



Radiocommunication Bureau (BR)

Circular Letter
CR/382

6 May 2015

To Administrations of Member States of the ITU

Subject: Minutes of the 68th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board

Pursuant to the provisions of Nos. 13.18 of the Radio Regulations and in accordance with §1.10 of Part C of the Rules of Procedure, please find attached the approved minutes of the 68th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board (16-20 March 2015).

These minutes were approved by the Members of the Radio Regulations Board by electronic means and are available on the RRB pages of the ITU web site.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'FRANCIS RANCY'.

François Rancy
Director

Annex : Minutes of the 68th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board

Distribution:

- Administrations of Member States of ITU
- Members of the Radio Regulations Board

Radio Regulations Board
Geneva, 16-20 March 2015



INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

Document RRB15-1/8-E
7 April 2015
Original: English

MINUTES*
OF THE
68th MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD

16-20 March 2015

Present: Members, RRB
Mr Y. ITO, Chairman
Ms L. JEANTY, Vice-Chairman
Mr M. BESSI, Mr N. BIN HAMMAD, Mr D.Q. HOAN, Mr I. KHAIROV,
Mr S.K. KIBE, Mr S. KOFFI, Mr A. MAGENTA, Mr V. STRELETS,
Mr R.L. TERÁN, Ms. J.C. WILSON
Executive Secretary, RRB
Mr F. RANCY, Director, BR
Précis-Writers
Mr T. ELDRIDGE and Ms A. HADEN
Also present: Mr H. ZHAO, Secretary-General
Mr M. MANIEWICZ, Deputy-Director, BR and Chief, IAP
Mr Y. HENRI, Chief, SSD
Mr A. MENDEZ, Chief, TSD
Mr A. MATAS, Head, SSD/SPR
Mr M. SAKAMOTO, Head, SSD/SSC
Mr B. BA, Head, TSD/TPR
Mr N. VASSILIEV, Head, TSD/FMD
Mr V. TIMOFEEV, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General
Mr D. BOTHA, SGD
Ms K. GOZAL, Administrative Secretary

* The minutes of the meeting reflect the detailed and comprehensive consideration by the members of the Radio Regulations Board of the items that were under consideration on the agenda of the 68th meeting of the Board. The official decisions of the 68th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board can be found in Document RRB15-1/7.

Subjects discussed	Documents
1 Opening of the meeting and introductory comments	-
2 Election of the chairman and vice-chairman for 2015	-
3 Late submissions	-
4 Report by the Director of BR	RRB15-1/2 + Add.1+2; RRB15-1/DELAYED/1
5 Submission by the Administration of the United States requesting the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network	RRB15-1/3
6 Consideration of the status of the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network	RRB15-1/4, RRB15-1/6
7 Requests for suspension of satellite networks under No. 11.49 of the Radio Regulations received more than six months after the date of the suspension	RRB15-1/5
8 Election of the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the Board's working groups	-
9 Consideration of the report of the Board's Working Group on the Rules of Procedure	RRB12-1/4(Rev.12)
10 Consideration of the draft report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-15 under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07)	RRB15-1/1
11 Confirmation of the dates of the next (69th) and subsequent (70th) meetings in 2015	-
12 Approval of the summary of decisions	RRB15-1/7
13 Closure of the meeting	-

1 Opening of the meeting and introductory comments

1.1 The **interim Chairman (Mr Kibe)** opened the meeting at 1400 hours on Monday, 16 March 2015, and welcomed participants to Geneva.

1.2 The **Secretary-General** said that it was a pleasure for him to welcome Board members to the first Board meeting of his tenure at the head of ITU, and he congratulated the five newly elected members, the seven re-elected members, and the Director for their election or re-election. In a world in which the role and degree of regulation were under increasing debate, the fact that the need for the Radio Regulations was never questioned bore out the importance of the work of both the Board and Bureau. The Board was called upon to tackle extremely diverse, important, complex and sensitive matters, as the harmful interference caused by Italian broadcasters to neighbouring countries. The demand for spectrum had never been greater, and in that light the Board's input to WRC-15, in the form of its report under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) and via the Director's report to the conference, were eagerly anticipated. The importance of spectrum was further underscored by the increasing interest being shown in the activities of ITU as a whole and ITU-R in particular by major players, including Google, Facebook and Amazon. He was confident that the Board would continue to work with its traditional transparency, fairness and competence, fully supported by the expert staff of the Bureau. He wished the meeting every success in its work.

