has not published an unfavourable finding in an IFIC Special Section, the Bureau shall maintain a favourable finding in respect to the national/subregional aspect of Nos. **S5.488** and **S5.491**. |  |
|  |  |  | i) These assignments are considered as effectively having their coordination information received on the same date[[1]](#footnote-2) as each of the other subsequently filed assignments for which coordination information has been received before 5 July 2003, except those covered in paragraphs b) and c).ii) These assignments maintain their original date of priority only with respect to the assignments mentioned in b) above, those assignments subject to c) and those for which complete coordination information has been received after 4 July 2003.2 For all assignments previously examined under Nos. **S5.488/S5.491** (edition 1998 or earlier) and for which the Bureau has not published an unfavourable finding in a subsequent IFIC Special Section, whether there was a three‑month deadline to provide agreements at the coordination stage or whether there was a requirement to only provide agreements at the notification stage, this conference has decided that such agreements are not required.3 As soon as practicable following this conference, the Bureau shall publish a list of the above‑mentioned networks having frequency assignments in the relevant bands and with service areas that extend beyond the national territory of the responsible administration with an explanation of the decision taken by the conference and an explanation of their coordination status vis-à-vis other networks. |  |
| 15 | WRC-03 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 409](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0409/en) | 9 Requests for extension (Documents 165 and 382)9.1 The **Chairman of Committee 4** said that [Document 165](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0165/en) contained a request from the United Arab Emirates for a two-year extension for its EMARSAT networks. There had been some reluctance to agree to that extension, despite the fact that the United Arab Emirates had reduced the number of networks to which the extension would apply. A compromise had been reached during informal discussions and he read out the following statement, which he hoped would help the meeting to approve the request: “Within Committee 4, there were some concerns expressed with regard to the request by the United Arab Emirates for the extension, until November 2004, of the period within which the frequency assignments for certain networks could be brought into use, as detailed in [Document 165](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0165/en). | The BR implemented the agreed extension for the 2 administrations |
|  |  |  |  The Administrations of Luxembourg, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have held discussions with the United Arab Emirates concerning the problems associated with the request in [Document 165](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0165/en). These Administrations have indicated a general concern for any WRC granting an extension to the time periods that are identified in the Radio Regulations. The United Arab Emirates has agreed to restrict their request only to the EMARSAT‑1A and the EMARSAT‑1B networks. Considering the extenuating circumstances of this particular request, as indicated in the report of the Director which is referenced in [Document 165](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0165/en), and based on discussions that have recently taken place between these five Administrations, as well as agreements that have been reached, it has been concluded that the problems related with this requested extension can be resolved after WRC-03. Consequently, the Administrations of Luxembourg, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have indicated to me that they no longer have objections to the requested extension. These Administrations have also indicated that their decision in this instance is without prejudice to their position at future conferences.”9.2 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that if the request was granted it might encourage more operators to request extensions at future conferences. As the United Arab Emirates had already received a two-year extension to the original nine-year period he would object to the request. The **delegate of the United States** endorsed that view, adding that by granting the request, the Conference might be setting a dangerous precedent. In his opinion, there were no exceptional circumstances related to the request and any decision by the Conference to grant the extension would be regrettable. |  |
|  |  |  | 9.3 The **Chairman** pointed out that efforts had been made to minimize the impact of the extension on the affected countries, and that those countries had agreed to the extension. While she recognized the concerns about a setting precedent, she said that the situation was an exceptional one, taking into account the development of the system and the fact that there would be minimum impact on the countries concerned. If there was no further opposition, she would take it that the request of the United Arab Emirates for an extension for two of its satellite networks could be approved.9.4 It was so **agreed**.9.5 The **Chairman**, drawing attention to [Document 382](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0382/en), said that a compromise had been reached between the Administrations of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, the Republic of Korea and the People’s Republic of China. Accordingly, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic was withdrawing its request for an extension for the LSTAR3B (116E) network and maintaining its request for a three-year extension for the LSTAR4B (126E) network. The request for the extension was an exceptional one, and the affected parties had given their consent. 9.6 The **delegate of France** said that he could go along with the request as all the parties concerned had given their agreement. 9.7 The **Chairman** said that, in the absence of any objection, she would take it that the request from the Lao People’s Democratic Republic was acceptable.9.8 It was so **agreed**.9.9 The **Director of BR** noted that the Conference had agreed to the two requests on the understanding that no precedent was being set, and that all the parties concerned had given their agreement. He wished to place on record that there was no possibility that any such agreements for extension would be repeated in the period between WRC-03 and WRC-07, as under no circumstances would the Bureau be in a position to allow administrations to be identified with a view to establishing any such agreements.9.10 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** fully supported the statement of the Director of BR and said that RRB should not grant any extensions before WRC-07. |  |
| 16 | WRC-03 | 14th Plenary[Doc 410](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0410/en) | 11.23 The **Chairman of Ad hoc Group 5 of the Plenary** drew attention to three further issues. First, as mentioned previously by the delegate of France, application of Resolution **539** **(Rev.WRC‑03)** should be broadened to take account of the additional 25 MHz between 2 605 and 2 630 MHz; he could coordinate that with the Editorial Committee. Second, he asked the Chairman of Committee 4 to ensure that all the modified footnotes in [Document 392](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0392/en) entered into force immediately after the conference. Third, as indicated in Document 368, and with the approval of the texts in Documents [391](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0391/en) and [392](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0392/en), the following text should be included in the minutes of the Plenary as guidance for the application of Resolution **539** **(Rev.WRC‑03)**: “In application of Resolution **539 (Rev.WRC-03)** when the notifying administration is required to seek the agreement of an affected administration under the first sub‑paragraph of *instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau* 1, and the notifying administration has not received a reply to a request for agreement from an affected administration, it can request the assistance of the Bureau. If, after the Bureau’s assistance, the affected administration still fails to reply, it shall be deemed that the administration has agreed to the excess power flux-density on the territory of its country.”11.24 The **Chairman** said that, in the absence of any objection, she took it that the meeting wished to approve the approach indicated by the Chairman of Ad hoc Group 5 of the Plenary, including the text relating to the application of Resolution **539 (Rev.WRC‑03)**.11.25 It was so **agreed.** |  |
| 17 | WRC-03 | 14th Plenary[Doc 410](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0410/en) | 28 Report by the Chairman of Committee 6 (Document 370)28.1 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that [Document 370](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0370/en) contained a number of statements which were important for the Radiocommunication Bureau in their day-to-day activities regarding the application of the Radio Regulations. He requested that those statements be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.28.2 The **delegate of France** proposed that it be considered that the Plenary approved the conclusions of Committee 6 contained in [Document 370](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0370/en).28.3 [Document 370](http://www.itu.int/md/R03-WRC03-C-0370/en) was **approved**. | Issues relating to the reopening of the 30-days period, 0.05dB tolerance (integrated in Annex 4 of Appendix **30B** by WRC-07), regulatory time limit referred to in paragraphs 4.1.3 or 4.2.6, application of Paragraphs 4.1.10ter and 4.2.14ter, revisions of Tables under Article **11** and **9A** have been implemented.Modification to the Region 2 Plan by CAN, applicability of Res.**49** to Article **2A** submission, application of footnote 4bis and 8bis of paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.2.2, examination under 5.2.1d) are still relevant. Grouping concept: The 32nd Meeting of the RRB (1-5 December 2003) adopted modified Rule of Procedure relating to §4.1.1a) and §4.1.1b) of Appendices **30** and **30A** ([CR/208](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0208/en)). |
| 18 | WRC-07 | 6th Plenary [Doc 399](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0399/en) | 4.4 The **Chairman** said that it was his understanding that the conclusions of Committee 5 were the outcome of discussions between all the administrations concerned and that complete agreement had been reached on them. He thanked the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the role he had played in obtaining that result and proposed that the Plenary approve [Document 278](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0278/en). 4.5 It was so **agreed**.4.7 The **Chairman** noted that the exceptions thus accorded could not be taken for granted and that each had been carefully reviewed with the administrations that could potentially be affected. The outcome, which was by no means a matter of course, was emblematic of the goodwill prevailing at the conference and the spirit of cooperation amongst all the administrations present. |  |
|  | WRC-07 |  | **Doc 278 proposals agreed by the 6th plenary:**VENESAT-1 (former URUSAT-3) satellite networkAfter considering all of the issues associated with this specific case, Committee 5 concluded that the request for extension of the notified date of bringing into use of any assignment to the satellite network VENESAT-1 (78º W) under RR No. **11.44** should be granted. Specifically, this is understood to mean that the notified date of bringing into use of any assignments to this satellite network shall be no later than 15 November 2008.Simón Bolívar 2 satellite networkAfter considering all of the issues associated with this specific case, Committee 5 concluded that the request for extension of the date on which the suspended assignments to the satellite network Simon Bolivar 2 (67º W) under No. **11.49** are to be brought back into regular use should be granted. Specifically, this is understood to mean that the date of bringing back into regular use of any assignment to the satellite network shall be no later than 18 September 2010.INDOSTAR-1, PALAPA-C1 and PALAPA-C4 satellite networksAfter considering all of the issues associated with these three specific cases, Committee 5 concluded that the resubmitted notification information for the satellite networks INDOSTAR-1 (107.7º E), PALAPA-C1 (113º E) and PALAPA-C4 (150.5º E) under No. **11.46**, should be taken into account. Specifically, this is understood to mean that the notification information submitted on 18 December 2006 for INDOSTAR-1 (107.7º E), 18 October 2007 for PALAPA-C1 (113º E) and 1 February 2006 for PALAPA-C4 (150.5º E) for the recording of the satellite network assignments be considered as having been received (as notice under No. **11.15**) within the period established by No. **11.44.1.** |  |
|  |  |  | VINASAT-4A2 satellite networkAfter considering all of the issues associated with this specific case, while Committee 5 could not agree to accede to the request, as made, for a possible future extension of the time-limit for bringing into use, RR No. **11.44** refers, of the notified assignments of the satellite network VINASAT-4A2 (132º E), Committee 5 concluded that the Radio Regulations Board should be instructed, in this singular case, to take any appropriate action for the VINASAT-4A2 satellite network to continue being taken into account until 23 May 2009 in the event of a launch delay caused by a second satellite scheduled for the same launch vehicle that will launch the VINASAT-4A2 space station or, until 23 May 2011 in the event of a launch failure. The assignments to the VINASAT-4A2 space station under consideration are restricted to those covered by the **RES49/1217** Special Section in BR IFIC 2601 of 21 August 2007. In this regard, these actions should, to the extent possible, minimize the consequences for administrations concerned. |  |
|  |  |  | Pakistan’s BSS and feeder-link Plan assignmentsAfter considering all of the issues associated with this specific case, Committee 5 concluded that the request for an interim decision regarding the shifting of Pakistan BSS and associated feeder-link Plan assignments from 38.2º E to 38º E, should be granted. Specifically, this is understood to mean that the Radio Regulations Board (RRB) would be authorized to replace the Plan assignments of Pakistan with the assignments in the List derived from those published in **AP30/E/441** and **AP30A/E/441** Special Sections in BR IFIC 2604 of 2 October 2007 after the following conditions are met:– successful completion of the Article **4** procedure with all coordination agreements obtained before the next competent Conference; and,– characteristics of assignments to be within the envelope of the current Plan assignments of Pakistan except the orbital position (*inter alia*, 12 channels in Region 3 over national territory). |  |
| 19 | WRC-07 | 9th Plenary [Doc. 431](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0431/en) | 1.1 The **Chairman** made the following statement: “I have the pleasure to inform you that the State of Israel and the Palestinian Authority, under my auspices, have agreed to resume negotiations on telecommunications, including spectrum issues, by holding meetings of the Joint Technical Committee, starting on 29 November 2007, with the objective of establishing a timetable by 31 December 2007 for release of spectrum to the Palestinian Authority. I also have the pleasure to offer the following course of action to the Plenary:1) In Appendix **30B** procedures a note (a) will be included, indicating that Palestine may apply these procedures to obtain assignments/an allotment in the Appendix **30B** Plan.2) The Plenary will request the Director of the Bureau to continue providing assistance to the Palestinian Authority, pursuant to the previous relevant ITU resolutions.3) As a result of this, there is no longer a need to consider [Document 118](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0118/en).Both parties have agreed to this course of action without any reservation.(a) This note will be attached to the word “country” in ADD 6.35 and MOD 7.1 of Appendix **30B (Rev.WRC-07)** and read as follows:1.2 He invited the meeting to endorse his statement as a decision of the plenary, without reservation.1.3 It was so **agreed**. | Provisions to which the note was attached were approved by WRC-07. |
| 20 | WRC-07 | 9th Plenary [Doc. 431](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0431/en) | 6.1 The **Chairman of Committee 6** introduced [Document 337 and Addendum 1](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0337/en) thereto, containing the conclusions reached by the committee in reviewing Documents [30](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0030/en), [39 (Addendum 21)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0039/en), [41 (Addendum 27)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0041/en), [65](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0065/en), [5 (Addendum 15)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0005/en) and [4 (Addendum 4)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0004/en), as follows: “a) In relation to the application of Articles **15** and **23**, Committee 6 considered several documents ([30](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0030/en), [39 (Addendum 21)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0039/en), [41 (Addendum 27)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0041/en), [65](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0065/en), [5 (Addendum 15)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0005/en) and [4 (Addendum 4)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0004/en)) relating, in particular, to reported cases of harmful interference into assignments recorded in the MIFR with favourable finding under No. **11.31**. b) Committee 6 noted that, in spite of repeated requests from the Bureau to the concerned administrations to take the necessary actions to eliminate harmful interference, there was no information reported to the Bureau on any improvement of the situation in respect of these cases. c) Committee 6 thanked the Board and the Bureau for the actions taken in this regard and urged the concerned administrations to take the necessary actions for resolving these cases, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations. d) Committee 6 urged the concerned administrations to fulfil their obligations under the provisions of the Radio Regulations, without prejudice to the positions of, or any other existing and future submissions from administrations to the ITU. e) Committee 6 also proposes that the Director, Radiocommunication Bureau, be requested to report to WRC-11 on the results of his efforts on this issue. | This request was considered by RRB since its 45th and the results reported to WRC-12 in [Addendum 3 to Document 4](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0004/en). More information can be found in the following documents:45th ([Doc. RRB07-3/5](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-RRB.07.3-C-0005/en)); 46th ([Doc. RRB08-1/5](http://www.itu.int/md/R08-RRB.08-C-0005/en));47th ([Doc. RRB08-2/7](http://www.itu.int/md/R08-RRB.08.2-C-0007/en));48th ([Doc. RRB08-3/5](http://www.itu.int/md/R08-RRB.08.3-C-0005/en));50th ([Doc. RRB09-1/5](http://www.itu.int/md/R09-RRB.09-C-0005/en));52nd ([Doc. RRB09-3/6](http://www.itu.int/md/R09-RRB.09.3-C-0006/en)). |
|  |  |  |  f) Concerning the proposal contained in [Document 30](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0030/en), in order to adopt a WRC resolution to the effect of quantifying No. **23.3** in technical terms, Committee 6 was of the view that this approach would be extremely difficult to implement in practice.  g) However, Committee 6 is of the view that a broadcasting station operating on board an aircraft and transmitting solely to the territory of another administration without its agreement cannot be considered in conformity with the Radio Regulations.”6.2 The committee proposed that the plenary approve those conclusions.6.3 The **delegate of the United States** made the statement reproduced in Annex A.6.4 The **Chairman** proposed that the plenary approve the conclusions reached by Committee 6 as a decision of the plenary.6.5 It was so **agreed**.6.6 The **delegate of Cuba** made the statement reproduced in Annex B. |  |
| 21 | WRC-07 | 9th Plenary[Doc 431](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0431/en) | 7 Seventh report of Committee 5 (Document 345)7.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced [Document 345](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0345/en), which contained the committee’s conclusions regarding issues addressed in Resolution **547** **(WRC-03)**. The committee had also agreed on the action to be taken by the Bureau concerning the updating of country codes for two countries throughout Appendices **30** and **30A**.7.2 The conclusions contained in [Document 345](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0345/en) were **approved**.i.e.“Committee 5 also recommends that the Bureau be tasked by a decision to be taken by the Plenary of WRC-07 to update the country codes from SCN to KNA for the Federation of Saint Kitts and Nevis and from SCG (Serbia and Montenegro) to SRB (Republic of Serbia; the continuator State of Serbia and Montenegro) throughout Appendices **30** and **30A**.The Plenary is requested to approve this Committee 5 proposal.” |  |
| 22 | WRC-07 | 10th Plenary[Doc 432](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0432/en) | 2 Tenth report of Committee 5 (Document 378)2.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 378, which covered issues from Part 2 of the Director’s report ([Addendum 2 to Document 4](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0004/en)) that had been considered under conference agenda item 7.1.2.2 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that No. **9.11A** had been the subject of many heated and lengthy debates at the present conference. While he had endorsed the Bureau’s decision to bring the matter to the attention of the conference, it had been concluded that it was not necessary to amend the related rules of procedure, as it risked conflicting with the principles contained in § 1 of Appendix **5** of the Radio Regulations. The Rules of Procedure, and Article **13**, should continue to be applied. He proposed the deletion of the second sentence of § 1.3, pointing out that considerable resources had already been expended on the question and it was unhelpful to invite further consideration of the matter. 2.3 The **delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic** recalled that the Group of Arab States had made a proposal at WRC-03 to amend Article **13** of the Radio Regulations, stating that, as of 1 January 2005, the Rules of Procedure should be converted into regulatory texts. That proposal had been accepted, and was reflected in Nos. **13.0.1** and **13.0.2** of the Radio Regulations. He had no objection to the deletion of the second sentence of § 1.3 in [Document 378](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0378/en), but emphasized that it should not affect the implementation of Nos. **13.0.1** and **13.0.2**. The process decided upon by the WRC should be respected. His administration was always prepared to consider the proposals put forward by the Bureau and the Radio Regulations Board.2.4 The conclusions contained in [Document 378](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0378/en), with the suppression proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, were **approved**.  | The application of Nos. **5.219**, **5.220** and similar provisions, the examination of frequency assignments to an inter-satellite link of a geostationary space station communicating with a non-geostationary space station are still relevantThe application of No. **11.15** and Resolution **55** has been implemented: ImplementedThe 53rd Meeting of the RRB (22-26 March 2010) adopted modified Rule of Procedure relating to No. **5.510** ([CR/312](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0312/en)) |
| 23 | WRC-07 | 10th Plenary [Doc. 432](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0432/en) | 6.1 The **Vice-Chairman of Committee 4** said that the agreed proposals under conference agenda item 1.9 had been sent to the Editorial Committee. Certain provisions should be included in Resolution [**COM6/6**] for application from 17 November 2007, and he requested Committee 6 to incorporate those provisions into [Document 406(Rev.1)](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0406/en). He also requested that the following text be included in the minutes of the meeting: “WRC-07 notes that the Rules of Procedure developed by the Radio Regulations Board for RR provisions Nos. **5.415** and **5.416** require that administrations proposing to operate a regional system obtain the agreement of the administrations which are to be parties to the regional system and to supply these agreements to the BR at the time of notification of the regional system under the provisions of RR Article **11**. This conference believes that these agreements should be supplied to BR at the time of the submission of the coordination request information (under Section II of Article **9**). The Radiocommunication Bureau and, through the Bureau, the Radio Regulations Board are requested to modify the relevant Rules of Procedure such as to conform to this requirement. Furthermore, the Bureau is requested to obtain copies of any such agreements for any systems, which are expected to be regional and which are currently in coordination, earlier than at the time of notification under RR Article **11**. Any such agreements should be provided by administrations, subsequent to such a request from the Bureau, at the latest by 30 June 2008.”6.2 The proposals in [Document 391](http://www.itu.int/md/R07-WRC07-C-0391/en) were **approved**. | RRB modified RoPs on Nos. **5.415** and **5.416** at its 47th meeting ([CR/287](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0287/en)) |
| 24 | WRC-12 | 4th Plenary [Doc. 329](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0329/en) | 1.11 Committee 6 had taken note of a statement by the Administration of Cuba requesting that WRC‑12 specifically **instruct the** Director of BR to include in his report to the next WRC a report on the interference to Cuban broadcasting by the Administration of the United States, in conformity with the conclusions of WRC-07.…1.15 The Chairman said that there would be bilateral coordination between the countries concerned together with the Chairman of the Conference and Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau with a view to finding a satisfactory solution to the issue raised. As the delegate of Cuba had requested, **the issue would also be included in the Report by the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to the next WRC**. | RRB noted this request at its **59th meeting** that WRC‑12 had instructed the Bureau to follow the matter closely and report on it to WRC-15. |
| 25 | WRC-12 | 7th Plenary [Doc. 548](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0548/en) | 2.4 “It was suggested that the Bureau should urge administrations, through a Circular Letter, to notify aeronautical frequency assignments to the MIFR. At the same time, Committee 4 appreciated previous consultations between the ICAO Secretariat and the Radiocommunication Bureau on this matter and expressed the opinion that such consultations should continue with respect to a possible transfer of ICAO database information to the Bureau.”2.5 The **Chairman** took it that the conference could adopt that conclusion.2.6 It was so **agreed**. | The BR and ICAO secretariat are working on the project. The progress depends on finalization of ICAO web portal with frequency database. By December 2014 the ICAO web portal is not yet completed. |
| 26 | WRC-12 | 8th Plenary [Doc. 549](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0549/en) | 2.7 Based on the text contained in [Document 491](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0491/en), the **Chairman** proposed that the following text be approved by the plenary as the conference’s conclusions regarding [Document 57](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0057/en): “Therefore WRC-12 requests the following:  a) the BR to develop and submit to the Radio Regulations Board the detailed description of the Bureau’s practices and actions applied under RR No. **11.50**, especially with respect to frequency assignments in the MIFR whose period of validity of allocation to a service has expired or will expire before the next conference, b) the RRB to develop the relevant Rules of Procedure.”2.8 It was so **agreed**.  | RRB approved the relevant RoP on RR **11.50** at its 67th meeting ([CR/373](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0373/en)) |
| 27 | WRC-12 | 8th Plenary [Doc. 549](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0549/en) | 10.3 The **Chairman of Committee 4** drew attention to a text, contained in [Document 418](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0418/en), which proposed the application of a transitional measure for new footnote 5.D103 [**5.443D**], as follows:“In relation to the application of No. **9.11A** in No. **5.D103** and deactivation of No. **9.21** in the band 5 030-5 091 MHz with respect to AMS(R)S, the following transitional measure shall apply. The coordination requirements of the satellite networks, for which complete coordination information is received prior to the entry into force of No. **5.D103**, are established under the provisions in force including No. **9.21**. Moreover, in application of No. **11.31**, the notification information of these satellite networks received after the date of entry into force of No. **5.D103** shall continue to be treated under No. **9.21**, and No. **9.11A** shall not be applied in application of No. **11.32**.”10.4 The **Chairman** took it that the conference could adopt that transitional measure for ADD **5.D103**.10.5 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 28 | WRC-12 | 8th Plenary [Doc. 549](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0549/en) | 16.4 The **Chairman of Committee 4** suggested that the following text, set out in [Document 482](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0482/en), be included in the minutes of the plenary as a means of resolving the issue of those square brackets:  “Some delegations argued for removing the phrase “for more than 2 per cent of the time” from footnote No**.** 5.B121 (RR**5.511F**). The percentage of data loss for radio astronomy is the subject of Recommendation ITU‑R RA.1513, the revision of which should be undertaken during the next ITU‑R study cycle. These studies should take into account that in this case No. 5.B121 (RR**5.511F**) refers to a band labelled with No. **5.340**, interference thresholds for this band are given in Recommendation ITU‑R RA**.769**. Furthermore, it should be studied what the operational consequences for the radiolocation service are, in case the phrase: “for more than 2 per cent of the time” would not be included in footnote No. 5.B121 (RR**5.511F**). The conclusions of these studies should be included in the report of the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to WRC-15, allowing WRC-15 to decide whether or not the words “for more than 2 per cent of the time” should be deleted from the footnote 5.B121 (RR**5.511F**) during WRC-18.” 16.7 The **Chairman** proposed deletion of the words “during WRC‑18” from the proposed text…16.8 It was so **agreed**. | Based on the exchange of views between WPs 5B and 7D, WP 7D believes that no change to footnote RR No. **5.511F** is required, and has produced a Note to the Director and RRB accordingly (Annex 4 to Doc. 7D/140) |
| 29 | WRC-12 | 9th Plenary [Doc. 550](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0550/en) | 1.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, based on Document 450, … proposed that the following text be included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference regarding Document 56: “After consideration of [Document 56](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0056/en), it has been brought to the attention of the conference that there is no documentation readily available to administrations on the practices and actions undertaken by the Bureau for the implementation of § 6.16 of Article **6** of RR Appendix **30B** whether the Bureau does not take into account the results of interference calculations toward a specific assignment on the territory of the administration responsible for the proposed assignment if this administration previously applied § 6.16 of that Article with regard to this assignment. Therefore, it is proposed to request the following: a) the Bureau to submit to the Radio Regulations Board the detailed description of the Bureau’s practices and actions, especially with respect to applying § 6.16 of Article **6** of RR Appendix **30B**, b) the Radio Regulations Board to develop the relevant Rules of Procedure.”1.2 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** said that the word “whether” should be replaced by “whereby”.1.3It was so **agreed**.1.4 The **delegate of Qatar** asked whether there would be a deadline by which the Bureau must submit the detailed description of its practices and actions to the Radio Regulations Board.1.5 The **Director of BR** said that the description would be drafted and submitted to the Board for consideration at its next meeting.1.6 The **Chairman** took it that the conference could approve the decision proposed by Committee 5 in § 2 of [Document 450](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0450/en), as amended by the delegate of the United Kingdom.1.7 It was so **agreed**. | RRB approved the relevant ROP 6.16 of Appendix **30B** at its 60th meeting([CR/339](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0339/en)) |
| 30 | WRC-12 | 9th Plenary [Doc. 550](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0550/en) | 4.3 The **Chairman of Committee 5** drew attention to § 1 of the fourth report from Committee 5 to the plenary meeting, contained in [Document 450](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0450/en), which had implications for Article 11: Committee 5 proposed that the following text be included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference: “In adopting the modifications to Nos. **11.41** and **11.42** as well as the addition of No. **11.42A**, WRC-12 recognizes that, by applying No. **11.41** to record an assignment in the MIFR under this provision, the notifying administration commits itself that it would comply with No. **11.42**, as modified by this conference, for frequency assignments to space and terrestrial services allocated in the same frequency band with equal rights.”4.4 The **Chairman** took it that the conference could adopt the above text as its decision. 4.5 It was so **agreed**.4.6 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** suggested that it would be useful to compile the WRC-12 decisions that had been recorded in the minutes of the plenary meeting, and issue the compilation to all delegations in a single document after the conference.4.7 The **Chairman** agreed. |  |
| 31 | WRC-12 | 11thPlenary [Doc. 552](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0552/en) | 1.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5** said that [Document 517](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0517/en) covered a specific request from Bulgaria for an exceptional derogation to the orbital limitations contained in Annex 7 to Appendix **30** of the Radio Regulations. Committee 5 proposed that the request should be accepted subject to the conditions outlined in [Document 517](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0517/en); and that to that end the plenary should adopt the text that appeared in inverted commas in [Document 517](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0517/en).1.2 The **Chairman**, turning to the text of the proposal**,** said that it was for “WRC-12” and not “the Plenary” to instruct the Radiocommunication Bureau. He took it that the conference could adopt the decision proposed by Committee 5, as thus amended, reproduced in Annex A to these minutes. 1.3 It was so **agreed**. | *The submission received on 19.03.2012 was processed in accordance with the decision.* |
| 32 | WRC-12 | 11th Plenary [Doc. 552](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0552/en) | 1.8 The **Chairman** took it that the conference approved the recommendation of Committee 5 to accede to the request of the Islamic Republic of Iran to reinstate the ZOHREH-1 satellite network filing.1.9 It was so **agreed.** |  |
| 33 | WRC-12 | 12th Plenary [Doc. 553](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0553/en) | 9 Applicability to Appendix 30B of the extension of satellite suspension periods from two to three years9.1 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** asked whether the extension of satellite suspension periods from two to three years, which had been incorporated into Appendices **30** and **30A**, would also be applied to assignments relating to Appendix **30B**, thus harmonizing the practices in regard to the non-planned bands. He noted that the agenda of the present conference did not cover Appendix **30B**. 9.2 The **representative of BR** said that the Bureau considered it the intention of the conference also to extend the suspension period under Appendix **30B**. If the present conference decided to confirm the extension of the suspension period under Appendix **30B**, the Bureau would draft rules of procedure to that effect for approval by RRB, and corresponding amendments to the Radio Regulations would be prepared for approval by the next conference.9.3 The **Chairman** took it that the conference approved application in regard to Appendix **30B** of the extension of the suspension period from two to three years, as well as the approach proposed by the Bureau to implement that extended period via rules of procedure.9.4 It was so **agreed**.  | RRB approved the relevant RoP on 8.17 of Appendix **30B** at its 60th meeting ([CR/339](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0339/en)) |
| 34 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.12 The **Chairman** said that the wording of the final sentence had been discussed at length and agreed by Committee 5. Any reopening of its substance was therefore unforeseen. He therefore took it that the conference wished to approve the following amended text for inclusion in the minutes of the Plenary as the conference’s decision in relation to Documents [138](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0138/en) and [244](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0244/en): “WRC-12 recognizes that an administration can bring into use, or continue the use of, frequency assignments for one of its satellite networks by using a space station which is under the responsibility of another administration or intergovernmental organization, provided that this latter administration or intergovernmental organization, after having been informed, does not object, within 90 days from the date of receipt of information, to the use of this space station for such purposes. This requirement shall not be applied retroactively and applies to assignments brought into use after the end of WRC-12.”3.13 It was so **agreed**.  | 66th Meeting of RRB:Frequency assignments of satellite network of appealed administration have not been considered as brought into use since another administration responsible for space station objected to use this space station for bringing into use.Documents [RRB14-1/3](http://www.itu.int/md/R14-RRB14.1-C-0003/en), [RRB14-2/4](http://www.itu.int/md/R14-RRB14.2-C-0004/en), [RRB14-2/9](http://www.itu.int/md/R14-RRB14.2-C-0009/en), [RRB14-2/10](http://www.itu.int/md/R14-RRB14.2-C-0010/en), [RRB14-2/16](http://www.itu.int/md/R14-RRB14.2-C-0016/en) |
| 35 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.16 The **Chairman** said he therefore took it that the conference wished to approve for inclusion in the minutes of the Plenary the following amended text as the conference’s decision in relation to [Addendum 1 to Addendum 28 to Document 6](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0006/en): “After consideration of [Addendum 1 to Addendum 28 to Document 6](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0006/en), it has been brought to the attention of the Conference that there is no documentation readily available to administrations on the practices and actions undertaken by the Bureau for consolidating frequency assignments of different GSO networks submitted by an administration at the same orbital position, into frequency assignments of a single satellite network. Therefore it is concluded to instruct: a) the Bureau to develop and submit to the Radio Regulations Board the detailed description of the Bureau’s practices and actions, especially with respect to consolidating frequency assignments of different GSO networks submitted by an administration at the same orbital position, into frequency assignments of a single satellite network; b) the Radio Regulations Board to develop the relevant Rules of Procedure.”3.17 It was so **agreed**. | RRB approved the relevant RoP on Article **11** at its 62nd meeting ([CR/346](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0346/en)) |
| 36 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.18 The **Chairman** said he further took it that the conference wished to approve for inclusion in the minutes of the Plenary a third text, relating to the conference’s modification of No. **13.6**, also set out in [Document 524](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0524/en), which read as follows: “Considering [Document 139](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0139/en), WRC-12 recognizes that the Bureau, when applying No. **13.6**, requests administrations to provide information about the characteristics and use of satellite networks. In response, administrations need to provide to the BR information on the actual use of the notified characteristics of commercial satellite networks.”3.19 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 37 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.21 The **Chairman** took it that the conference authorized the Radio Regulations Board to extend by one year the deadline for bringing into use the frequency assignments to the VINASAT-FSS-131E-III network in the event of a launch delay, as proposed by Committee 5.3.22 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 38 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.24 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, with reference to the second issue addressed in [Document 525](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0525/en), which concerned interim agreements within Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B**, indicated that Committee 5 had discussed a proposal to introduce a regulatory mechanism allowing administrations having no immediate plans to use their planned assignments and allotments in Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B** to give their agreement on a temporary basis to administrations wishing to operate assignments in the List without seeing their protection margins permanently degraded. The committee had recognized that the issue was complex and required further study within the appropriate ITU-R study group.3.25 The **Chairman** took it that the conference invited the appropriate ITU-R study group to further study the matter.3.26 It was so **agreed** |  |
| 39 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.27 The **Chairman of Committee 5** said that the third issue addressed in [Document 525](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0525/en) concerned a proposal to modify Article **4** of Appendices **30** and **30A** to require the explicit agreement of administrations under Article **4**, instead of their implicit agreement as was currently the case. It had been recognized that the issue was complex and required further study within the appropriate ITU-R study group.3.28 The **Chairman** took it that the conference invited the appropriate ITU-R study group to further study the matter.3.29 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 40 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.31 The **Chairman** took it that the conference wished to formulate its decision as follows:  “The conference decides to instruct the Bureau and the RRB to carefully investigate the matter in order to find ways and means to alleviate the situation such as suggesting another orbital position for Iraq and processing its requirement on the selected new orbital position with the highest priority in the processing chain of Article **4** of Appendices **30** and **30A** or the possible options as appropriate. With respect to the reduction of the EPM of other countries resulting from non-reply to the request for coordination it is considered necessary that the substance of the matters be fully examined with a view to avoid the occurrence of such reduction in future.”3.32 It was so **agreed** |  |
| 41 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc.554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.36 The **Chairman** took it that the conference wished to conclude as follows: “The conference urges the Administration of France, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Saudi Arabia to accelerate their coordination discussions and to make the utmost effort to find a satisfactory solution to the matter, taking into account the recommendation made by the RRB at its 58th meeting, as set out in its summary of decisions”. 3.37 It was so **agreed**. | Discussed in 60 – 64th RRB meetings. |
| 42 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 3.38 The Chairman of Committee 5, introducing [Document 526](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0526/en), expressed appreciation of the efforts of the Director and the Radiocommunication Bureau in producing the Director’s Report to the conference on the activities of the Radiocommunication Sector. The details of the deliberations of Committee 5 on the relevant parts of the Director’s Report (as allocated to Committee 5 in [Document 141](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0141/en)) were set out in the annex to [Document 526](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0526/en).3.39 The delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed gratitude to the Director and his staff for a very detailed and valuable report. The findings of the report, which had been completed prior to the conference, should be implemented in line with the decisions of WRC-12. With regard to § 3.8.1 of the annex to [Document 526](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0526/en), he said that although no change to the Radio Regulations was being sought at present, a draft rule of procedure should be developed and submitted to the next RRB meeting. He accordingly proposed a modification of the text of the second sentence, in which the word “encouraged” should be replaced by “instructed”.3.40 It was so agreed.3.41 With that amendment, [Document 526](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0526/en) was approved.3.42 The **Chairman** said that he took it that the conference had decided to instruct the Radiocommunication Bureau to draft a rule of procedure on examination under § 2.2 of Annex 4 of Appendix **30B**, as indicated in § 3.8.1 of the annex to Document 526.3.43 It was so **agreed**. | Annex 4 of Appendix **30B**:RRB approved the relevant RoP on 6.16 of Appendix **30B** at its 60th meeting ([CR/339](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0339/en))Pfd limits to the steerable beams in Appendix **30B**:RRB approved the relevant RoP on No.**21.16** at its 60th meeting ([CR/339](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0339/en)) |
| 43 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 9.1 Committee 5 had reached the following conclusion, which it requested the Plenary to approve as a decision of the conference:  “In case of a satellite failure, especially that of a newly launched satellite, during the ninety-day bringing into use period that renders the satellite technically incapable of operating in a given frequency band, the notifying administration may submit the case to the Board for its consideration and careful investigation... In considering such a matter, the Board may determine on a case-by-case basis whether it is appropriate to apply the provisions of No. **11.49** to the relevant frequency assignments in this case.  “The ITU‑R is invited to study, as a matter of urgency, to determine what regulatory changes, if any, should be made to the RR under agenda item 7 for WRC-15 to address the issues above. “In parallel with the above ITU‑R study activity, the Board is instructed to consider the development of a RoP taking into account the results of the ITU‑R studies, if they become available, to cover the period between WRC-12 and WRC-15.”  | The matter is under consideration in RRB Under discussion in ITU-R (WP4A, SC and CPM)Doc. [CPM15-02/1](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-CPM15.02-C-0001/en) (Chapter 5)Doc. [CPM15-02/2](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-CPM15.02-C-0002/en) |
| 44 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 9.2 The second issue concerned the measures to prevent a single spacecraft being used to bring into use frequency assignments at multiple orbital positions. In that regard, the committee had reached the following conclusion, which it requested the Plenary to approve as a decision of the conference: “WRC-12 recognizes that the issue of using one space station to bring frequency assignments at different orbital locations into use within a short period of time was not the intent of these new provisions, and ways to address this issue require study. WRC-12 took significant steps in this regard with changes to bringing into use and suspension provisions, as well as to No. **13.6**. In examining this issue, it must be emphasized that there are legitimate reasons why an administration or operator may need to move a spacecraft from one orbital position to a new orbital position, and care should be taken not to constrain the legitimate use of fleet manoeuvres and management. Nevertheless, administrations are encouraged to examine their own national regulatory provisions to ensure that opportunities for abusive practices are minimized. Until ITU-R studies are completed, where an administration brings into use frequency assignments at a given orbital location using an already in-orbit satellite, the BR is requested to make an enquiry to that administration as to the last previous orbital location/frequency assignments brought into use with that satellite and make such information available.”…9.13 The **Chairman**, noting that no agreement could be reached on possible modifications to the text, proposed that the two texts proposed in [Document 523](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0523/en) be approved unchanged as decisions of the conference.9.14 It was so **agreed**. | Under discussion in ITU-R (WP4A, SC and CPM)Doc. [CPM15-02/1](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-CPM15.02-C-0001/en) (Chapter 5)Doc. [CPM15-02/2](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-CPM15.02-C-0002/en) |
| 45 | WRC-12 | 13th Plenary [Doc. 554](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0554/en) | 11.6 The **representative of BR** said that his understanding of the Plenary’s decision was that Resolution **553** **[COM5/7] (WRC‑12)**, which would enter into force on 18 February 2012, would apply retroactively to submissions made in the band 21.4-22 GHz prior to that date, in particular coordination requests submitted prior to 18 February 2012 to which, in theory, the regulations in force on the dates of receipt of those coordination requests should apply. It was also his understanding that criteria which were identified in Annex 2 to the attachment to Resolution **553 [COM5/7]** would be applicable only as from 18 February 2012. However, as the decision of the conference was to apply the special procedure retroactively, the Radiocommunication Bureau would therefore apply the new resolution retroactively to coordination requests. 11.7 With those explanations, the forty-second series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B42) ([Document 532](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0532/en)), as amended on first reading, was **approved** on second reading. |  |
| 46 | WRC-12 | 14th Plenary [Doc. 555](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0555/en) | 1.1 The **Chairman** said that, following an evaluation by the Director of BR of the financial implications of reviewing the different language versions of the Radio Regulations, it was proposed that the conference approve the following, alternative course of action (see [Document 544](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0544/en)) in relation to [Document 521](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0521/en): “To safeguard the solemnity and accuracy of the versions of the Radio Regulations in Arabic, Russian and Chinese languages, WRC‑12 invites the ITU departments and the administrations concerned to jointly carry out a comprehensive review of these versions in order to reach full alignment of these versions in the edition of the Radio Regulations to be published after WRC-15.”1.2 The **delegate of China** asked whether both the Space Services and the Terrestrial Services Departments would review the different language versions. In order to prevent delays in the work of Member States, it would be preferable to take appropriate action immediately concerning any inconsistencies that had already been identified. Any inconsistencies found subsequently could be reviewed at or after WRC-15. 1.3 The **Director of BR** said that, as set out in [Document 535](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0535/en), it was the practice of the Editorial Committee to correct errors in the different language versions where they had been identified. While errors in the Chinese version had already been pointed out by the Chinese delegation, it was proposed that a thorough review of the three language versions mentioned be made in order to ensure full alignment, and any errors found would be submitted to the Editorial Committee at WRC-15. Responding to a question from the **Chairman of Committee 3**, he confirmed that there would be no budgetary implications arising from alignment of the different languages versions.1.4 The **Chairman** took it that the conference approved the alternative course of action set out in [Document 544](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0544/en) in relation to [Document 521](http://www.itu.int/md/R12-WRC12-C-0521/en) (agenda item 8.1.2) (see text in § 1.1 above).1.5 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 47 | WRC-15 | 4th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/272](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0272/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/230 | 1.10 With regard to Document 230, the Chairman of Committee 5 explained that the committee had agreed on changes to be made to Resolutions 907 and 908 (WRC-12) and had communicated the result of its work to the Editorial Committee for subsequent submission to the present plenary meeting in Document 228. Committee 3 had also been informed of the possible consequences of those changes. Committee 5 in addition requested that the conference instruct the Radiocommunication Bureau to develop and implement the tools and means described in the clauses “*instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau*” and “*instructs the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau*” of the two Resolutions in question, preferably by 1 January 2017 and no later than 30 June 2017.1.11 With regard to work under agenda item 9.2, the committee had endorsed the decisions of the RRB regarding the reinstatement of the frequency assignments of the CSDRN-M satellite network and the extension to 31 December 2015 of the period for bringing into use of the frequency assignments to the LAOSAT-128.5E satellite network.1.12 Document 230 was **approved**. | **WRC-15 instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau** to develop and implement the tools and means described in the “*instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau*” of these two Resolutions preferably by 1 January 2017 and no later than 30 June 2017, taking into account the possible financial implications.WRC-15 took note of section 3.2.7.7 of Addendum 2(Rev.1) and section 8.6 of Addendum 3 to Document 4 regarding the decision of the Radio Regulations Board to re-instate the frequency assignments of the CSDRN-M network. WRC-15 furthermore took note of section 8.11 of Addendum 3 to Document 4 regarding the exceptional extension of the deadline for bringing into use the frequency assignments of the LAOSAT128.5E satellite network until 31 December 2015. **WRC-15 endorsed the decisions taken by the Board in both of these cases.** WRC-15 furthermore noted that these decisions by the Board were taken on a case-by-case basis, based upon the specific circumstances associated with these two particular cases. |