1.3 The **Director** said that he and the entire staff of the Bureau looked forward to working with and in support of the Board. With the mix of newly elected and re-elected Board members, whom he congratulated, continuity was guaranteed, and he stressed the importance of consistency between past and future decisions in order to ensure the stability of ITU-R regulatory system. The challenges facing the Board were considerable, but its activities over past years showed that the system was sound.

2 Election of the chairman and vice-chairman for 2015

2.1 The **interim Chairman** said that, following informal consultations, it was proposed that Mr Ito and Ms Jeanty be elected Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board, respectively, for 2015.

2.2 **Mr Magenta** supported that proposal.

2.3 Mr Ito and Ms Jeanty were **elected** Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board, respectively, for 2015.

2.4 The **Chairman** thanked the Board for the honour and trust thus placed in him, and particularly welcomed and congratulated the new Board members recently elected by PP-14. He stressed the importance of the Board's work in 2015 in preparation for WRC-15, which included the report it was currently working on under Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**. The Board could expect to be called upon to provide comment and clarification at the conference, in the increasingly competitive and fast-changing environment of radiocommunications. He looked forward, with the present Board membership, to continuing the Board's tradition of operating as a single, united body, with its excellent working relationship with the Bureau.

2.5 **Ms Jeanty** also thanked her fellow Board members for the honour and confidence placed in her; she pledged to do her utmost to fulfil all expectations.

2.6 All Board members subsequently taking the floor congratulated the Chairman and Vice-Chairman on their election.

3 Late submissions

3.1 It was **agreed** that a late submission from Croatia (Document RRB15-1/DELAYED/1), concerning interference between stations in Italy and neighbouring countries, would be taken up for information in conjunction with the Director's report in Document RRB15-1/2.

4 Report by the Director of BR (Document RRB15-1/2 and Addenda 1 and 2; RRB15-1/DELAYED/1)

4.1 The **Director** introduced his report in Document RRB15-1/2, drawing attention to Annex 1 which indicated the actions taken by the Bureau arising from decisions by the Board at its 67th meeting. The actions taken in regard to coordination of satellite networks around 116° E were described more fully in Addendum 2 to Document RRB15-1/2. Addendum 1 contained a compendium of decisions taken by plenary meetings of past WRCs since WRC-95. The status of such decisions had been discussed by the Board at recent meetings, and the view of the ITU Legal Adviser was that WRC plenary decisions were intermediate in status between the Radio Regulations and the rules of procedure. Given the importance of such decisions, the compendium was intended to enable the Board to review their implementation by the Bureau, and to consider whether any of these decisions should be reflected in rules of procedure.

4.2 **Chief TSD**, introducing the sections of the Director's report related to terrestrial systems, drew attention to § 2 and Annex 2 concerning the processing by the Bureau of filings for terrestrial systems. Reports of harmful interference were summarized in the tables in § 4.1 of the report, while developments since the Board's 67th meeting in regard to harmful interference to broadcasting stations in the VHF/UHF bands between Italy and its neighbouring countries were indicated in § 4.2. A report from the Administration of Croatia had been submitted in Document RRB15-1/DELAYED/1, and a few minutes ago he had received an e-mail from Italy indicating that by 30 April 2015 there would be an improvement in regard to the harmful interference to television broadcasting, but making no mention of sound broadcasting.

4.3 **Mr Strelets** said that the information provided by the Administration of Croatia in Document RRB15-1/DELAYED/1 was disappointing because it showed that not all practical steps had yet been taken by Italy to resolve the harmful interference. He hoped that the efforts made by the Secretary-General, the Director and others would bear fruit. Noting that many countries were moving from analogue to digital broadcasting during 2015, he asked how the Bureau was handling its work under No. 11.50.

4.4 **Chief TSD** said that the Bureau had prepared Circular Letter CR/377 outlining the process for revising the MIFR. In practice, if the switchover from analogue to digital broadcasting created harmful interference, the Bureau would deal with cases on a case-by-case basis.

4.5 The **Chairman** expressed appreciation for the continuing work of the Bureau to resolve the problems of harmful interference caused by Italy to neighbouring countries.

4.6 The **Director** observed that the Bureau remained cautious, given the complexity of the problem. He said that the Administration of Italy was making efforts to stop the harmful interference to neighbouring countries, and a new law aiming at resolving the harmful interference to television broadcasting services was expected to come into force on 30 April 2015. A report on the progress achieved following the implementation of that law would be prepared by the Bureau and submitted to the 69th meeting of the Board.

4.7 **Mr Bessi** recalled that the Board had been dealing with the problem for several years and asked whether there was anything in the Italian e-mail to which the Board should react.