| 48 | WRC-15 | 4th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/272](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0272/en)Approval of Document 225 | 1.13 The **Chairman of Committee 6** noted that Working Group 6B had set up four ad hoc groups to study the items to be included in the agenda of future WRCs. Working Group 6A was pursuing its work under agenda item 8 and continued to receive relevant proposals. The initial results of work under agenda items 2 and 4 would be submitted to the present plenary meeting within the framework of Document 228. Lastly, studies were being pursued regarding item 9.2.1.14 Introducing Document 225, the speaker drew attention to the committee’s conclusion that no changes were required to the titles of Articles 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 49, 50, 52 and 53 of the Radio Regulations, provided that the ITU secretariat took the necessary action to facilitate browsing of the Radio Regulations by introducing headers on each page of Volume 1 indicating the title of the relevant chapter. In addition, as was indicated in Document 228 submitted by Committee 7 to the present plenary meeting, it was proposed that Resolution 67 (WRC-12) be suppressed and Article 2 modified.1.15 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** recalled that it was difficult for smaller delegations, especially those from developing countries, to participate in the work of all the committees, and that it would be desirable to limit the number of items included on the agenda of the next WRC to the minimum that was necessary. It was not necessary to have an agenda item for every point that could be dealt with within the framework of ITU’s current activities, and issues requiring a decision by the conference could be included in the report of the Director under agenda item 9.1.1.16 The **Chairman of Committee 6** assured the participants that the committee was aware of that difficulty and took account of it in its work.1.17 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** indicated a change that was needed in the Arabic version of the paragraph dealing with item 9.1.1.18 His comment was **noted**.1.19 Document 225 was **approved**. | ITU Secretariat takes necessary action to facilitate the browsing of the Radio Regulations by introducing headers on each page of Volume I showing the title of the relevant Chapter. |
| 49 | WRC-15 | 6th Plenary [Doc CMR15/430](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0430/en)Approval of Document 308 | 2.9 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that Document 308 set out in annex the committee’s conclusions under agenda item 9.2 pertaining to application of provision No. **9.19** of the Radio Regulations to terrestrial services, and new data items for HAPS gateway links. 2.10 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, noting that the situation with respect to pfd values had been unsatisfactory for a long time, suggested that the Director of BR should be instructed to bring the matter to the attention of the relevant ITU‑R study groups and provide pfd values for the regions concerned. The data elements listed in BR Circular Letter CR/345 might also be studied and relevant findings presented to the next WRC. It would also be preferable to replace “would continue” in section B of the annex to Document 308 with “may wish to continue”.2.11 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that the concerns expressed by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran were addressed by the phrase “the Conference invites the relevant ITU‑R Study Groups to identify the applicable pfd values” in paragraph A 2 of the annex.2.12 The **Chairman** suggested that, with that explanation, the plenary endorse the conclusions of Committee 6 in annex to Document 308, and therefore agree as follows: **A)** **Application of provision No. 9.19 of the Radio Regulations to terrestrial services** The conference agreed:1 to confirm the current Bureau’s practice for application of provision No. **9.19** of the Radio Regulations related to coordination of transmitting terrestrial stations with respect to typical earth station included in the service area of a space station in the broadcasting-satellite service in the bands shared with equal rights between these services as follows:“Since the pfd threshold values are only available for the band 11.7-12.7 GHz, and given the fact that different propagation conditions and criteria may apply to the other bands, in examination of frequency notices for terrestrial stations under No. **9.19** the Bureau currently establishes coordination requirements using only frequency overlap as the coordination threshold for the following bands: 620-790 MHz, 1 452-1 492 MHz, 2 310-2 360 MHz, 2 520-2 670 MHz, 17.7 - 17.8 GHz, 40.5-42.5 GHz and 74-76 GHz.”2 the conference invites the relevant ITU‑R Study Groups to identify the applicable pfd values and calculation methods for establishing coordination requirements under No. **9.19** in the relevant frequency bands, including 620 – 790 MHz, 1 452-1 492 MHz, 2 310-2 360 MHz, 2 520-2 670 MHz, 17.7 - 17.8 GHz, 40.5-42.5 GHz and 74-76 GHz.**B)**  **New data items for HAPS gateway links**The conference agreed that no changes are required to the Radio Regulations to include the data items listed in BR Circular Letter CR/345 of 8 May 2013 for the notification of high-altitude platform stations (HAPS) gateway links in the bands 6 440-6 520 MHz and 6 560-6 640 MHz in some countries pursuant to No. **5.457** and the associated Resolution **150 (WRC‑12)**.Administrations wishing to implement HAPS gateway links in the bands 6 440-6 520 MHz and 6 560-6 640 MHz would continue to use the data elements listed in the above-mentioned Circular Letter on a provisional basis till a competent World Radiocommunication Conference includes the required data items in Appendix 4 to the Radio Regulations.2.13 It was so **agreed**. | RRB approved the relevant RoP on No.**9.19** at its 74th meeting ([CR/417](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0417/en))RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.**9.19** at its 73rd meeting ([CR/412](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)). |
| 50 | WRC-15 | 6th Plenary [Doc CMR15/430](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0430/en) | 8.1 The **delegate of Slovenia** made the following statement:“Slovenia would like to present some concerns related to chapter 7.4.2.2 of the Director’s report on the activities of the Radiocommunication Sector dealing with harmful interference caused by Italy to the broadcasting services (sound and television) of its neighbouring countries. Slovenia is deeply concerned at the delay in the schedule for solving television harmful interference cases; the activities were announced two years ago and we still cannot detect any improvement in the spectrum. On the other hand, Slovenia appreciates the Italian efforts to start these activities and expects the activities will continue until all harmful interference cases to all Slovenian stations are solved.Unfortunately, there are still a lot of harmful interference cases to Slovenian sound broadcasting stations operating according to the Geneva 1984 Agreement that remain unsolved. Slovenia is fully aware that there is a big need for frequencies for FM radio stations on both sides of the border; however, we believe that the Geneva 1984 Agreement should be respected and that spectrum usage should be based on available resources, respecting ITU rules and international agreements.Slovenia would like to emphasize that harmful interference caused by Italian non-coordinated stations results in severe economic damage to Slovenia. Slovenia understands that some interference cases might need a longer time to resolve; however, detailed reports of hundreds of cases of harmful interference were presented to the Italian Administration back in 2003. Slovenia regrets that practically no interference cases have been solved and urges immediate actions to eliminate harmful interference.Slovenia would appreciate it if the issue referred to in chapter 7.4.2.2 of the Director's report on the activities of the Radiocommunication Sector dealing with harmful interference caused by Italy to the broadcasting services (sound and television) of its neighbouring countries remains open until the next WRC, where the progress should be presented. We suggest including a renewed action plan to eliminate harmful interference to the broadcasting services (sound and television).”8.2 The **delegate of Italy** made the following statement:“Italy regrets and apologizes for the delay in solving the harmful interference with its neighbouring countries. Mr Chairman, I have to admit that I am a bit surprised at this declaration from Slovenia, due to the fact that Italy has already started to have bilateral meetings establishing a “road map” with all neighbouring countries, first considering the most critical cases and then the less critical ones. This process will take some time and it is still in progress. In recent years, Italy has met regularly with its neighbouring countries within the framework of the radiospectrum policy group and radiospectrum committee meetings of the European Union and, at each meeting, Italy gives updated information about interferences cases and about the interference measures carried out in cooperation with neighbouring countries. Italy also regularly sends the RRB a report entitled “road map” with an update of the situation regarding interference cases. The new national plan of frequency assignments approved by Agcom, the national agency responsible, has excluded the use of interference channels in the border areas with Slovenia, Croatia, Malta and France and these channels will therefore be switched off. Italy is making a great effort to achieve a complete solution of this matter, and this problem has high priority for the Italian Administration. It is also a priority at the high political level, with the Italian Parliament approving two laws dedicated to the issue over the last two years. On Friday, 30 October 2015, the Ministry of Economic Development adopted an official act establishing a process and a time schedule for the final release of all interfering channels. This process started on 2 November, and includes different steps that will be completed by the end of April 2016 with the switch off of all interfering TV channels. FM interference with our neighbouring counties was discussed within the framework of the radiospectrum policy group meeting held in Brussels on 15 October. Given the heavy use of analogue FM both in Italy and in its neighbouring countries, Italy has asked to hold bilateral and multilateral meetings with all parties to establish the real needs for FM frequencies and to find a solution.”8.3 The **Director of BR** said that the problem was an extensive one that had been discussed at length at WRC‑12 and at every meeting of RRB since then. He was pleased to report that the legislative and regulatory measures necessary to resolve the issue were now being taken by the Italian authorities. The reverse auction process, through which the Government would buy out the assignments creating most of the harmful interference, had recently begun and was expected to be completed by the end of 2015. He suggested that the conference should encourage the Director of BR and RRB to continue their efforts in collaboration with the Administration of Italy and all affected administrations to find a definitive solution as soon as possible. 8.4 The **delegate of Croatia**,noting that his Administration was also affected, called on all parties concerned to work towards resolution of the longstanding problem.8.5 The **Chairman** suggested that the plenary should note the statements made and endorse the suggestion made by the Director of BR.8.6 It was so **agreed**. | **WRC-15 encourages the Director of BR and RRB** to continue their efforts in collaboration with the Administration of Italy and all affected administrations to find a definitive solution as soon as possible. |
| 51 | WRC-15 | 7th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/504](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0504/en)Approval of Document 335(Rev.1) | 3.14 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, turning to the committee’s third report to the plenary (Document 335(Rev.1)), concerning the consideration of proposals relating to agenda item 7, said that, with respect to the modification to a recorded assignment in the List under RR Appendices **30** and **30A**, the plenary was requested to consider and approve the following Committee 5 conclusion:“WRC-15 considered the issue of modification to a recorded assignment in the List under RR Appendices **30** and **30A**. Article 4 of those Appendices has no specific provisions to modify the characteristics of an assignment after it has successfully entered into the Regions 1 and 3 List of additional uses except for § 4.1.23 where an assignment may be deleted from the List. This being the case even if the modification would reduce the interference caused by the assignment. If the assignment in the List is no longer suitable, the notifying administration has only the option to submit a new proposal under § 4.1.3 of Article 4 in order to replace the assignment in the List. Thus, it is possible to modify the characteristics of an Article 4 submission at the coordination stage, before entering into the List under § 4.1.11, but not afterwards. This issue was raised in the Director’s Report to WRC-15, where the Conference was invited to consider the issue with a view of modifying the provisions of Article 4 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A** to permit such modifications in cases where the interference into other networks is reduced. This issue was also the subject of a proposal from a Member State. It was felt that further study of this issue is required. The ITU-R is therefore invited to study this issue under the standing agenda item 7 with the aim of finding an appropriate regulatory and technical solution to this issue*.*”3.15 With respect to updating the reference situation when the assignments in the List under RR Appendices **30** and **30A** are changed from provisional to definitive, he said that the plenary was requested to consider and approve the following Committee 5 conclusion: “WRC-15 received a proposal addressing §§ 4.1.18-4.1.20 of Appendix **30** to the Radio Regulations which describes the requirements and conditions for recording in the Regions 1 and 3 List of an assignment with outstanding coordination requirements. It was noted that § 4.1.18 prescribes that in the case of recording in the List with outstanding coordination requirements, this recording shall be provisional, but that the entry shall be changed from provisional to definitive recording in the List if the Bureau is informed that the new assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 List has been in use, together with the assignment which was already in the List and which was the basis for the disagreement, for at least four months without any complaint of harmful interference being made. In entering an assignment provisionally into the List, the reference situation of assignments which were the basis for the disagreement is not updated. The Radio Regulations do not provide exact instructions as to if and when the reference situation of these assignments is to be updated and the Bureau has been obliged to adopt a practice for how to do this. The current practice is that the reference situation of assignments which were the basis for the disagreement is updated when changing the recording from provisional to definitive, i.e. after four months without complaints about harmful interference, and it was felt that further study of this issue is required if this current practice is to be changed. ITU-R is therefore invited to study this issue under the standing agenda item 7 with the aim of finding an appropriate regulatory and technical solution to this issue.”3.16 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** stressed that any decision concerning a matter of such critical importance as the modification to a recorded assignment in the List under RR Appendices **30** and **30A** should be postponed until after the conduct of a careful study to ascertain that the suggested course of action would not run counter to the very principle on which those appendices were based.3.17 The **Chairman of Committee 5** confirmed that no such decision was intended at the present time; rather, the suggestion was that the results of any study to be conducted on the issue under agenda item 7 should be presented for consideration at the next WRC.3.18 On that understanding, Document 335(Rev.1) was **endorsed** and the conclusions contained therein were **approved**. | - |
| 52 | WRC-15 | 7th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/504](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0504/en)Approval of Document 354 | 3.19 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, introducing the committee’s fourth report to the plenary (Document 354), concerning the consideration of proposals relating to agenda items 7 and 9, said that, with respect to agenda item 7 issue 7K – Addition of a regulatory provision in RR Article **11** for the case of launch failure, the plenary was requested to consider and approve the following Committee 5 conclusion:“In considering the issue of satellite launch failure, WRC-15 confirms the decision taken by WRC‑12 (at its thirteenth meeting) that the Board may address requests for a time-limit extension based on either a co-passenger issue or *force majeure* taking into account internationally applicable rules and practices in this regard so long as any extension is “limited and qualified”.”3.20 With respect to agenda item 9, concerning the status of WRC decisions recorded in the minutes of a world radiocommunication conference, the plenary was further requested to consider and approve the following Committee 5 conclusion:“WRC-15 instructed the Bureau to publish, after the end of WRC-15 and as soon as possible, a Circular Letter containing all decisions made by WRC-15 included in its plenary minutes and to make it available on the ITU website.”3.21 Lastly, with respect to agenda item 9.2, concerning the bringing into use of frequency assignments for non-GSO FSS/MSS systems, the plenary was requested to consider and approve the following Committee 5 conclusion:“WRC-15 discussed section 3.2.2.4.4 of Document 4(Add.2)(Rev.1), Report of the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau (BR), with respect to the bringing into use of frequency assignments for non-GSO FSS/MSS systems. WRC-15 was not able to conclude on the issue raised by the BR but recognized a lack of specific provisions in the Radio Regulations.WRC-15 invites ITU-R to examine, under the standing WRC agenda item 7, the possible development of regulatory provisions requiring additional milestones beyond those under RR Nos. **11.25** and **11.44** on the systems referred to in the paragraph above. This study may also consider the implications of the application of such milestones to non-GSO FSS/MSS systems brought into use after WRC-15.”3.22 Document 354 was **endorsed** and the conclusions contained therein were **approved**. | The Board continued to make decisions on requests for a time-limit extension based on either a co-passenger issue or *force majeure* as a result of this confirmation of WRC-15.The Bureau published Circular Letters on WRC decisions, see [CR/389](https://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0389/en) and [CR/456](https://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0456/en). |
| 53 | WRC-15 | 8th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/505](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0505/en)Approval of Document CMR15/398 | 1.32 The **Chairman** proposed that a decision be taken separately on each of the five proposals set out in Document 398.  1.33 The first proposal, concerning Issue L, was **approved**, with the following wording: “In discussing the issue of possible modifications to the Regions 1 and 3 Appendices 30 and 30A Plans WRC-15 recognized that there can be cases where the assistance of the Bureau may be required for countries experiencing a case of *force majeure*. For the administrations of those countries, it may not be possible to either receive incoming correspondence from the Bureau, or to reply to such correspondence within the time limits established in § 4.1.10a4.1.10d of Article 4 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**, and lack of such correspondence could negatively impact the reference situation of the Plan assignments of those administrations. In such cases, those administrations could benefit from specific actions taken by the Bureau to address this situation and WRC-15 instructs the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to explore the issues and to request the Radio Regulations Board to address those specific situations.” … 1.36 The fourth proposal, concerning coordination among non-GSO FSS systems, was **approved**, with the following wording: “WRC-15 received a contribution dealing with Section 3.2.2.4.3 of the Director’s Report (Document [4](http://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0004/en)(Add.2)(Rev.1)) on coordination among non-GSO FSS systems. WRC-15 recognizes that notifying administrations may mutually agree on the organization of multilateral coordination meetings for non-GSO FSS systems and may wish to seek the assistance of the Bureau under existing procedures. The coordination among non-GSO FSS systems in bands subject to Section II of RR Article **9** can be further studied in ITU-R, and any modifications to the procedures, if required, can be submitted under WRC-19 agenda item 7.” 1.37 The fifth proposal, concerning notification of typical earth stations in the fixed-satellite service, was **approved**, with the following wording: “In considering the issue of notification of typical earth stations in the fixed-satellite service in the Director’s Report (Document 4(Add.2)(Rev.1) § 3.2.3.8), WRC-15 concluded that further ITU-R studies are needed before any regulatory decision can be made. For the purposes of these studies, WRC-15 agreed to instruct the Bureau to publish a Circular letter containing a common format according to which administrations may wish to submit to the Bureau, on a voluntary basis, characteristics and number of typical earth stations deployed in their countries, to the extent available, for information purposes only.” 1.38 Document 398, without the second and third proposals contained in it, was **approved**.  | - |
| 54 | WRC-15 | 8th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/505](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0505/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/416 | 1.39 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 416, containing the sixth report of Committee 5 to the plenary meeting and presenting the results of the Committee’s discussions under agenda item 9.2. The report requested the plenary to endorse the conclusion of Committee 5 and to instruct the Radio Regulations Board and the Radiocommunication Bureau to take appropriate actions.1.40 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** requested the Director of BR to confirm that, in the event of difficulties in applying the Radio Regulations, it would continue to proceed in the usual manner by seeking the opinions of the study groups and applying all the relevant Resolutions in force. The **Director of BR** said that it was indeed his intention to adhere to established practice.1.41 The **Chairman** proposed that Document 416 be approved as a whole, taking into account the observations of the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran and of the Director of BR.1.42 It was so **agreed**. | It was recognized during discussion of the Director’s Report and its various addenda that some of the issues that were raised could benefit from study within ITU-R Study Groups. As such, **the Radiocommunication Bureau is encouraged** to refer these issues as soon as they are identified, and as appropriate, to the ITU-R for such study. It would also be useful if a draft of the Director’s Report, or at least a draft of Part 2 of that Report, could be made available in time for CPM19-2. Finally, it is requested for the Director to consider structuring the report along the lines of the structure of WRC-19.The annex provides details of the results of the deliberations of the Director’s Report by Committee 5.ANNEXPART 2**Experience in the application of the Radio Regulatory Procedures** **and other related matters****2** **Preparation of the Radio Regulations (2012 edition)****2.1** **General comments****2.2.2** **Inconsistencies, provisions that are lacking clarity** Table 2**Inconsistencies in the RR, provisions that are lacking clarity***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.* ***11.48*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).*WRC-15 noted the inconsistency between RR No. **11.48** and § 8 of Annex 1 to Resolution 552 (WRC12) and **confirmed its understanding** that frequency assignments of satellite networks operating in the 21.4-22 GHz band shall be cancelled by the Bureau 30 days after the end of the seven-year period following the date of receipt by the Bureau of the relevant complete information under RR No. **9.1** or **9.2**, as appropriate, and after the end of the three-year period following the date of suspension under RR No. **11.49**.**3.2** **Comments relating to coordination, notification and recording of frequency assignments, aeronautical services, appendices and resolutions****3.2.2** **Article 9 of the Radio Regulations***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on the rules concerning the Receivability of forms of notice generally applicable to all notified assignments submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of the Radio Regulatory Procedures at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.2.4.1** **Submission of requests for coordination related to non-GSO satellite systems****WRC-15 endorsed** the suggestion of the Director and recommended the RRB to develop an appropriate Rule of Procedure.**3.2.2.4.2** **Application of Article 22 of the Radio Regulations for the protection of GSO FSS and GSO BSS networks from non-GSO FSS systems**In cases where the software cannot adequately model certain non-geostationary satellite FSS systems, Resolution **85 (WRC-03)** will continue to be applied until an update to Recommendation ITU-R S.1503 improving the modelling of those non-GSO systems has been agreed within ITUR and has been implemented in the epfd validation software. This would not preclude the Bureau to undertake verification of the non-GSO FSS systems that can be modelled with the existing version of the software.Should there be an update to Recommendation ITU-R S.1503 then there would be a consequential requirement for an update to the verification software which would have financial implications and require additional funding. The Bureau would then be in a position to complete the verification of compliance of those FSS systems that could not have been modelled with the current software.**3.2.3** **Article 11 of the Radio Regulations***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.* ***11.32*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.3.2** **Objection to a coordination agreement after publication of Part I-S****WRC-15 endorsed** the approach presented in this section.**3.2.3.9** **Excessive notified characteristics of recorded frequency assignments of GSO satellite networks operating in the FSS, BSS, MSS and associated space operation functions** **WRC-15 expressed general support** for the ideas presented in this section and suggested to BR that it should look to the ITU-R Study Groups to help define criteria to be used in their analysis.**3.2.4** **Other articles of the Radio Regulations***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Nos.* ***23.13B*** *and* ***23.13C*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.4.2** **Processing of requests under RR No. 23.13B of the Radio Regulations to a network submitted under RR Appendix 30****WRC-15 endorsed** the proposed method.**3.2.4.3** **Frequency assignments used in space services with a direct or indirect reference to the provisions of Article 48 of the Constitution**In discussing the issues raised in this section, in conjunction with the questions raised in the RRB Report on Resolution 80 regarding these same issues (see Section 4.4 of Document 14), **WRC-15 noted** that Article 48 refers to “military radio installations” and not to stations used for governmental purposes in general and **decided that BR** should not infer that an administration refers to Article 48 of the Constitution in its answer to an inquiry under RR No. 13.6, unless this administration has explicitly invoked Article 48. **WRC-15 also decided** that there should be no restriction in terms of class of station and nature of service for a station eligible to operate under Article 48.**3.2.5** **Comments relating to Appendices 4 and 8 of the Radio Regulations****3.2.5.2.2** **Treatment of frequency assignments with a bandwidth less than the stated averaging bandwidth**WRC-15 thanked the Director for this section and **suggested that this detailed issue be referred** to the appropriate ITU Study Group for further consideration.*RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.* ***21.14*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.5.2.6** **Service area below 3 degree elevation angle**WRC-15 considered this issue and **decided to request BR** to remove the 3 degree limitation.**3.2.6** **Comments relating to RR Appendices 30 and 30A***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Appendix* ***30A*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.6.2** **Calculation of power control value for assignments in the List****WRC-15 clarified** that the use of power control should be extended to assignments in the Region 1 and 3 List and the corresponding RoP should be modified accordingly*.**RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.* ***4.1.11*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.6.4** **Agreement provided under paragraph 4.1.11 of RR Appendices 30 and 30A****WRC-15 endorsed** the current BR practice outlined in this section.*RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Appendix* ***30A****., Article 2A.1.2 at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.6.10** **Coordination criteria under § 9.7 for an incoming satellite network under Article 2A (Space Operation Function) in the 14.5-14.8 GHz frequency band****WRC-15 considered** that a coordination arc of ±7° be applied for 14.5-14.8 GHz (to be aligned with Ku-band from agenda item 9.1.2).**Note from the Secretariat:** Since WRC-15 decided to modify Appendix 5 of the Radio Regulations to apply a ±6° coordination arc for "FSS not subject to a plan and any associated space operation functions" in this band, the alignment requested by the Plenary will be implemented by applying the value of ±6° also in this case.*RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Appendix* ***30A****, Annex 4 at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.6.11** **Power density used for the calculation of Δ*T*/*T* under § 2 of Annex 4 to RR Appendix 30A****WRC-15 considered and confirmed** the approach presented in this section.**3.2.7** **Comments relating to RR Appendix 30B***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Appendix* ***30B****, Article 6.25 to 6.29, at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***3.2.7.1** **Provisional entry of converted assignment***RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.* ***13.6*** *at its 73rd meeting (*[*CR/412*](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)*).***WRC-15 considered and confirmed** the course of action presented in this section.**Add1 §6** **No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations**This section of the report raised the issue of whether partial evidence provided by an administration to support the use of frequency assignments across a frequency band may be considered as sufficient, in a reply to a RR No. **13.6** query, to demonstrate the use, or continuation of use, of frequency assignments in accordance with the notified characteristics recorded in the MIFR. In considering this issue, **WRC-15 was of the view** that administrations need to respond as completely as practicable to queries under RR No. **13.6**. If the Bureau receives what it considers to be a partial reply to a query, it is expected that the Bureau would further clarify the scope of its query for the administration or request additional or alternative information. In addition, it was recognized that WRC-15 agreed some revisions to RR No. **13.6** that are intended to ensure greater transparency in the application of this provision. These revisions should have the consequence of helping to address such issues. |
| 55 | WRC-15 | 8th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/505](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0505/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/427 | 1.45 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 427, containing the tenth report from Committee 5 to the plenary meeting and following-up the examination of Document 110 from the Administration of Colombia containing a request to extend the regulatory deadline for bringing into use of the assignments of SATCOL 1B satellite network at 70.9º W. The Administration of Colombia had submitted the following text to the Chairman of Committee 5 for submission to plenary: “The Administration of Colombia requested in Document 110 that WRC-15 consider an extension of the regulatory period for bringing into use the frequency assignments of the SATCOL 1B satellite network, taking into account Article 44 of the ITU Constitution and Recommendation 6 of the Plenipotentiary Conference 2014 (PP14). The Administration of Columbia sought the endorsement of WRC-15 to instruct the Radiocommunication Bureau to extend the regulatory period for bringing into use the assignments of SATCOL 1B until 28 November 2018. Discussions took place amongst the concerned administrations to reach agreement on the protection of their satellite networks. On the basis of the agreements reached between the concerned administrations WRC-15 instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau to extend the regulatory period for bringing into use the assignments of SATCOL 1B until 28 November 2018.”1.46 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the conference should respond positively to the request from Colombia, a developing country experiencing numerous difficulties.1.47 The **Chairman** proposed that the Conference unanimously approve the text from the Administration of Colombia, thereby instructing the Radiocommunication Bureau to extend the regulatory period for bringing into use the frequency assignments of the SATCOL 1B satellite network until 28 November 2018, and to record that decision in the minutes of the meeting.1.48 It was so **agreed**.1.49 The **delegate of Colombia** said that his government was endeavouring to ensure broadband access for the entire population and sought constantly to comply with the Radio Regulations and agreements applicable in that area. | - |
| 56 | WRC-15 | 11th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/508](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0508/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/456 | 1.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, introducing Documents 426 and 456, said that the committee had reached no conclusion concerning the regulatory texts produced on the basis of the proposals submitted to it under agenda item 1.12, as contained in the annex to Document 426, in which context he drew particular attention to proposed new footnote No. 5.X112. Informal discussions conducted subsequently among concerned administrations had resulted in, *inter alia*, the newly modified footnote No. 5.A112 in the annex to Document 456, concerning which the following text had been produced for inclusion in the minutes of the plenary as the position of the conference:“In adopting No. 5.A112, WRC-15 recognized Resolution 174 (Rev. Busan, 2014) “ITU’s role with regard to international public policy issues relating to the risk of illicit use of information and communication technologies” and UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/41/65 on “Principles relating to remote sensing of the Earth from space”, in particular its Principle IV, that are relevant for this application.” He added that the regulatory texts presented in the annex to Document 456, including footnote No. 5.A112, had been developed through intensive discussions aimed at finding solutions acceptable to all concerned, one result of which was that footnote No. 5.X112 had been discarded. 1.2 Responding to a suggestion by the **Chairman** that requests for the inclusion of country names in footnotes should be communicated to the Chairman of Committee 5, the **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** insisted that all such requests must be made in plenary in order to obtain the necessary formal approval. 1.3 The **delegates of Indonesia, Saudi Arabia** and **Bahrain** requested the addition of their country names in footnote No. 5.A112. 1.4 It was so **agreed**.1.5 Document 456, including the text relating to No. 5.A112, and the texts in annex, as amended, was **approved**. | - |
| 57 | WRC-15 | 12th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/509](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0509/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/453 | 3.1 The **Chairman** **of the Editorial Committee** introduced Document 453, which reproduced a number of texts from Document 428 (thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading) relating to Article **11** and Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B**, for which approval had been deferred at the request of the delegate of Argentina, pending further consultations.3.2 The **delegate of Argentina**, speaking on behalf of CITEL, said that during informal consultations with representatives of other regions and other participants, consensus had been reached on the texts proposed in Document 453, subject to the inclusion of the following statement in the minutes of the plenary as a decision of the conference:“Before taking the decision to modify No. **11.49** of the Radio Regulations under issue A for agenda item 7, WRC-15 recognized the need to promote transparency without compromising the fair treatment of administrations. WRC-15 gave careful and special consideration to the concerns raised by some administrations regarding the possible uncertainty that could result from the adoption of a provision that may reduce the bringing back into use period based on the untimely submission of information to the Bureau for the suspension of recorded frequency assignments. WRC-15 therefore decided to instruct the Bureau, in its application of No. **11.49** as revised by WRC -15, to take into account any legitimate mitigating circumstances that could result in a notifying administration's inability to meet the six-month deadline. If the Bureau has reliable information that the use of a frequency assignment has been suspended, but it still is within the six-month period, the Bureau is encouraged, as a courtesy, to remind the notifying administration of its obligation to inform the Bureau of the suspension under No. **11.49**.”3.3 The **Director of BR** advised the plenary against accepting the text as proposed, since the wording effectively instructed the Bureau to take into account any legitimate mitigating circumstances that could result in non-compliance with the six-month deadline, thereby contradicting the very provisions of the Radio Regulations. Nevertheless, the proposal might be acceptable from a regulatory point of view if milder terms were used and a phrase was inserted to the effect that matters would be brought to the attention of the RRB. He therefore suggested replacing “instruct the Bureau” with “invite the RRB” and “take into account” with “consider” as a compromise which would maintain the original purpose of the text without weakening the provisions of the Radio Regulations.3.4 The **delegate of Argentina** agreed with the Director’s proposal, suggesting that the Bureau should take the plenary decision into account, consulting with the Board if problems arose in its application. The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, supporting the Director’s suggested wording as being in line with current practices of ITU-R, suggested that the RRB should consider publishing a rule of procedure on the matter, for comment by administrations. 3.5 The **Director of BR** said that the Bureau had always to apply the Radio Regulations, whereas any requests by administrations could be brought before the RRB. It would be difficult to develop a rule of procedure, since no rule could be designed which would fit every case. Each situation should therefore be treated on its own merits.3.6 It was **agreed** to include in the minutes the following amended text as a decision of the conference:“Before taking the decision to modify No. **11.49** of the Radio Regulations under issue A for agenda item 7, WRC-15 recognized the need to promote transparency without compromising the fair treatment of administrations. WRC-15 gave careful and special consideration to the concerns raised by some administrations regarding the possible uncertainty that could result from the adoption of a provision that may reduce the bringing back into use period based on the untimely submission of information to the Bureau for the suspension of recorded frequency assignments. WRC-15 therefore decided to invite the Radio Regulations Board, in its application of No. **11.49** as revised by WRC -15, to consider any legitimate mitigating circumstances that could result in a notifying administration's inability to meet the six-month deadline. If the Bureau has reliable information that the use of a frequency assignment has been suspended, but it still is within the six-month period, the Bureau is encouraged, as a courtesy, to remind the notifying administration of its obligation to inform the Bureau of the suspension under No. **11.49**.”3.7 The **delegate of Canada**,noting that the text still contained editorial inconsistencies,requested that it be further edited following the meeting.3.8 It was so **agreed**.**Article 11 (MOD 11.49, MOD 11.49.1); Appendix 30 (MOD 5.2.10, MOD 20*bis*); Appendix 30A (MOD 5.2.10, MOD 24*bis*); Appendix 30B (MOD 8.17, ADD 14*bis*)**3.9 Approved.3.10 With the text of the conference decision included in the minutes, the sixteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B16) (Document 453) was **approved**. | The Board apply these considerations when considering submissions under RR. No. **11.49.**RRB decided to include the following decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No. **11.49** at its 73rd meeting ([CR/412](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)). |
| 58 | WRC-15 | 13th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/510](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0510/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/468 | 7.13 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 468, which reported on the discussions regarding receivability of requests for coordination for the new FSS allocation in the band 13.4 - 13.65 GHz. Two opposing points of view had emerged in those discussions: one in favour of adopting a date at least six months following the conference, after which all coordination requests received by the Bureau for the frequency band in question would be accepted; and the other, in favour of maintaining the Bureau’s current practice of adopting a date preceding the entry into force of the Final Acts, as a decision had been taken by the Conference on the frequency band in question and that “qualified favourable” findings could be issued for coordination requests submitted for that band. As it had not been possible to bridge those viewpoints, and the compromise text had not been adopted, the speaker requested the Bureau to provide clarification on its practice in that area with a view to finding a solution to the question that was still pending.7.14 The **representative of BR** explained that if the Bureau received a coordination request for an allocation which had been the subject of a conference decision but was not yet in force, it applied §3.3 of the Rule of Procedure regarding No. **9.11A**. The Bureau then issued a “qualified favourable” finding (which became favourable at the date of coming into force of the allocation) if, at the date of receipt by the Bureau of the coordination request, the allocation concerned was not in force but would come into force before the planned date of bringing the assignment into use. Such a finding allowed coordination of assignments to the network concerned and to take that network into account when applying No. **9.27**.7.15 The **delegate off the Islamic Republic of Iran** observed that the practice referred to was not applicable to the allocation in question but to those under No. **9.11A**. While extending the application of “qualified favourable” conclusions to cover the band in question could be envisaged, he noted that such an option would not reconcile the two viewpoints.7.16 The **delegate of Norway** stressed that No. **9.11A** concerned coordination between systems using the geostationary orbit and non-geostationary satellite systems and did not concern the case under discussion. He wanted to know whether the Rule of Procedure in question was also applicable to advance publication and to coordination under provisions of the Radio Regulations other than No. **9.11A**.7.17 The **representative of BR**, replying, said that the Rule of Procedure in question did not apply to advance publication, which was not subject to regulatory examination, which was why information relating to an allocation subject to the advance publication procedure was published on the date on which it was received.7.18 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** shared the concerns of the delegate of Norway. According to the explanation that had been given, when the Bureau received advance publication information for a frequency band not allocated in the Table of Frequency Allocations, it applied §3.3 of the Rules of Procedure dealing with No. **9.11A**. That provision, however, when referred to in the Table, required coordination and was therefore not applicable to new bands. In order to ensure equitable access to those bands for all administrations, further study of the question was required.7.19 The **representative of BR** reiterated that the procedure under §3.3 of the Rule of Procedure dealing with No. **9.11A** was not applicable to advance publication, for which neither regulatory examination nor a qualified favourable finding were required.7.20 The **delegate off the Russian Federation** shared the point of view of the delegates of Norway and the United Kingdom regarding the possible application of §3.3 of the Rule of Procedure dealing with No. **9.11A**. Given the lack of time for a more in-depth study of the question, he suggested that the RRB should examine the application of those provisions of the Rule of Procedure to all coordination requests for satellite networks and terrestrial services, and that pending the conclusion of that examination, BR should not process coordination requests for those bands.7.21 The **delegate of France**, turning again to the previous proposal, was favourable to the RRB studying the situation but suggested that administrations willing and able to do so should submit their coordination requests to the Bureau in accordance with current regulations. Once the RRB studies were completed, BR would be instructed to publish those coordination requests, and the date of receipt of those requests would be determined in accordance with the RRB’s conclusions.7.22 The **delegate of Israel** recalled that applying the Rule of Procedure regarding No. **9.11A** had been established practice for 23 years, for all frequency allocations after every WRC. The proposal put forward by the Russian Federation, like the text proposed by the Chairman of Committee 5, only blocked filings and did nothing to ensure equitable access to spectrum for all administrations, unlike the legitimate established practice. She emphasized that the number of coordination requests (CR/C) was already limited by virtue of their nature as compared to advance publication information. She reminded participants that the discussion was not about the Plans but about unplanned bands to which the principle “first come, first served” had always applied, a principle which should not always benefit the same administrations. She had no objection to further examination of the question, but objected to conducting that examination during the final hours of the conference, given in particular that the subject had not been dealt with in the previous study period and no contribution had been submitted on the subject, which had been raised only in the previous two days. Lastly, she emphasized that the final document on agenda item 1.6.1 already approved by the plenary referred in footnote 5.A161 to 27 November 2015 as the date from which coordination requests could be submitted for newly allocated bands. For all the reasons referred to, she was opposed to the adoption of the proposed measures.7.23 The **delegate of Turkey** was also opposed to the proposal made by the Russian Federation.7.24 The **delegate of Egypt**, favouring the proposal of the Russian Federation, considered that the RRB alone was in a position to provide clarification. He considered that without an allocation, there could be no submission of a coordination request. Most administrations had not submitted advance publication information for the band in question before the Conference had taken a decision. If 27 November were the date adopted, all the administrations that had not submitted advance publication information would have to wait at least six months in order to do so. The speaker also noted that nothing prevented administrations from submitting coordination requests (CR/C), albeit subject to cost recovery, but the last to submit their requests could face difficulties in access to spectrum. He emphasized that the proposal of the Russian Federation was intended to clarify matters, without establishing priority or blocking, and he hoped for confirmation that application of the Rule of Procedure in question was current practice. He was resolutely opposed to allowing allocations in the band in question to be subject to coordination requests from 27 November 2015, and suggested that a transition period should be applied for those allocations in order to avoid any blockage for administrations that had not submitted advance publication information.7.25 The **Director of** **BR**, noting the diverging views which appeared to him to be irreconcilable during the present Conference, suggested referring the study of the question to the RRB, a body in which all the Regions were represented and which had the necessary expertise and time.7.26 The **delegate of Israel** wished to have confirmation that administrations were authorized to submit coordination requests immediately after the WRC and that the RRB would examine the question and submit its conclusions at a later date. She wondered what would become of the cost recovery fees paid on submission of the initial coordination request in the event of a different conclusion from the RRB.7.27 The **Chairman of RRB** said that the Board needed to take time to study the question before replying.7.28 The **Director of** **BR** explained that if RRB modified the date of receipt, the Bureau would have to review the situation but would not charge any additional fees. The process would have no impact on cost recovery.7.29 Replying to a request for clarification from the **delegate of Sweden** concerning the proposal that would be submitted to RRB, the **Director of BR** said that he understood the French proposal as the retroactive application of RRB decisions. The date of receipt would thus be modified retroactively in the light of RRB’s conclusions. He proposed to draft a text based on the French proposal for submission at the next plenary meeting.7.30 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** suggested, in order to avoid retroactive application of RRB decisions, that BR should no longer process filings for that band until RRB had formulated its conclusions.7.31 Replying to an observation by the **Chairman of Committee 5** concerning the application to the uplink of the decision taken, the **delegate of France** recalled that the decision to be adopted would not be applicable to the uplink because there was already an existing allocation for the FSS.7.32 It was **agreed**, in the light of all the comments that had been made, to refer to RRB for detailed study the question of the receivability of coordination requests for the new FSS allocation in the band 13.4 - 13.65 GHz before the date on which the allocation entered into force. | RRB approved the relevant rule of procedure on RR No.**9.11A** at its 72nd meeting ([CR/402](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0402/en)) |