4.8 **Mr Hoan** said that, although there had been some progress in regard to the harmful interference caused by Italy to neighbouring countries, the problem remained unsolved. Referring to the last paragraph of § 4.2 of the Director's report, he noted that so far only France and Croatia had responded to the Bureau's request for an update on the situation. He proposed that the Board should urge the Bureau to continue monitoring the situation, in particular with regard to the switchover from analogue to digital broadcasting.

4.9 **Mr Khairov** said that progress had been made thanks to the efforts of the Bureau but there were still hundreds of reports of harmful interference and no promising approach to solving the interference problems being experienced by sound broadcasting stations in neighbouring countries.

The Board should urge Italy to draw up a road map for eliminating harmful interference, along with a timeline, indicating the technical and regulatory steps that would be taken to resolve the matter.

4.10 **Ms Jeanty** thanked the Bureau for all the work done on the long-standing problem of harmful interference caused by Italy to neighbouring countries. Given that a new law would come into force on 30 April 2015, she suggested that the Board might wait until its next meeting before taking any further action. Also, the e-mail from Italy had arrived too late to be considered at the present meeting.

4.11 The **Director** said that the harmful interference to sound and television broadcasting stations in neighbouring countries arose because Italy did not respect the regional plan or the Radio Regulations. Until the Italian law changed there would not be comprehensive progress in resolving the problems. A new law relating to television broadcasting was expected to come into force on 30 April, raising hopes for a solution. It would however take longer to resolve cases of harmful interference to the sound broadcasting services caused by Italy to its neighbours. Responding to a question by **Mr Khairov**, he said that Italy had no draft legislation for sound broadcasting. For television broadcasting, a reverse auction was intended to move Italian local stations out of the critical frequencies, the new legislation was expected to come into force at the end of April, and the regulatory authorities had approved a new frequency plan.

4.12 **Mr Strelets** recalled that the problem was long-standing and great efforts had been made to resolve it. He suggested that the Board urge the Director to continue its efforts to achieve a complete solution at the earliest possible date.

4.13 It was so **agreed**.

4.14 **Chief SSD**, introducing the sections of the Director's report related to space systems, drew attention to § 2 and an updated version of Annex 3 on the Bureau's processing of filings for space systems. The new version of Annex 3 included information covering February 2015 and showed that all regulatory deadlines had been met. He recalled that at its 66th meeting, the Board had approved a rule of procedure enabling administrations to submit to the Bureau advance publication information (API) notices under subsection IB of Article 9 of the RR to satellite online through a web-based application (SpaceWISC). The new web interface had been fully operational since 1 March 2015 and was already being used by administrations. The Bureau hoped that WRC-15 would recognize the effectiveness of that web-based approach and extend it to the submission of other and more complex forms of coordination such as non-planned service coordination requests, notification and recording in the Master International Frequency Register, and Appendices 30/30A and 30B filings. Implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings (late payments) was covered in § 3 of the Director's report and Annex 4, which contained a list of satellite network filings for which payment had been received after the due date but prior to the BR IFIC meeting that would have cancelled them, and which the Bureau continued to take into account. Annex 4 also listed the satellite network filings cancelled as a result of non-payment of invoices. Statistics on the cancellation by the Bureau of coordination request special sections, in particular in implementation of No. 13.6, were shown in tabular form in § 5 of the Director's report. The Bureau continued to verify information on bringing into service, requesting further clarification from administrations if necessary. As indicated in § 6, details relating to the coordination of satellite networks around 116° E were provided in Addendum 2 to Document RRB15-1/2.

4.15 **Mr Strelets**, referring to § 5 of the Director's report, asked whether he was correct in understanding that the "suppression of coordination request special sections" should not concern the cancellation of assignments recorded in the MIFR.

4.16 **Chief SSD** confirmed Mr Strelets' understanding and that the title would be reviewed accordingly. Regarding the gap between a decision to cancel frequency assignments and the actual suppression from the relevant database, he explained that under No. 13.6, the Bureau conducts examination on the conformity of frequency assignments with specific provisions of the Radio Regulations that may result in a Board's decision to cancel those assignments from the MIFR. If an administration is disagreeing with the Bureau's decision, the matter is brought to the Board and

meanwhile the Bureau is keeping the assignments in the MIFR pending the Board's decision. Responding to a comment by **Mr Bessi**, he confirmed that under No. **13.6**, assignments would be retained in the MIFR until the Board took a decision, whereas previously the Board had merely confirmed the Bureau's decisions in uncontested cases.