| 59 | WRC-15 | 14th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/511](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0511/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/483  | 1.16 The **delegate of the United States** proposed that the square brackets be removed from around “in non-segregated airspaces” in the title of the resolution. She also proposed that the two identical footnotes in the resolution, currently in square brackets, should be replaced by “or consistent with international standards and practices approved by the responsible civil aviation authority”.1.17 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the footnote should not begin with “or”, but rather with “may also be used”.1.18 It was **agreed** that the square brackets in the title and footnotes should be removed, and that the wording of the footnotes should be replaced in line with the text proposed by the delegate of the United States as amended by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran.1.19 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** requested clarification regarding the meaning of “responsible civil aviation authority”.1.20 The **delegate of the United States** said that the “responsible civil aviation authority” referred to the national civil aviation authority in the country where the unmanned aircraft system was operating.1.21 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the footnote should not refer to national civil aviation authorities only as they could not be solely responsible for international standards. The document as a whole, and draft Resolution [COM4/5] in particular, was particularly complex, and several contentious issues had arisen during previous discussions on the text. The conference should not be rushed into any decisions; many aspects of the text required further careful consideration and should be taken up by the conference in 2023. With that in mind, he had drafted a statement for inclusion in the minutes of the meeting; on that condition he would approve the document. It was not a statement on behalf of the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran, but rather a general statement to reflect the widespread concerns expressed by numerous delegations about the complexity of the document as a whole, and draft Resolution [COM4/5] in particular. The statement was specifically supported by the Administrations of the Russian Federation, Belarus, Armenia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic and Indonesia. Subject to inclusion of the statement in the minutes of the plenary, draft Resolution [COM4/5] was agreed upon as the only option for further refinement. 1.22 The **Secretary of the Plenary** read out the following statement, as submitted by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran:“In considering Document 483 regarding agenda item 1.5, concerns were expressed regarding the complexity of the issue and the complexity of the text of the resolution describing both the case and the course of action envisaged for its implementation, and regarding the numerous operative parts of the document, the lack of clarity of certain parts of the resolution, and the difficulty of its application.In view of the above, the conference felt it appropriate to indicate that it is very difficult to authorize the use of the frequency band in question for the operation of UAS/CNPC, in particular the earth station in motion on board aircraft, before the study and course of actions called for in the resolution to address various aspects of operation are completed and agreed by WRC-23, since lack of prudence for such operation would adversely affect the safe operation of flight and be detrimental to the satellite services and terrestrial services of other administrations.”1.23 The **delegate of the United States** said that her delegation considered that the resolution adequately set out the requisite timeframes, checks and balances to ensure prudent and timely action. She could support the inclusion in the minutes of the statement, provided it was presented as a statement by the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran.1.24 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** reiterated that the statement was not a statement by his Administration, but rather a general statement reflecting the difficulties encountered by the conference with regard to a number of complex issues referred to in Resolution [COM4/5].1.25 The **delegate of Cuba** said that the statement made by the Islamic Republic of Iran did indeed reflect the work of the conference and provided useful clarification.1.26 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** agreed that there were issues of contention in the document, and said that his delegation wished to reserve its right to make a declaration in the final acts of the conference.1.27 The **Director of BR** suggested that any delegations could, by show of hands, indicate that they were in favour of the statement as proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, which could then be included in the minutes of the plenary as a statement by those administrations.1.28 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, supported by the **delegate of South Africa**, expressed grave concern that the procedure suggested by the Director of BR was tantamount to a vote, which was contrary to the spirit of the statement. 1.29 The **Chairman** said that the suggestion had been intended simply to facilitate the process of inclusion of the names of the administrations who wish to associate to the proposed statement. 1.30 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that any expressions of support for the statement could be submitted to the secretariat in writing.1.31 It was so **agreed**.2.1 The **Chairman** invited the meeting to approve on second reading the texts submitted by the Editorial Committee in Document 483, as just amended.2.2 The **delegate of India**, referring to ADD 5.idR3, requested more time for further consultations with Pakistan. The **delegate of Pakistan** said that the name of India should be removed completely from 5.idR3. The **Chairman** said that footnote 5.idR3 would remain pending.2.3 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that since his statement, which had been submitted in a spirit of compromise to facilitate proceedings and clarify the difficulties that had been encountered with regard to the issues arising in Resolution [COM4/5], had not been included in the minutes in the manner he had requested, he could not support ADD Resolution [COM4/5].2.4 With the exception of ADD 5.idR3 and ADD Resolution [COM4/5], the nineteenth series of texts (B19) (Document 483), as amended on first reading, was **approved** on second reading.22.31 Regarding Resolution COM4/5 (WRC-15), the **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** recalled that during the discussion of the resolution at the thirteenth plenary meeting, he had put forward a text to be included in the minutes of the plenary, failing which he would find it difficult to approve the text of the resolution. He therefore reiterated his suggestion to include the following text, not simply as a statement but as a proposed way forward:“In considering Document 483 regarding agenda Item 1.5, concerns were expressed regarding the complexity of the issue and the complexity of the text of the resolution describing both the case and the course of action envisaged for its implementation, and regarding the numerous operative parts of the document, the lack of clarity of certain parts of the resolution, and the difficulty of its application. In view of the above, the conference felt it appropriate to indicate that it is very difficult to authorize the use of the frequency band in question for the operation of UAS/CNPC, in particular the earth station in motion on board aircraft, before the study and course of actions called for in the resolution to address various aspects of operation are completed and agreed by WRC-23, since lack of prudence for such operation would adversely affect the safe operation of flight and be detrimental to the satellite services and terrestrial services of other administrations.”22.32 The **Chairman** confirmed that the statement would be included in the minutes. He took it that, on the understanding that table 1 300-1 525 MHz and ADD 5.R1a would be amended as proposed, the plenary could approve the texts in Document 501 on second reading, with the exception of footnote 5.R1b.22.33 It was so **agreed**. |  |
| 60 | WRC-15 | 14th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/511](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0511/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/499 | 16.19 The **Chairman** invited delegates to continue their consideration of Resolutions PLEN/1 (WRC-15) and PLEN/2 (WRC-15), as set out in Document 499.16.20 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, reporting on the outcome of the informal consultations conducted with regard to the list of countries in Resolutions PLEN/1 (WRC15) and PLEN/2 (WRC-15), said that a solution to the concerns expressed had been agreed, namely that, on receipt of the relevant notification from the concerned administration, the Radiocommunication Bureau would follow its usual practice of ascertaining, in accordance with No. 11.31, whether the conditions provided for in the applicable footnotes were met. In the event that the Bureau’s findings were unfavourable, any assignment received under No. 11.31 would be returned to the notifying administration. If, however, the notifying administration was able to satisfy its neighbours that its operations would not cause interference in their territory, an exception to the limits specified in those footnotes could be explicitly agreed. On that understanding, the proposal was that the list of countries appearing in the two resolutions could be retained in their current form. As to the positioning of earth stations in the territory of third countries, it was not permitted under Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97).16.21 The **Director of BR** confirmed that the Radiocommunication Bureau would indeed follow the described procedure in such cases.16.26 It was so **agreed**. | - |
| 61 | WRC-15 | 14th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/511](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0511/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/501 | 22.36 Following the suspension of the meeting, an initial proposal by the **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** re-iterating his previous proposal and a further brief suspension, the **delegate of Sweden** said that, following informal consultations with a number of delegates, a way forward had been found, as follows: first, the Director of BR would be requested to explain how ADD 5.R1b would be applied by the Bureau with the words “in the above countries” deleted from it, and then a proposal would be made for the plenary to delete those words from the footnote on the understanding that the Director’s explanation would be recorded in the minutes of the plenary.22.37 The **Director of BR** provided the following explanation: “Without the words “in the above countries”, ADD 5.R1b concerns a number of administrations, and how these administrations may implement IMT in the 1 452-1 492 MHz band by applying No. **9.21** of the Radio Regulations in respect of the mobile service used by aeronautical telemetry in accordance with No. **5.342**. Thus, ADD 5.R1b deals with the relationship between the countries listed in it and the countries listed in No. **5.342**.” 22.38 With that explanation, the **Chairman** invited the plenary to approve ADD 5.R1b on the understanding that the names of the countries listed in Documents 25(Add.1) (Add.4), 28 and 130 would be included in it and that the words “in the above countries” would be deleted from it.22.39 ADD 5.R1b, as amended, was **approved** on second reading. | RRB approved the relevant rule of procedure on RR No.**5.346** at its 73rd meeting ([CR/412](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0412/en)). |
| 62 | WRC-15 | 14th Plenary [Doc. CMR15/511](https://www.itu.int/md/R15-WRC15-C-0511/en)Approval of Doc. CMR15/502 | 23.1 The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee** introduced Document 502, which dealt with correcting typographical and other apparent errors in the various language versions of the 2012 edition of the Radio Regulations. The agreement of the conference was sought to authorize the Director of BR to proceed with the inclusion of the corrections in the subsequent edition of the Regulations.23.2 The **Chairman** took it that the conference agreed to that course of action.23.3 It was so **agreed**. | - |
| 63 | WRC-19 | 4th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/237](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0237/en)Approval of Doc. [CMR19/201](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0201/en) | 2.1 Introducing Document 201, the **Chairman of Committee 4**said that the committee had considered § 3.4.1 of Addendum 2 to the Report of the Director to WRC‑19 (Document 4) (“Proposed use of terrain data for examination of terrestrial notices, establishment of coordination requirements and compatibility calculations of terrestrial stations”). It proposed that the following text, which was set out in the annex to Document 201, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“It was noted the information provided in § 3.4.1 of Addendum 2 to the Report of the Director (Doc. CMR19/4) to WRC-19 that all examinations of frequency assignments to terrestrial services and the identification of potentially affected administrations currently performed by the Bureau in the application of various RR and Regional Agreement procedures are made using propagation prediction models without terrain height profiles.It was recognized that the use of terrain height data for the identification of potentially affected administrations could be beneficial to administrations and such an approach would shorten the list of coordination requirements and reduce the coordination burden both for administrations and the Bureau.Given the above considerations, it was proposed to instruct the Bureau to simulate the examination of RR No. **9.21** notices in the non-planned bands using digital elevation models (DEM) and report the results to the Radio Regulations Board. The Board could subsequently decide, through the relevant Rules of Procedure, that the Bureau should use terrain height data in the RR No. **9.21** examinations, and to report on the results to the next WRC.Bearing in mind that the currently available Shuttle Radar Topography Mission dataset with a resolution of one arc second in longitude and latitude (SRTM1) does not extend north of 60 degrees North and south of 56 degrees South, the Bureau could be further instructed to continue the examination of terrestrial stations located outside this geographical extent without the use of terrain height information and to explore the possibilities to utilize alternative digital elevation models with a larger geographical extent.”2.2 It was so **agreed**.2.3 Document 201 was **approved**. | - |
| 64 | WRC-19 | 4th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/237](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0237/en)Approval of Doc. [CMR19/189](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0189/en) | 5.1 The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee** introduced Document 189.5.2 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 189.**Article 9 (MOD 9.36, MOD 9.36.1, MOD 9.52C and MOD 9.53A)**5.3 Approved.5.4 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that deadlines were an important and sensitive issue for developing countries, which often lacked the resources to respond within four months. Given that failure to respond was taken as tacit agreement, administrations that missed the deadline also missed the opportunity to claim protection. That had a direct impact on their rights. As a precautionary measure, it would be prudent to include the following text in the minutes of the meeting as an instruction to the Bureau:“Before the expiry of the deadline referred to in this document, the Radiocommunication Bureau shall send a message to the administrations concerned drawing their attention to the need to reply within the deadline as contained in the document.” He further recommended that copies of the message be sent to administrations and to diplomatic missions in Geneva, so that appropriate action might be taken. In response to a comment by the **Chairman of Committee 5**, he said that the requirement to send such reminders existed already in Appendices 30, 30A and 30B to the Radio Regulations and employed similar wording. 5.5 The **delegates of** **South Africa** and **Nepal** endorsed the proposal.5.6 The **Chairman** noted that there was no objection to the proposed text, which would therefore be included in the minutes of the Plenary as an instruction to the Bureau.5.7 It was so **agreed**.5.8 The second series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B2) (Document 189) was **approved**. | RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR No.**9.52C** at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 65 | WRC-19 | 6th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/469](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0469/en)Approval of Document [CMR19/228](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0228/en) | 2.4 The **Chairman of Committee 4** introduced Document 228, containing the seventh report of Committee 4 to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding Agenda item 9.2 and the notification of IMT stations. It was proposed that the following text, set out in Document 228, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:“WRC-19 instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau to apply the following principles when processing notifications of frequency assignments to ‘IMT’ stations:a) Assignments to base stations in frequency bands identified for IMT in the country submitting the notice can be notified with the nature of service ‘IM’\*. b) Assignments to base stations in frequency bands allocated to the mobile service, but not identified for IMT in the country submitting the notice, can be notified with the nature of service other than ‘IM’. If in this case assignments to base stations are notified with the nature of service ‘IM’, the notice shall be returned to the notifying administration.\*The symbol ‘IM’ designates IMT stations in the mobile service, as explained in Circular Letter CR/391 of 26.02.2016.”2.5 The **delegate of the** **Islamic Republic of Iran** requested clarification regarding the meaning and intention of subparagraph b) of the proposed text, which in his view was unclear and should be sent back to Committee 4 for redrafting.2.6 The **delegate of the** **Russian Federation** said that the wording of the text was clear. Furthermore, it represented a delicate compromise achieved after lengthy discussions. Introducing changes at such a late stage would result in further prolonged debate.2.7 The **delegates of Denmark, France**, **the** **United Arab Emirates** and **Nigeria** agreed with the delegate of the Russian Federation; the text was clear and should be approved.2.8 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** proposed various amendments intended to clarify the meaning of the text.2.9 The **Director of BR** provided the following clarification: the objective of the text dealing with the treatment by the Radiocommunication Bureau of the notification of “IMT” stations was that administrations could notify assignments as “IM” only in the case of base stations in frequency bands that had been identified for IMT in the country. Otherwise, the assignments could only be notified as “other than IM”.2.10 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** endorsed that clarification, which should be incorporated into part b) of the text.2.11 The **Chairman** proposed that the text presented in Document 228 be approved for inclusion in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference, on the understanding that the clarification provided by the Director of BR would also appear in the minutes of the meeting.2.12 It was so **agreed**.2.13 Document 228 was **approved**. | - |
| 66 | WRC-19 | 6th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/469](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0469/en)Approval of Document [CMR19/232](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0232/en) | 2.14 The **Chairman of Committee 4** introduced Document 232, containing the eighth report of Committee 4 to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding Agenda item 9.2 and the application of RR No. **9.19** to terrestrial services. It was proposed that the following text, contained in Document 232, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“1 Based on the information provided in § 3.1.3.5 of Addendum 2 to the Report of the Director it was noted that the Bureau identifies the coordination requirements for the assignments to terrestrial services vis-à-vis typical earth stations of the broadcasting-satellite service under RR No. **9.19** in eight frequency bands, namely 620-790 MHz, 1 452-1 492 MHz, 2 310-2 360 MHz, 2 520-2 670 MHz, 11.7 - 12.75 GHz, 17.7-17.8 GHz, 40.5-42.5 GHz and 74-76 GHz. 2 It was further noted that currently the coordination triggers are available only for the band 11.7-12.7 GHz, as contained in Annex 3 of RR Appendix **30**. For all other bands the Bureau uses the Rules of Procedure on RR No. **9.19** establishing the criteria for coordination as a frequency overlap and the coordination distance of 1 200 km with respect to the territories on which typical BSS earth stations are located. It was recognized that 1 200 km would be a very conservative coordination distance that might overestimate real needs for coordination and result in a considerable coordination burden for the administrations.3 The relevant ITU-R Study Groups are invited to develop more specific criteria for establishing coordination requirements under RR No. **9.19** in the bands 620-790 MHz, 1 452-1 492 MHz, 2  310 – 2  360 MHz, 2 520-2 670 MHz, 17.7-17.8 GHz, 40.5 - 42.5  GHz and 74 - 76 GHz.4 In addition, the Bureau is invited, when the coordination triggers are available, to simulate the examination of RR No. **9.19** notices in the non-planned bands using digital elevation models (DEM) and report the results to the Radio Regulations Board for further actions.”2.15 It was so **agreed.**2.16 Document 232 was **approved**. | RRB approved the modification to the rule of procedure on RR No.**9.19** at its 84th meeting ([CR/465](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0465/en)). |
| 67 | WRC-19 | 6th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/469](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0469/en)Approval of Doc. [CMR19/293](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0293/en) | 2.20 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 293, containing the first report of Committee 5 to the Plenary and reflecting the committee’s conclusions regarding Agenda item 1.2. It was proposed that the following text contained in the document be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“Noting the exceptional circumstances encountered by the Administration of Slovenia in bringing into use the NEMO-HD satellite network, WRC-19 decided to exclude the assignments of this satellite network, which are recorded in the Master Register (see Part II-S contained in BR IFIC 2832), from the application of e.i.r.p. limits in the frequency band 401-403 MHz contained in RR No. **5.C12** until 22 November 2029 and instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau to act accordingly.”2.21 It was so **agreed**.2.22 Document 293 was **approved**. | - |
| 68 | WRC-19 | 6th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/469](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0469/en)Approval of Doc. [CMR19/289](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0289/en) | 2.23 The **Chairman of Committee 6** introduced Document 289, containing the second report of Committee 6 to the Plenary and reflecting the committee’s conclusions regarding Agenda item 4 and the application of Resolution **95 (Rev.WRC-07)**. The committee had agreed to suppress Resolution **556** **(WRC-15)**. For the sake of clarity, it was proposed that the following text, contained in Document 289, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference: “As a result of the suppression of Resolution **556 (WRC-15)**, the Bureau is instructed to continue to apply the current calculation method in regard to analogue assignment in the Region 2 Plan.” 2.24 It was so **agreed**. 2.25 The **Chairman** noted that the suppression of Resolution **556 (WRC-15)** would be considered at a subsequent plenary meeting.2.26 Document 289 was **approved** on that understanding. | - |
| 69 | WRC-19 | 7th PlenaryDoc. [CMR19/568](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0568/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/303](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0303/en) | 4.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 303, the committee’s second report to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding agenda item 1.4 and the application of revised Annex 7 to Appendix **30** and associated resolutions. It was proposed that the following text, set out in Document 303 but amended to reflect the output numbers of certain resolutions it contained, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Instructions to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of** **revised Annex 7 to RR Appendix 30 and associated Resolutions****1** **Application of the revised orbital limitations applicable to broadcasting satellites serving an area in Region 1 and using a frequency in the band 11.7-12.2 GHz** When, under Article 4 of RR Appendix **30**, an administration of Regions 1 and 3 submits to the Bureau a new satellite network with frequency assignments in the band 11.7‑12.2 GHz, serving an area in Region 1 from the West and occupying a nominal orbital position further west than 37.2° W, the frequency assignments of this satellite network shall be deemed receivable only if a portion of land located in the western part of Region 1 as determined by the relevant software application of the Radiocommunication Bureau (excluding any territory with special status (e.g. Antarctica)) is visible from the nominal orbital position of that satellite network (i.e. the elevation angle is greater than 5 degrees). Otherwise the Bureau shall return those assignments to the notifying administration.**2** **Application of the revised orbital limitations applicable to broadcasting satellites serving an area in Region 2 and using a frequency in the band 12.2-12.7 GHz**When, under Article 4 of RR Appendix **30**, an administration of Region 2 submits to the Bureau a new satellite network with frequency assignments in the band 12.2-12.5 GHz (resp. 12.5-12.7 GHz), serving an area in Region 2 from the East and occupying a nominal orbital position further east than 44° W (resp. 54° W), the frequency assignments of this satellite network shall be deemed receivable only if a portion of land located in the eastern part of Region 2 as determined by the relevant software application of the Radiocommunication Bureau (excluding any territory with special status (e.g. Antarctica)) is visible from the nominal orbital position of that satellite network (i.e. the elevation angle is greater than 5 degrees). Otherwise the Bureau shall return those assignments to the notifying administration.**3** **Application of Resolution COM5/2 (WRC‑19)***Resolves* 2 of Resolution **COM5/2 (WRC-19)** indicates that identification of frequency assignments of certain networks associated to 40-cm and 45-cm earth station antenna diameters are based only on EPM and a minimum orbital spacing less than 9 degrees. This *resolves* only applies in the frequency band 11.7-12.2 GHz. The HISPASAT-37A satellite network included in Annex 1 of this Resolution contains frequency assignments, which partially overlap with the frequency band 11.7-12.2 GHz. For the protection of such assignments from non-planned satellite networks, the criteria contained in Resolution **COM5/4 (WRC-19)** shall be applied however, for the protection of these assignments from new submissions under Article 4 that are subject to Resolution **COM5/2 (WRC-19)**, the criteria contained in *resolves* 2 of this Resolution shall be used.**4** **Application of new Resolution COM5/3 (WRC‑19)*****a)*** ***Resolves* 2 on the date of receipt of submissions**Submissions referred to in *resolves* 2 shall have a common date of receipt of 21 May 2020. The formal date of receipt and the date of protection shall be 21 May 2020 if the submissions are complete. If the submissions are incomplete and a reply to the Bureau’s telefax seeking for missing information is received on or before 21 May 2020, the formal date of receipt and the date of protection shall be 21 May 2020. If the reply to the Bureau’s telefax is received after 21 May 2020, the date of protection shall be the same as the formal date of receipt established in accordance with the Rule of Procedure on the receivability of the notice. The established date of protection shall be used for the Bureau’s examination under relevant provisions of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**. For submissions with the same formal date of receipt, the Bureau shall mutually take them into account in its technical and regulatory examination.***b)*** ***Resolves* 3 on the date of receipt of submissions**Submissions referred to in *resolves* 3 (i.e. submissions under § 4.1.3 of RR Appendix **30** in the frequency bands 11.7-12.5 GHz and feeder-links assignments in the frequency bands 14.5-14.8 GHz and 17.3-18.1 GHz of RR Appendix **30A**) at an orbital position of orbital arcs for which the limitations of Annex 7 to RR Appendix **30 (Rev.WRC‑15)** were suppressed by WRC‑19 and not meeting the specified requirements in § 1 of the Attachment to that Resolution, shall have a common date of receipt of 22 May 2020. For those submissions, the date of protection shall be the same as the formal date of receipt established in accordance with the Rule of Procedure on the receivability of the notice. The established date of protection shall be used for the Bureau’s examination under relevant provisions of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**. For submissions with the same formal date of receipt, the Bureau shall mutually take them into account in its technical and regulatory examination.***c)*** ***Submissions under § 4.1.12 of RR Appendix 30/30A of the satellite networks applying that Resolution***During the frequency coordination, the notifying Administration may change the beam from elliptical to shaped. Therefore, the Bureau shall accept submissions of satellite networks applying that Resolution and containing a shaped beam under § 4.1.12 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**, if the characteristics of the submission under § 4.1.12 are within the envelope of the characteristics of submission under § 4.1.3.**5** **Calculation of the minimum geocentric orbital separation referred to in *resolves* 1 and 2 of Resolution COM5/4 (WRC‑19)**When calculating the minimum geocentric orbital separation between the wanted and interfering space stations, the Bureau shall take into account the East-West station-keeping accuracies of the FSS and BSS space stations so that the two space stations are the closest.**6** **In relation with the specific case of the Administration of South Sudan, which currently does not have any frequency assignments in the Plans of RR Appendices 30** and **30A**, WRC-19 decided that the Administration of South Sudan may apply Resolution **COM5/3 (WRC‑19)** and instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau to accept such submission from the administration of South Sudan.”4.2 It was so **agreed.**4.3 Document 303 was **approved**.4.4 The **delegate of South Sudan** thanked the Plenary for approving Document 303. He expressed gratitude and appreciation to ITU, particularly the Radiocommunication Bureau, and to all administrations and entities that had helped his country make such significant progress since WRC-12. | RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Appendix **30**, Annex 7 at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 70 | WRC-19 | 7th PlenaryDoc. [CMR19/568](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0568/en)Approval of Doc. [CMR19/338](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0338/en) | 4.5 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 338, the committee’s third report to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding agenda item 9.2. It was proposed that the following text, set out in Document 338, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“**Space research allocation in 14.5-14.8 GHz**Having discussed Section 3.1.2.4 of Document [4 (Add.2)](https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-r/md/16/wrc19/c/R16-WRC19-C-0004%21A2%21MSW-E.docx), Committee 5 concluded that the Conference should instruct the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to monitor the use of the space research allocation in the frequency band 14.5-14.8 GHz, and should invite ITU-R to study the evolution of the technical parameters of systems in the space research service and the associated sharing environment of the same frequency band.”4.6 It was so **agreed.**4.7 Document 338 was **approved.** | - |
| 71 | WRC-19 | 7th PlenaryDoc. [CMR19/568](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0568/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/238](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0238/en) | 13.1 The **delegate of Egypt** introduced Document 238, which contained a request relating to the Egyptian satellite Nilesat 301, which was to be located at orbital position 7°W before 19 March 2022, the deadline for bringing into use the frequency assignments of filing EGY-N-SAT. Although confident that it would be able to meet that deadline, the Egyptian Administration was concerned that any unexpected mishaps leading to delays beyond its control could affect the timely launch of the satellite. It therefore requested the conference to grant a six-month extension of the time-limit to 19 September 2022.(…)13.6 The **Chairman** took it that the conference wished to approve the request of the Egyptian Administration.13.7 It was so **agreed.** | - |
| 72 | WRC-19 | 8th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/569](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0569/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/344](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0344/en) | 3.4 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 344, the committee’s sixth report to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding agenda item 9.1. It was proposed that the following text, set out in Document 344, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“WRC-19 received Document 92(Add.21) addressing concerns with ongoing uplink interference being experienced by two GSO MSS satellite networks in the frequency band 2 670-2 690 MHz. This issue was also included in Part 1 of the Director’s Report (Document 4(Add.1), Annex 2, § 2.3.2) and was discussed during the Radiocommunications Assembly 2019 (RA-19). The result of the discussion at RA-19 was an acknowledgement of the concern raised regarding the difficulties being currently faced with continuing incompatibility between MSS and MS, and an invitation to WRC-19, to take necessary actions it deems appropriate, with a view to accelerate the satisfactory resolution of the problem.WRC-19 acknowledged the urgency of the issue, given the ongoing interference being experienced. It also considered possible revisions to Resolution **225 (Rev.WRC-12)** intended to draw particular attention to this issue. While the proposed revision was not agreed, WRC-19 agreed to invite the ITU-R to focus efforts on accelerating the sharing studies such that the development of appropriate ITU‑R Recommendation(s) and/or Reports providing technical and operational measures for the coexistence of the mobile-satellite service and terrestrial component of IMT in the frequency band 2 655 - 2 690 MHz are completed during the next study cycle, i.e. by 2023.”3.5 It was so **agreed**. 3.6 Document 344 was **approved.**3.7 The **delegate of India** extended his administration’s gratitude to the conference for its consideration of the issue. Harmful interference from terrestrial IMT systems outside India was severely affecting the mobile-satellite services crucial to the country’s development, in particular in remote and rural areas. He was grateful to Committee 5 and its working and sub-working groups for having considered India’s proposal and looked forward to the WRC taking action to resolve the issue. He invited ITU-R to accelerate and complete the relevant studies in the next cycle. India would participate actively in that regard and called on other Member States to do the same. | - |
| 73 | WRC-19 | 8th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/569](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0569/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/347](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0347/en)  | 3.8 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 347, the committee’s seventh report to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding agenda item 9.3, on action in response to Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07). It was proposed that the following text, set out in Document 347, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“In accordance with WRC-19 agenda item 9.3, the Conference received Document 15 from the Radio Regulations Board entitled *Report by the Radio Regulations Board on Resolution* ***80 (Rev.WRC-07)****.* This report summarized RRB activity in relation to Resolution **80** **(Rev.WRC-07)**, “*Due Diligence in Applying the Principles Embodied in the Constitution*.” In the Report to WRC‑19, the Board provided an update to the report to WRC-15 focusing on its efforts to address issues the Board and the Radiocommunications Bureau have faced since WRC-15 affecting fulfilment of the principles contained in Article 44 of the ITU Constitution (CS) and No. **0.3** of the Preamble to the Radio Regulations.The Board report says, in part, the following: “*the Board considered concerns raised by some administrations regarding the appropriateness of other administrations’ application of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution. The alleged cases of non-compliance with CS Article 48 that were presented to the Board were summarized as follows:**– Administrations invoking CS Article 48 after the Bureau has launched an investigation under RR No.* ***13.6*** *as a means to prevent its application and retain rights in the Master International Frequency Register.**– Administrations invoking CS Article 48 for frequency assignments that are not used for military purposes*.”In response to the content of this Board Report, the Conference received several contributions from administrations that included various actions to be considered by the Conference to address the concerns raised by administrations, however it was understood that none of these various actions could be implemented without specific instruction from a Plenipotentiary Conference to a WRC to do so.Taking into account the report of the Board on Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**, and the contributions and comments at WRC-19 associated with that Report, the WRC-19, in accordance with Article 21 of the ITU Convention, invites the 2022 Plenipotentiary Conference to consider the question of invocation of CS Article 48 in relation to the Radio Regulations raised at WRC-19 and take necessary actions, as appropriate.In addition to this result, WRC-19 instructed the Bureau to continue their current practice of responding to specific requests from administrations related to the status of individual satellite networks, including an indication of whether CS Article 48 has been invoked for a satellite network.”3.9 It was so **agreed**.3.10 Document 347 was **approved**. | - |
| 74 | WRC-19 | 8th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/569](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0569/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/451](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0451/en)  | 3.11 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 451, the committee’s eighth report to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding agenda item 9.2, on any difficulties or inconsistencies encountered in the application of the Radio Regulations. It was proposed that a text, set out in Document 451, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference.3.12 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** endorsed the text but proposed that the following sentence be added to the paragraph starting “In considering section 3.2.5.6 …”: “WRC-19 also decided that test-points at sea shall not be taken into account by the Radiocommunication Bureau in its technical and regulatory examination of the relevant submissions received by the Bureau.” 3.13 The **Director of BR** said that, as that proposal reflected the Bureau’s current practice, he saw no objection to its inclusion.3.14 The following text was thus **approved** for inclusion in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“In accordance with WRC-19 agenda item 9.2, the Conference received Addendum 2 to Document 4 from the Director, Radiocommunication Bureau entitled ‘Report of the Director on the activities of the radiocommunication sector, Part 2.’ This report summarized the experience in the application of the radio regulatory procedures and other related matters. Document [351](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0351/en) compiled the results achieved by WRC-19 in considering the Report of the Director.In considering section 3.1.2.1 on ‘Coordination requirement under RR No. **9.7** for an inter-satellite link of a geostationary space station communicating with non-geostationary space station, as referred to in RR No. **5.328B**’, in order to fulfil the requirements of RR No. **5.328B** and of § 6.4 of the Rule of Procedure relating to RR No. **11.32**, WRC-19 instructs the Bureau to establish coordination requirements for such link of a GSO station based on frequency overlap similar to that of a non-GSO station until such time as some other criteria or method is established.In considering section 3.1.3.4 on ‘Draft CR/D database made available in BR IFIC before publication of CR/D in accordance with RR No. **9.53A’**, WRC-19 instructs the Bureau to cease its current practice of creating a draft CR/D.In considering section 3.1.4.2 on ‘Coordination status of a satellite network during examination under RR Nos. **11.32** and **11.32A**’, WRC-19 supports the Bureau’s development of the software tools described in this section of the Director’s Report and confirms that the tools described will meet the needs of administrations in communicating coordination status in relation to an affected administration.WRC-19 instructs the Bureau, when carrying out examination under RR No. **11.32A** to also take into account coordination agreement status with satellite networks of affected administrations at notice level when such information is provided, so that the notifying administration may benefit from the coordination agreements already obtained.WRC-19 decided to modify relevant parts of RR Appendix **4** in order to enable such examination.In considering section 3.1.4.3 on ‘Possible revision to the implementation of RR No. **11.47** with respect to provisional recordings’, WRC-19 decided upon the second option of two options raised in this section were preferred to address the issue as follows:The Bureau is instructed to automatically extend the foreseen dates of bringing into use in the database to the end of the regulatory period established under RR No. **11.44** if no confirmation has been received by the Bureau within four months from the foreseen date of bringing into use: no publication will be issued for this revision of the date of bringing into use, but this information will be visible on the BR website. This option does not require any change in the current Radio Regulations.In considering section 3.1.7.1 on ‘Power flux-density (pfd) limits in RR Article **21** applicable to the mobile-satellite service in the frequency band 40-40.5 GHz’, WRC-19 decided to reinstate the missing mention to mobile-satellite service in the frequency band 40 - 40.5 GHz in RR Table **21-4** and to have this change to Table **21-4** come into force as of 23 November 2019. In addition, WRC‑19 decided to instruct the Bureau not to review the MSS frequency assignments already published at the time this reinstatement comes into force.In considering section 3.1.7.2 on ‘Scaling factor in the definition of RR Article **21** pfd limits applicable to non-GSO satellite systems in the fixed-satellite service in the frequency band 17.7‑19.3 GHz’, WRC-19 invites ITU-R to study the appropriateness of the equations contained in RR No. **21.16.6** for large non-GSO satellite systems (e.g. such as those having more than 1 000 satellites). The results of the studies can be considered by WRC-23 under standing agenda item 7 if an Issue under this agenda item has been included in the CPM-23 report. WRC‑19 also instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau to issue qualified favorable findings under RR Nos. **9.35**/**11.31** when examining compliance of frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems with RR Article **21** pfd limits applicable in the frequency band 17.7-19.3 GHz if the notifying administration requests it to do so. Such practice shall apply to non-GSO FSS satellite systems for which coordination requests have been received from 23 November 2019 until the last day of WRC-23.In considering section 3.2.5.6 on ‘Grid points at sea in the examination using the methods of Annex 4 of RR Appendix **30B**’, WRC-19 decided that only grid points that are located on land and inside the service area should be considered in addition to test-points in application of paragraph 2.2 of Annex 4 to Appendix **30B**. In taking this decision WRC-19 acknowledged that, should the use of Appendix **30B** expand beyond its current use, it may be necessary to reconsider this decision in the future. WRC-19 also decided that test-points at sea shall not be taken into account by the Radiocommunication Bureau in its technical and regulatory examination of the relevant submissions received by the Bureau. In considering section 3.3.1 on ‘Resolution **49 (Rev.WRC-15)**’, WRC-19 decided to invite ITU-R to study the issue of requiring updates to the Resolution **49 (Rev.WRC-15)** data on an ongoing basis and streamlining the submission of Resolution **49 (Rev.WRC-15)** data.In considering section 3.4.2 on ‘Typical earth stations in the fixed-satellite service’, WRC-19 instructs the Bureau to terminate the collection of information on typical earth stations in the fixed-satellite service.In considering section 3.4.3 on ‘Excessive parameters’, WRC-19 invites the ITU-R to review the parameters discussed in this section of the Report in the next study cycle and to provide any necessary guidance to the Bureau.”3.15 Document 451, as amended, was **approved**. | RRB decided to include the decision as notes to the relevant rules of procedure on RR Nos. **9.11A**, **11.31** and **11.47**, and Appendix **30B**, Annex 4 at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 75 | WRC-19 | 8th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/569](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0569/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/452](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0452/en)  | 3.16 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 452, the committee’s eighth report to the Plenary, which also related to its conclusions regarding agenda item 9.3. It was proposed that the following text, set out in Document 452, be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“In accordance with WRC-19 agenda item 9.3, the Conference received Document 15 from the Radio Regulations Board entitled *Report by the Radio Regulations Board on Resolution* ***80 (Rev.WRC-07)****.* This report summarized RRB activity in relation to Resolution **80** **(Rev.WRC-07)**.In considering section 4.2 of this report on ‘Linkage between bringing into use and notification for recording in the MIFR’, WRC-19 decided that, in cases where:*a)* the information related to the bringing into use of frequency assignments in RR Appendices **30**, **30A** or **30B** is submitted prior to the end of examination of Part B and notification submissions of these frequency assignments;*b)* the requirements of RR Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B** have been met for these frequency assignments prior to the end of examination of their Part B and notification submissions;*c)* after the fulfilment of the requirements of RR No. **11.44B**, the satellite has been relocated to another orbital location prior to the end of examination of the notification submission of these assignments;*d)* the examination of the Part B submission of these assignments leads to the notice being returned to the notifying administration because of an inadvertent error of the notifying administration;*e)* the notifying administration informs the Bureau that it is unable to fulfil the requirements of RR Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B** at the time of resubmitting the Part B and notification information;the Radio Regulations Board is instructed to consider, on a case-by-case basis, whether the fulfilment of the requirements of RR Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B** prior to the end of examination of their Part B and notification submissions can be accepted as the bringing into use of the frequency assignments.In considering section 4.3 of this report on ‘Issues related to the extension of time-limits for bringing into use or bringing back into use a frequency assignment’:On section 4.3.4 Situations of co-passenger delay’, WRC-19 decided that the Board shall consider the provision of the following information as required when dealing with a request for extension of regulatory deadlines due to co-passenger delay:– a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency bands;– the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date;– the status of the satellite construction, including the date it began and whether it was expected to be completed prior to the initial launch window;– the name of the launch service provider and the contract signature date;– the initial and revised launch window;– sufficient detail to justify that the request for extension is due to co-passenger delay (e.g. a letter from the launch service provider indicating that the launch is delayed because of a delay affecting the co-passenger satellite);– sufficient detail to justify the length of the requested extension period; and– any other relevant information and documentation.On section 4.3.5 ‘Compliance with the regulatory time limits for space stations using electric propulsion’, WRC-19 decided to invite the ITU-R to study whether the use of electric propulsion satellite technology should be taken into account in the Radio Regulations for consideration at a future competent WRC.When considering requests that qualify as *force majeure* or co-passenger delay, WRC-19 instructs the RRB to continue to take into account the use of electric propulsion on a case-by-case basis when deciding on the length of the extension, based on the merits of each individual case.On section 4.3.6 ‘Requests from developing countries that do not qualify as *force majeure* or co‑passenger delay’, WRC-19 invites the ITU-R to study the matter of requests for extensions of regulatory time limits from developing countries that do not qualify as *force majeure* or co‑passenger delay and to develop the specific criteria and conditions upon which the RRB could consider granting an extension of the regulatory deadline to a developing country.In considering section 4.4 of this report on ‘Requests for a transfer or change of the “notifying administration” from one to the other’, WRC-19 confirmed the approach so far used by the Board for treating cases of the change of notifying administration acting on behalf of an intergovernmental satellite organization for a satellite network of that intergovernmental organization, to an administration which is a member of that organization acting on its own behalf. WRC-19 further decided that a letter from an appropriate responsible authority of this intergovernmental satellite organization is required to confirm their agreement with the change of notifying administration. In addition, WRC-19 decided that the Board shall deny a request to change:– the notifying administration acting on behalf of an intergovernmental satellite organization for a satellite network of that intergovernmental organization, to an administration that is not a member of that organization;– the notifying administration, acting on its own behalf, of a satellite network or system to another notifying administration acting on its own behalf; or – the notifying administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations which is not an intergovernmental satellite organization to another administration of that group.In considering section 4.5 of this report on ‘Interpretation of the definition of “satellite network” in RR No. **1.112** and RoP No. **1.112**’, WRC-19 decided that the issue raised in this section of the report was addressed directly under WRC-19 agenda item 7 Issue H.”3.17 It was so **agreed**.3.18 Document 452 was **approved**. | RRB approved the modification to the rule of procedure on rules related to satellite systems submitted by an administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations relevant to RR Nos. **9.1.1**, **9.6.1**, **11.15.1**, Appendix **4** Annex 2 items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3, Appendix **30** (4.1.3, 4.1.25, 4.2.6, 5.1.1), Appendix **30A** (4.1.3, 4.1.25, 4.2.6,5.1.2), Appendix **30B** (2.6, 6.1), at its 84th meeting ([CR/465](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0465/en)). |
| 76 | WRC-19 | 8th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/569](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0569/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/471](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0471/en) | 3.19 The **Chairman of Committee 6** introduced Document 471, the committee’s fourth report to the Plenary, relating to the committee’s conclusions regarding agenda item 4 and Resolutions **85 (WRC-03)** and **750 (Rev.WRC-15)**. Having considered the relevant proposals and consulted with Working Group 5B, Committee 6 had agreed to retain Resolution 85 (WRC-03) with no change. It had further concluded, having noted the opinion of the ITU Legal Adviser, set out in Document 471, that no modifications of Resolution **750 (Rev.WRC-15)** were required under agenda item 4. Lastly it proposed that the following interpretation of the ITU Legal Adviser be included in the minutes of the Plenary as the understanding of the conference:“In interpreting Resolution **750 (Rev.WRC-15)**, *resolves* 1 and Table 1-1 of this resolution referred to mandatory limits while *resolves* 2 and Table 1-2 of this resolution referred to non-mandatory limits.”3.20 It was so **agreed**.3.21 Document 471 was **approved**. | RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the relevant rules of procedure on RR Resolution **571** at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 77 | WRC-19 | 10th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/571](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0571/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/518](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0518/en)  | 2.4 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 518, containing the fourteenth report of Committee 5 to the Plenary, relating to WRC-19’s consideration of requests from notifying administrations regarding regulatory treatment for specific satellite networks. It was proposed that the following text be included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:“WRC‑19 received several documents containing requests from notifying administrations regarding regulatory treatment for specific satellite networks. The results of WRC‑19 consideration of those requests is shown below.**Requests for WRC decisions on specific satellite network filings***Request for ASIASAT-AK, ASIASAT-AK1 and ASIASAT-AKX satellite networks*WRC‑19 considered the specific request made by China in Document 28(Add.22) regarding the validity of certain C- and Ku-band assignments to the Chinese satellite networks ASIASAT-AK, ASIASAT-AK1 and ASIASAT-AKX. After considering the content of Document 28(Add.22) and the particular issues raised therein, WRC‑19 decided to accede to the request contained in Document 28(Add.22) and consequently instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau to maintain in the Master International Frequency Register the frequency assignments to the ASIASAT-AK, ASIASAT-AK1 and ASIASAT-AKX satellite networks listed in the table below.

| Satellite Network | Long | Min Freq (MHz) | Max Freq (MHz) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ASIASAT-AK | 122°E | 6 425 | 6 723 |
| ASIASAT-AK | 122°E | 10 950 | 11 197 |
| ASIASAT-AK | 122°E | 11 453 | 11 700 |
| ASIASAT-AK1 | 122°E | 12 200 | 12 250 |
| ASIASAT-AKX | 122°E | 6 425 | 6 725 |
| ASIASAT-AKX | 122°E | 10 953 | 11 200 |
| ASIASAT-AKX | 122°E | 11 450 | 11 699 |
| ASIASAT-AKX | 122°E | 13 753 | 14 000 |

*Request for INTELSAT8 328.5E and INTELSAT9 328.5E satellite networks*WRC‑19 considered the specific request in Document 46(Add.22) regarding the retention of frequency assignments to the INTELSAT8 328.5E and INTELSAT9 328.5E satellite networks in the frequency bands 10 950‑11 195 MHz and 11 197.98‑11 198.03 MHz. WRC‑19 decided to accede to the specific request made in that document given the particular issues raised in the document. WRC‑19 consequently instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau to maintain the above-mentioned frequency assignments in the Master International Frequency Register. **Request for inclusion in the RR Appendix 30 and 30A Plans of 10 assignments at orbital position 1.9° E, in replacement of Bulgaria’s assignments appearing in the current Plans at 1.2° W**WRC‑19 considered the specific request in Document 43(Add.2) to consider the inclusion in the RR Appendix **30** and **30A** Plans of 10 assignments at orbital position 1.9° E, in replacement of Bulgaria’s assignments appearing in the current Plans at 1.2° W, pursuant to paragraph 4.1.27 of Article 4 of RR Appendices **30** and **30A**. Recognizing that this request was associated with a decision of WRC‑12 on this same issue, and considering the results of the activities conducted after WRC‑12 and the successful completion of the procedure of Article 4 of RR Appendix **30** and notification of the RR Appendix **30** Article 4 filing for BSS channels in the band 11.7-12.2 GHz at the orbital position 1.9° E, WRC-19 decided to accede to the request. WRC‑19 instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau to include in the RR Appendix **30** and **30A** Plans ten 33 MHz BSS and BSS feeder-link channels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17 and 18 with the characteristics listed in Table 1 below for the Administration of Bulgaria. Once the inclusion has been finished, the Radiocommunication Bureau shall remove the current Plan assignments at 1.2° W of the Administration of Bulgaria in the Appendices **30** and **30** Plans and cancel the frequency assignments corresponding to the above-mentioned 10 channels in the List of additional use and the Master Register of the BULSAT-BSS-1.2W-W satellite network identified in the Table 2 below.Table 1List of characteristics of the new RR Appendix 30 and 30A Plan assignments for the Administration of Bulgaria

| Parameter | Downlink | Feeder-link |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Orbital position | 1.9°E |
| Station keeping (East-West) | 0.05° |
| Beam identification | BUL02000 |
| Date of receipt | 23.11.2019 |
| Date of protection | 19.03.2012 | 04.11.2010 |
| Satellite beam name | E001 |
| Beam Type | Shaped |
| Maximum co-polar antenna gain | 33.8 dBi | 36.5 dBi |
| Maximum cross-polar antenna gain | –2 dBi | 0 dBi |
| Co-polar and cross-polar antenna gain contours | Corresponding to the CEED downlink beam and the CER feeder-link beam of the BULSAT-BSS-1.2W-W satellite network in Table 2 below |
| Boresight | Same as in the GIMS data |
| Service area | National territory defined as “BUL” in the GIMS software application |
| Test-points |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Longitude (deg. E) | Latitude (deg. N) |
| 27.91 | 42.06 |
| 28.47 | 43.70 |
| 25.28 | 41.35 |
| 22.40 | 42.30 |
| 23.01 | 41.44 |
| 22.69 | 44.17 |

 |
| Maximum input power | 13.7 dBW | 18.8 dBW |
| Maximum input power density | −61.5 dBW/Hz | −56.4 dBW/Hz |
| Earth station antenna gain | 33.5 dBi | 57 dBi |
| Earth station antenna diameter | 0.6 m | 5 m |
| Earth station antenna pattern | MODRES | MODTES |
| Earth station 3dB beam width | 2.86° | 0.25° |
| 10 channels | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18 |
| Bandwidth per channel | 33 MHz | 33 MHz |
| Polarization | Odd linear 0°Even linear 90° | Odd linear 0°Even linear 90° |
| Designation of emission | 33M0G7W-- | 33M0G7W-- |
| Power control |  | 3 dB |
| Automatic gain control |  | 15 dB |
| Noise temperature |  | 600 K |
| Exclusive operation group code | E5 | E5 |

Table 2The relevant beams of the BULSAT-BSS-1.2W-W satellite network in which the frequency assignments are to be cancelled

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Satellite name | Orbital position | Special Section (Part B) | Beam |
| BULSAT-BSS-1.2W-W | 1.9° E | AP30/E/599 | CEED |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The CEED downlink beam | The CER feeder-link beam |
| **Co-polar coverage** |
| **Cross-polar coverage** |

*Request for INSAT-EXK82.5E satellite network*WRC‑19 considered the specific request made by India in Document [92(Add.22)](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0092/en) regarding the extension of the regulatory period for bringing into use the INSAT-EXK82.5E satellite network. Considering the particular issues raised in the document, WRC‑19 decided to accede to this request and consequently instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau: 1 to consider the regulatory period for bringing into use the frequency assignments to the INSAT-EXK82.5E satellite network to be extended from 30 March 2017 to 30 June 2017;2 to record the date of bringing into use of these frequency assignments as 30 June 2017; 3 to record the date of suspension of these frequency assignments under   8.17 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B as 3 January 2018 (so that the 3-year suspension period referred to in this provision ends on 3 January 2021);4 to process the Part B and notification of these frequency assignments with a formal date of receipt of 22 November 2019. *Request for KYPROS-SAT-3 (39° E) satellite network*WRC‑19 considered the specific request made by Cyprus in Document [48(Add.22)](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R16-WRC19-C-0048) regarding the bringing into use of the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network at the 39° E orbital location. Having successfully addressed initial concerns raised with this request, WRC-19 exceptionally agreed to set the date of bringing into use of the frequency assignments to the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network as 7 March 2016. WRC‑19 noted that these frequency assignments were subsequently suspended as of 6 June 2016 and brought back into use within the 3-year period set forth in No. **11.49**.*Request for PALAPA-C1-B (113°E) satellite network*WRC-19 considered the specific request made by Indonesia in Document [35(Add.25)](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=R16-WRC19-C-0035) regarding the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use frequency assignments to the PALAPA‑C1-B (113°E) satellite network in the frequency bands: 11 452 - 11 678 MHz, 12 252‑12 532 MHz, 13 758-13 984 MHz, 14 000 - 14 280 MHz from 6 August 2019 to 31 July 2020. WRC‑19 agreed to accede to this limited time extension request, having confirmed that all frequency coordination activities requested by other administrations during WRC-19 had been completed for this satellite network.*Request for MNG00000 and SANSAR-1 (113.6° E) satellite networks*WRC-19 considered the specific request made by Mongolia in Document [164](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0164/en) regarding the reference situation of Mongolian satellite system (113.6° E) in the FSS Plan. WRC-19 instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau to apply with respect to MNG00000 and SANSAR-1 networks of Mongolia the criteria in § 2.1 of Annex **4** to RR Appendix **30B** (as revised by WRC-19) when performing examination of the assignments submitted under § 6.17 of RR Appendix **30B** after 22 November 2019”.2.5 The **Chairman of Committee 5** noted that Indonesia had, in addition to the request made regarding the PALAPA-C1-B (113°E) satellite network, submitted two other requests, relating to the PSN-146E (146°E) and the GARUDA-2 (123°E) satellite networks. Since the committee’s last meeting, an agreement had been reached by Australia and Indonesia on the PSN-146E (146°E) satellite network and a text would be prepared for consideration at a later plenary meeting. Consensus had yet to be achieved with respect to the GARUDA-2 (123°E) satellite network.2.6 The **delegate of Indonesia** welcomed the favourable conclusion regarding the PALAPA-C1-B (113°E) satellite network. He thanked the Administration of Australia and its operator for their cooperation, which had made it possible to reach agreement on the PSN-146E (146°E) satellite network. More time was required to liaise with concerned administrations and resolve coordination matters relating to the request for the GARUDA-2 (123°E) satellite network and he hoped to report on progress at a subsequent plenary meeting.2.7 The **delegate of Australia** confirmed that an agreement had been concluded and ratified by the Administrations of Indonesia and Australia. She hoped that text prepared by both administrations for inclusion in the minutes would be considered at a later plenary meeting.2.8 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** recalled that his delegation had called for the delegation of Indonesia to be given an opportunity to complete coordination, and he thanked the Administration of Australia and its operator for their efforts to find a solution. He hoped that Indonesia would be given additional time to complete the outstanding coordination work.2.9 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said thathis administration was working with the Administration of Indonesia to complete coordination with respect to the GARUDA-2 (123°E) network and would report to the Plenary on the progress made. 2.10 The **delegate of Luxembourg** noted that agreement had been reached to apply the criteria in §2.1 of Annex 4 to Appendix **30B** of the Radio Regulations as revised by WRC-19 to the request for the MNG00000 and SANSAR-1 (113.6° E) satellite networks submitted by Mongolia. Would those same criteria apply with respect to assignments submitted under §6.1 before 23 November 2019.2.11 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that a better arrangement might be possible, and he sought guidance from BR.2.12 The **representative of BR** said that the Bureau was continuing consultations with the Administrations of Mongolia and the Russian Federation in order to clarify a practical point relating to implementation. Once those consultations had been completed, a final text would be submitted to the Plenary. Additional clarification might be required to ensure that any decision made was acceptable to all administrations.2.13 The **Chairman** proposed that, subject to the above comments, the text presented in Document 518 with the exception of the last paragraph be approved for inclusion in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference, and that Indonesia be given more time to complete consultations with other parties. 2.14 It was so **agreed**.2.15 On that understanding, Document 518 was **approved**. | At its 84th meeting received a request from the Administration of Indonesia requesting the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the PALAPA-C1-B satellite network in the frequency bands 11 452 – 11 678 MHz, 12 252 – 12 532 MHz, 13 758 – 13 984 MHz and 14 000 – 14 280 MHz and the extension of the suspension period of those frequency assignments to the PALAPA-B2, PALAPA-C1, PALAPA-C1-K and PALAPA-C1-B satellite networks already brought into use. Based on the information provided, the Board concluded that the case qualified as a situation of *force majeure* due to the launch failure of the Palapa N1 satellite and decided to accede to the request of the Administration of Indonesia. (See Doc. [RRB20-2/29](https://www.itu.int/md/R20-RRB20.2-C-0029/en))At its 85th meeting the Board received a request from the Administration of India for the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the INSAT-EXK82.5E and INSAT-KUP-BSS(83E) satellite networks as a result of a case of *force majeure* resulting form the COVID-19 pandemic. The Board decided that additional information was required to determine whether the situation met all the conditions to qualify as a case of *force majeure* for the INSAT-EXK82.5E satellite network. The Board instructed the Bureau to invite the Administration of India to provide the necessary information to its 86th meeting that would support the request and instructed the Bureau to continue to take into account the frequency assignments to these two satellite networks until the end of the 86th meeting. (See [Doc. RRB20-3/14](https://www.itu.int/md/R20-RRB20.3-C-0014/en)) |
| 78 | WRC-19 | 10th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/571](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0571/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/499](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0499/en) | 10.2 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 499, the approval of which had been deferred from earlier in the meeting. It was proposed that the following text, contained in the document, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Understanding of the Radiocommunication Bureau of *resolves* 11 and Annex 2 of Resolution [7(A)-NGSO-MILESTONES] (WRC-19)**The Bureau notes that Resolution **[7(A)-NGSO-MILESTONES] (WRC-19)**, including its Annex 2, does not supersede the proper application of the provisions of RR Article **9** of the Radio Regulations, in particular RR No. **9.6** (initiation of the coordination process), RR Nos. **9.50** to **9.52** and **9.52C** (action upon a request for coordination) and RR No. **9.53** (mutual efforts by the requesting and responding administrations to overcome the difficulties).This set of provisions creates a balanced framework where both the requesting and responding administrations perform a series of acts that constitutes the bilateral coordination process:– the requesting administration starts the process;– the responding administration replies to this request by either giving its agreement or indicating its disagreement together with information concerning its assignments upon which the disagreement is based and suggestions as it is able to offer with a view to a satisfactory resolution of the matter;– both administrations make every possible mutual effort to overcome the difficulties, in a manner acceptable to the parties concerned.Therefore the Bureau understands that notifying administrations, when providing, *inter alia,* item 3 of Annex 2 to Resolution **[7(A)-NGSO-MILESTONES] (WRC-19)** pursuant to *resolves* 11 of this Resolution, will have to report on the status of coordination and on efforts made in the coordination with satellite systems or networks identified under the relevant provisions of Section II of RR Article **9**. Notifying administrations may also include under this item 3 information about coordination activities with later filed satellite systems or networks that they are aware of, which the Bureau understands as beneficial for an administration requesting the application of *resolves* 11. The Bureau notes that it is materially impossible for such an administration to include information related to cases where the requesting administration has not initiated contacts with a view to start detailed technical and operational discussions in advance of the submission of the report request under item 3. The Bureau finally understands that, by adopting *resolves* 11 and Annex 2 of Resolution **[7(A)-NGSO-MILESTONES] (WRC-19)**, WRC-19 decided to establish a transparent process that will be open for comments: any administration disagreeing with the content of a report provided under item 3 of Annex 2 of this Resolution will have the opportunity to submit its views to the Radio Regulations Board and the administration having submitted the report will have the opportunity to provide its clarification on the matter. The RRB will take into account this information when implementing *resolves* 11*b)* of this Resolution.”10.3 It was so **agreed**.10.4 Document 499 was **approved**. | - |
| 79 | WRC-19 | 10th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/571](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0571/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/500](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0500/en)  | 10.5 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 500, the approval of which had been deferred from earlier in the meeting. It was proposed that the following text, contained in the document, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:“1 WRC-19 has adopted a new milestone-based approach for the deployment of non-geostationary satellite systems in specific bands and services. WRC-19 indicates to the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau that with the milestone approach, WRC-19 is not encouraging routine use of No. **13.6** in the Radio Regulations, in the absence of reliable information, to seek confirmation of the deployment of the number of satellites in notified orbital planes for non-geostationary satellite orbit systems in frequency bands and services not listed in *resolves* 1 of the new Resolution.2 WRC-19 invites ITU-R to study, as a matter of urgency, tolerances for certain orbital characteristics of non-GSO space stations of the fixed-satellite, mobile-satellite or broadcasting satellite services to account for potential differences between the notified and deployed orbital characteristics for the inclination of the orbital plane, the altitude of the apogee of the space station, the altitude of the perigee of the space station and the argument of the perigee of the orbital plane.3 WRC-19 invites ITU-R to study, as a matter of urgency, possible development of a post-milestone procedure taking into account the reporting defined in § 18 of the Resolution **[7(A)‑NGSO-MILESTONES]**.Furthermore, WRC-19 instructs the Bureau in applying the relevant provisions of the RR (e.g.  No. 11.44C.2 or *resolves* 9*d)* of Resolution **[7(A)-NGSO-MILESTONES]**) to exercise utmost caution until such time as ITU-R completes studies on tolerances.”10.6 It was so **agreed**.10.7 Document 500 was **approved**. | RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Article **13** at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 80 | WRC-19 | 10th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/571](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0571/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/509](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0509/en)  | 12.2 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 509, the approval of which had been deferred from earlier in the meeting. It was proposed that the following text, contained in the document, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Instructions to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of Resolution [A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)****1 Application of the § 2 of the attachment of Resolution [A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19) for modification under § 6.1 of RR Appendix 30B of a submission previously sent to the Bureau under § 6.1 of RR Appendix 30B**When, under the application of § 2 of the attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)**, an administration intends to modify a submission previously sent to the Bureau under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**, to resubmit such submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B** applying the special procedure described in the Attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B]** **(WRC-19)**, the Bureau shall verify if the minimum ellipse submitted under this procedure is within the envelope of the initial submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**. If this is the case, the Bureau shall keep the initial date of receipt of the initial submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**, shall restart compatibility examination with existing filing and shall publish a new special section. Otherwise, the Bureau shall give a new date of reception which is the date of reception of request application of this procedure.**2 Application of the § 2 of the attachment of Resolution [A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19) for direct submission under § 6.17 of RR Appendix 30B of a submission previously sent to the Bureau under § 6.1 of RR Appendix 30B**a) Submission of an ellipse under § 6.17 of RR Appendix 30B When, under the application of § 2 of the attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)**, an administration intends to directly submit under § 6.17 of RR Appendix **30B** and apply the special procedure described in the Attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)** to a submission previously sent to the Bureau under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**, the Bureau shall verify if the minimum ellipse submitted under this procedure is within the envelope of the initial submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**. If this is the case, the Bureau shall keep the initial date of receipt of the initial submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B** and shall perform analysis under § 6.17 of Appendix **30B** based on this minimum ellipse. Otherwise, the Bureau shall return the notice to the administration.b) Submission of a shaped beam under § 6.17 of Appendix 30B When, under the application of § 2 of the attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B]** **(WRC-19)**, an administration intends to directly submit under § 6.17 of RR Appendix **30B** and apply the special procedure described in the Attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)** to a submission previously sent to the Bureau under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**, the Bureau shall verify if the shaped beam submitted under this procedure is within the envelope of the minimum ellipse generated by the Bureau, considering associated test points, and within the envelope of the initial submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B**. If this is the case, the Bureau shall keep the initial date of receipt of the initial submission under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B** and shall perform analysis under § 6.17 of RR Appendix **30B** based on this minimum ellipse. Otherwise, the Bureau shall return the notice to the administration.**3 Beam to be created in cases of submissions of an additional system by an administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations**For a submission of an additional system by an administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations, the beam of the submission is formed by combining all individual minimum ellipses associated with each of the administrations of the group:– If all individual minimum ellipses overlap with each other, the beam contains only one coverage area formed by the contours stemming from the combination of all individual minimum ellipses.– If not all individual minimum ellipses overlap with each other, the beam consists of multiple spots stemming from the non-overlapping ellipses and each spot is formed by the contours stemming from the combination of individual minimum ellipses that overlap with each other.**4 Application of the § 12 of the attachment of Resolution [A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19) when there is a lack of collaboration of the notifying administration of the existing network**When, under the application of § 12 of the attachment of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)**, the Bureau does not receive confirmation from the notifying administration of the incoming network that the collaboration between the two administrations has successfully started, the notifying administration may seek assistance of the Bureau. The Bureau shall immediately send a telefax to the notifying administration of the existing network requesting it to provide within 30 days the conditions for the operation to verify harmful interference and proposed date of the implementation of those conditions within the next 4 months for the application of § 12 of Resolution [**A7(E)-AP30B]**. In the absence of such information received by the Bureau, the Bureau shall immediately send a reminder providing an additional 15-day period for the response. In the absence of such acknowledgment within 15 days, it shall be deemed that the notifying administration of the existing network which has failed to start collaboration has undertaken that no complaint will be made in respect of any harmful interference affecting its own assignments which may be caused by the assignment of the notifying administration of the incoming network for which coordination was requested.”12.3 It was so **agreed**.12.4 Document 509 was **approved**. | RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the rule of procedure on RR Resolution **170 (WRC-19)**, at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 81 | WRC-19 | 10th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/571](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0571/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/510](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0510/en) | 13.7 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 510, the approval of which had been deferred from earlier in the meeting. It was proposed that the following text, contained in the document, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Instructions to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of Annex 3 and Annex 4 of RR Appendix 30B as well as of criteria referred to in Resolution [A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19) in its processing, after 22 November 2019, of submissions received under that Appendix**The Radiocommunication Bureau shall continue to calculate and update already accepted single-entry values in both uplink and downlink for all RR Appendix **30B** satellite networks in consistency with footnotes X2 and X3 to item 2.1 of the Annex 4 of RR Appendix **30B (Rev.WRC-19)**, so that this information could be used by administrations during coordination of their respective networks. The Radiocommunication Bureau shall apply:1 For complete submissions under § 6.1 received by the Bureau before 23 November 2019:*a)* Annex 3 (WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.3 b);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.5. Note: Including protection of submissions under Issue E examined before Part A.2 For complete submissions under § 6.17 received by the Bureau before 23 November 2019:*a)* Annex 3 (WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.19 c);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.21;*c)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) in its further examination under the new footnote to § 6.21 c);*d)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.22. Note: Including protection of submissions under Issue E examined before Part B.3 For complete submissions under § 6.17 received by the Bureau after 22 November 2019, related to complete submissions under § 6.1 received by the Bureau before 23 November 2019:*a)* Annex 3 (WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.19 c);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) in its examination under § 6.21;*c)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) in its further examination under footnote YY to § 6.21 c) if the remaining affected assignments are recorded in the List before 23 November 2019;*d)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) in its further examination under footnote YY to § 6.21 c) if the remaining affected assignments are recorded in the List after 22 November 2019; *e)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.22. Note: Including protection of submissions under Issue E examined before Parts A and/or B.4 For complete submissions under § 6.1 received by the Bureau after 22 November 2019:*a)* Annex 3 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.3 b);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.5.5 For complete submissions under § 6.17 received by the Bureau after 22 November 2019, related to complete submissions under § 6.1 received by the Bureau after 22 November 2019:*a)* Annex 3 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.19 c);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.21;*c)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.22.6 For complete submissions under § 6.1 in application of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)**:*a)* Annex 3 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.3 b);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) and the new criteria referred to in Resolution **[A7(E)‑AP30B] (WRC-19)** in its examination under § 6.5, as appropriate. Note: Including examination of submissions under Issue E before the examination of the last normal Part A and/or Part B received before 23 November 2019.7 For complete submissions under § 6.17 in application of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)**, the Bureau shall apply:*a)* Annex 3 (Rev.WRC-19) in its examination under § 6.19 c);*b)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) and the new criteria referred to in Resolution **[A7(E)‑AP30B] (WRC-19)** in its examination under § 6.21, as appropriate;*c)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) and the new criteria referred to in Resolution **[A7(E)‑AP30B] (WRC-19)** in its further examination under footnote YY to § 6.21 c), as appropriate;*d)* Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) and the new criteria referred to in Resolution **[A7(E)‑AP30B] (WRC-19)** in its examination under § 6.22, as appropriate.Application of § 6.16: – In excluding the territories of the concerned administration, the Bureau shall apply Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) until the last complete submissions under § 6.1 or § 6.17 received by the Bureau before 23 November 2019 has been examined and Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) afterward.– If § 6.16 request is submitted in order to be taken into account for the examination of a complete submissions under § 6.17, in examining those submissions, the Bureau shall apply appropriate Annex 4 used in the examination under § 6.21 and § 6.22 as indicated above.Application of § 6.27 in updating criteria:The Bureau shall apply Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07) until the last complete submissions under § 6.1 or § 6.17 received by the Bureau before 23 November 2019 has been examined and Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19) afterward.Application of § 7.5:– For a request under Article **7** received before 23 November 2019, the Bureau shall apply Annex 3 (WRC-07) and Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-07).– For a request under Article **7** received after 22 November 2019, the Bureau shall apply Annex 3 (Rev.WRC-19) and Annex 4 (Rev.WRC-19). In its examination under 6.21 c), the Bureau shall take into account also complete submissions under § 6.1 in application of Resolution **[A7(E)-AP30B] (WRC-19)** and Article 7 request transferred to Article 6 under § 7.7 that has been examined before the date of receipt of the examined notice submitted under § 6.1.”13.8 It was so **agreed**.13.9 Document 510 was **approved**. | RRB decided to include the decision as a note to the relevant rules of procedure on RR Appendix **30B**, Annexes 3 and 4 at its 85th meeting ([CR/471](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0471/en)). |
| 82 | WRC-19 | 11th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/572](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0572/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/402](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0402/en) | 1.7 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 402, consideration of which had been deferred from the ninth plenary meeting.1.8 The **delegate of France** said that, following consultations, it was proposed that the following text be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference: “Regarding meteorological radars, the revision of *resolves* 8 of Resolution **229 (Rev.WRC‑19)** as agreed under Agenda item 9.1 (Issue 9.1.5) (WRC-19) is strictly limited to the specification of Dynamic Frequency Selection (DFS) parameters with respect to the changes in Nos. **5.447F** and **5.450A**”. 1.9 It was so **agreed.**1.10 Subject to the above, Document 402 was **approved.**  | - |
| 83 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/518(Corr.1)](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0518/en) | 3.13 Turning to Document 518, the **Chairman** recalled that the text therein had been approved at the tenth plenary meeting for inclusion in the minutes of that plenary, with the exception of the final paragraph of the document pending further coordination between Mongolia and other affected administrations. 3.14 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 518(Corr.1). It was proposed that the last paragraph of Document 518 should be replaced by the following text, to be included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Request for MNG00000 and SANSAR-1 (113.6° E) satellite networks**WRC‑19 considered the specific request made by Mongolia in Document 164 regarding the reference situation of the Mongolian satellite system (113.6° E) in the FSS Plan. WRC‑19 instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau to apply with respect to the MNG00000 and SANSAR-1 networks of Mongolia the criteria in § 2.1 of Annex **4** to RR Appendix **30B** (as revised by WRC‑19) when performing examination of the assignments submitted under § 6.17 of RR Appendix **30B** after 22 November 2019 and related to assignments which were submitted under § 6.1 of RR Appendix **30B** before 23 November 2019.”3.15 It was so **agreed.**3.16 Document 518(Corr.1) was **approved**. | - |
| 84 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/518(Corr.2)](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0518/en) | 3.17 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 518(Corr.2), in which it was proposed that the following additional text be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Request for PSN-146E (146° E) satellite network**WRC‑19 considered the specific request made by Indonesia in Document 35(Add.25) regarding the extension of the regulatory time limit for bringing into use frequency assignments to the PSN-146E (146° E) satellite network in the frequency bands: 17.7-21.2 GHz and 27.0-31.0 GHz from 25 October 2019 to 31 March 2023. WRC‑19 agreed to accede to this limited time extension request, having confirmed that all frequency coordination activities requested by other administrations during WRC‑19 had been completed for this satellite network.**Request for GARUDA-2 (123° E) satellite network**WRC‑19 considered the specific request made by Indonesia in Document 35(Add.25) regarding the extension of the regulatory time limit for bringing back into use the frequency assignments to the GARUDA-2 (123° E) satellite network in the frequency bands: 1 530 - 1 559 MHz, 1 626.5-1 660.5 MHz, from 1 November 2020 to 1 November 2024. WRC‑19 agreed to accede to this time extension request and the continued inclusion of the GARUDA-2 frequency assignments in the MIFR, both of which are conditional to the adherence by Indonesia to the coordination agreement reached with the United Arab Emirates. Furthermore, WRC‑19 confirmed that all frequency coordination activities requested by other administrations during WRC-19 had been completed for this satellite network.”3.18 It was so agreed.3.19 Document 518(Corr.2) was **approved**.3.20 The **delegate of Indonesia** expressed appreciation to the conference for agreeing to its requests with respect to the PSN-146E (146° E) and GARUDA-2 (123° E) satellite networks, which were of great importance in providing connectivity in his country, in particular to remote islands and rural areas. He thanked the Administrations of Australia, the United Arab Emirates, the Islamic Republic of Iran, China, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Samoa, South Africa, the United Kingdom, France, the Russian Federation and other administrations for their cooperation and support. He also thanked the Chairman, the Chairman of Committee 5, the Chairman of Working Group 5B and Chairman of Sub-Working Group 5B1, the Director of BR, ITU staff and members of the Radio Regulations Board for their assistance. | At its 85th meeting the Board received a submission from the Administration of Indonesia requesting the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the PSN-146E satellite network in the 17.7 - 21.2/27 - 31 GHz bands on the basis of a case of *force majeure* due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Board decided not to accede to the request and concluded that while there were elements of *force majeure* in the request, there was insufficient information at this time to determine whether the situation met all the conditions required to be considered as a case of *force majeure*. The Board instructed the Bureau to invite the Administration of Indonesia to provide additional information in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the case qualified as a case of *force majeure*. (see Doc. [RRB20-3/14](https://www.itu.int/md/R20-RRB20.3-C-0014/en)) |
| 85 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/550](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0550/en) | 3.25 The **Chairman of Ad hoc Group of the Plenary 4A** introduced Document 550 on agenda item 1.13. It was proposed that the following text set out in the annex to Document 550 be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Verification of No. 21.5 for the notification of IMT stations operating in the frequency band 24.45-27.5 GHz which use an antenna that consists of an array of active elements**ITU‑R is invited to study, as a matter of urgency, the applicability of the limit specified in No. **21.5** of the Radio Regulations to IMT stations, that use an antenna that consists of an array of active elements, with a view to recommend ways for its possible replacement or revision for such stations, as well as any necessary updates to Table **21-2** related to terrestrial and space services sharing frequency bands.Furthermore, the ITU-R is invited to study, as a matter of urgency, verification of No. **21.5** regarding the notification of IMT stations that use an antenna that consists of an array of active elements, as appropriate.”3.26 It was so **agreed**. 3.27 Document 550 was **approved**. | - |
| 86 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/283](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0283/en) | 5.3 The **Chairman of Committee 4** introduced Document 283, which contained the tenth report from Committee 4 to the Plenary. It was proposed that the following text set out in Document 283 be approved and included in the minutes of the meeting as a decision of the conference:“The administrations of Region 1 wishing to allocate the frequency band 50-54 MHz, or portions thereof, to the amateur service exclusively on a primary basis at future WRCs are invited to add their names to footnote RR No. **5.169*bis*** and not to footnote RR No. **5.169**, due to its special historical status. BR shall take all necessary actions to guide such administrations to propose addition of their names only to footnote RR No. **5.169*bis***.”5.4 It was so **agreed**.5.5 Document 283 was **approved**.  | - |
| 87 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/563](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0563/en) | 27.1 The **Chairman of Committee 6**, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of Ad-Hoc Group of the Plenary 6, introduced Document 563 containing the group’s report on agenda item 10. The group had considered the proposed agenda for WRC-23 and the preliminary agenda for WRC‑27. Despite the suggestion that the ad-hoc group should only consider titles of the agenda items and associated resolutions for WRC-27, it had considered all elements of the agenda for WRC-27. It was proposed that the following text, contained in the document, be approved and included in the minutes of the plenary meeting for consideration as a possible future issue during the studies under WRC-23 agenda item 7:“To consider the protection of geostationary satellite networks in the MSS operating in 7/8 and 20/30 GHz from emissions of non-geostationary satellite systems operating in the same frequency bands and identical directions”. 27.2 It was so **agreed**.27.3 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** proposed that an instruction from the conference to the Bureau be included in the minutes of the plenary meeting to read: “WRC-19 therefore instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau to convey this statement to the relevant ITU-R study group for necessary action, as appropriate”.27.4 It was so **agreed.**27.5 Document 563 was **approved.** | - |
| 88 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/554](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0554/en) and Corrigendum 1 | 28.104 Following the informal consultations, the **Chairman** announced that consensus had been reached to delete *recognizing* d) in draft Resolution COM6/18.28.105 In order to cater for the concerns of those administrations wishing to retain the reference to the frequency band, the **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** requested that the following text be included in the minutes of the meeting to reflect decisions taken by the conference: “Agenda item 9.1 x invites ITU-R to conduct studies to identify the potential frequency bands for the use of IMT for fixed wireless broadband within the frequency bands allocated to the fixed service on a primary basis. Accordingly, an agenda item for WRC-27 will be developed to consider those identified bands.”28.106 It was so **agreed**. | - |
| 89 | WRC-19 | 12th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/573](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0573/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/535](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0535/en) | 35.2 The **Chairman** invited participants to take up Document 535, the consideration of which had been deferred from earlier in the meeting pending the approval of Document 555. It was proposed that the following text, contained in the document, be approved for inclusion in the minutes of the plenary meeting as a decision of the conference:**“Application of Rules of Procedure on RR No. 9.11A**It is proposed that RR No. **9.12** does not apply to frequency assignments of stations operating in the space research or earth exploration-satellite services. Therefore, the Bureau is requested under the Rule of Procedure for RR No. **9.11A** to not apply coordination under RR No. **9.12** for frequency assignments of stations operating in the space research and Earth exploration-satellite service as part of RR No. **5.A16** and RR No. **5.B16**.**Protection of EESS in the frequency band 36-37 GHz**Under studies considered for WRC‑19 agenda item 1.6, a preliminary study on the protection of EESS (passive) sensors operating in the 36-37 GHz was submitted to the ITU-R. This preliminary study indicated that it may be necessary to not exceed an out-of-band e.i.r.p of −34 dBW/100 MHz, for all angles greater than 71.4 degrees from nadir, for FSS non-GSO space stations operating in the frequency band 37.5-38 GHz. In addition, interference into the cold calibration channel of the EESS (passive) sensor operating in the frequency band 36-37 GHz has not been studied. WRC‑19 invites ITU-R to conduct further study of this topic and develop Recommendations and/or Reports, as appropriate, and Report back to WRC‑23 to take action, if necessary.Furthermore, WRC‑19 agreed that modifications to Resolution **750 (Rev WRC-19)** should not be considered under these studies since the frequency band 36-37 GHz is not referenced in No. **5.340**.”35.3 It was so **agreed**.35.4 Document 535 was **approved**. | RRB approved the modification to the rule of procedure on RR No.**9.11A** and Table **9.11A** at its 84th meeting ([CR/465](http://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0465/en)).  |
| 90 | WRC-19 | 14th Plenary Doc. [CMR19/575](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0575/en) Approval of Doc. [CMR19/566](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0566/en) | 3.1 The **Chairman of Committee 7**, introducing Document 566 and recalling the procedure set out in Document 130 concerning the treatment of editorial corrections to the Radio Regulations, sought the conference’s agreement to authorize the Director of BR to proceed with the inclusion of the corrections outlined in Documents 203 (Committee 4), 340 (Committee 5), and 212 and 336 (Committee 6).3.2 The **Chairman of Committee 5** said that the corrections covered by Document 456 should be dealt with in the same manner.3.3 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** asked what could be done to minimize the need for such a process in the future.3.4 The **Chairman of Committee 7** said that every effort was made to avoid errors; however, given the complexities of the work of Committee 7 and WRCs in general, imperfections would always be found. Committees could contribute by striving to submit documents to Committee 7 in good time and after careful review. He expressed sincere appreciation to all those involved in the work of Committee 7, in particular the Secretary to the Committee.3.5 In reply to a further question from the **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, the **Director of BR** confirmed that the chairmen of all conference committees, including Committee 7, would be consulted as necessary during the editorial correction process, in accordance with the Bureau’s usual practice.3.6 The **Chairman** took it that the conference wished to authorize the Director of BR to proceed with the inclusion of the corrections outlined in Documents 203, 212, 336, 340 and 456 in the next edition of the Radio Regulations, in accordance with the procedure described in Document 566.3.7 It was so **agreed.** | Corrections as contained in Documents 203, 212, 336, 340 and 456 were applied in accordance with Document 566. |
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1. There were diverging views on whether the equal receipt date treatment should apply to N‑SAT‑127 W vis-à-vis NSS-7. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)