4.17 **Mr Hoan** pointed out that in Table 2 of Annex 3 to the Director's report the regulatory time-limit of four months had sometimes been exceeded.

4.18 **Chief SSD**, noting that the treatment time for February 2015 was 3.4 months and thus within the regulatory time-limit of four months, explained that several factors could impact the treatment time. The BR IFIC for space services was published every two weeks, so publication might be delayed by up to two weeks. Closure of the office, for example for end of year holidays, would add to publication delays. Massive submission of coordination requests for satellite networks on a same day could also lengthen the publication time. For example, the Bureau had received almost 100 coordination requests in December 2014, whereas 20-40 per month was more usual. Furthermore, the Bureau had limited resources. The **Director** added that the treatment times of more than six months which had occurred in mid-2014 were attributable to a bug in the Bureau's software, which had delayed the processing of networks. Also, in view of the financial situation faced by ITU, recruitment of new staff had been put on hold, pending the Council 2015 decision of the ITU budget for 2016-17.

Decisions of past WRCs concerning the application of the Radio Regulations (Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2)

4.19 The **Director** introduced Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, which identified all decisions taken by the plenaries of WRCs, and recorded in the minutes thereof, since WRC-95, concerning the application of the Radio Regulations. Those decisions could be divided into four general categories: (1) those approving the extension of the notified date of bringing into use of frequency assignments, or the date of bringing back into regular use of suspended assignments – all such decisions had been unanimously approved by the relevant conferences; (2) ad hoc decisions, all of which had been implemented; (3) requests for the development of rules of procedure – all such requests had been implemented and the relevant rules of procedure approved by the Board; and (4) decisions constituting an authentic interpretation of the Radio Regulations, including the endorsement of Bureau practices – such decisions, emanating from the body empowered to adopt the Radio Regulations, had the highest level of interpretation of the regulations (higher in status than rules of procedure), and were binding on the Bureau. He suggested that the Board need discuss only those category (4) decisions or parts thereof identified as “still relevant”, i.e. still under implementation by the Bureau, with a possible view to developing rules of procedure for them. Responding to a request for clarification from **Ms Jeanty**, he said that the interest of developing a rule of procedure for a given decision identified as “still relevant” was to ensure full transparency regarding any practice of the Bureau in implementing the decision, thereby also pre-empting any problems that might arise if an administration took action based on its own, different interpretation of the decision.

4.20 The **Chairman** invited the Bureau to introduce those category (4) decisions or parts thereof that were still relevant and that might be candidates for the development of a rule of procedure.

4.21 **Chief SSD** drew attention first to item 17 in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, noting that some elements of the decision of WRC-03 had been fully implemented, whereas others remained relevant and were applied by the Bureau on a daily basis and without any difficulty. Thus, the Bureau's practice in not requiring Resolution **49** vis-à-vis Article 2A (Appendices **30** and **30A**) might eventually be the subject of a rule of procedure, as could the Bureau's implementation of footnotes *4bis* and *8bis* of sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.2 (Appendix **30A**).

4.22 The **Chairman** observed that no administration had re-voiced the need for a rule of procedure on that conference decision.

4.23 **Mr Bessi** welcomed the Bureau's initiative in bringing past WRC decisions to the attention of the Board in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, and stressed the importance of clarifying all the Bureau's practices for the benefit of administrations. He noted that the conference had required a rule of procedure to be produced for the grouping concept, and that the Board had approved such a rule at its 32nd meeting. In regard to WRC-03 Document 370, he wondered whether the conference had called for any other rules of procedure, and whether any circular letter had been sent out to administrations explaining the Bureau's practice regarding the matters addressed in that document. If so, had any comments been received from administrations? Noting that the relevant texts of the Union called for rules of procedure to be developed only where there was a clear need for them, he noted that the Bureau had encountered no problems in implementing the conference's decisions under item 17 in over ten years. Thought might nevertheless be given to developing a rule on the application of Resolution **49** in regard to Article 2A.

4.24 **Chief SSD** confirmed that the only rule of procedure developed in regard to WRC-03 Document 370 had been on the grouping concept, as required by the WRC. The Bureau's practice in regard to Resolution **49** and the footnotes referred to had not been the subject of a circular letter. Nevertheless, the action taken over the years by the Bureau meant administrations had become acquainted with the Bureau's application of the conference's decisions.

4.25 **Mr Strelets** said that the extremely useful document before the Board had been produced further to proposals made by participants in the recent meeting of the Special Committee; the Bureau was to be thanked for reacting so quickly to those proposals. At present there were simply too many texts containing provisions to be observed (CS/CV, Radio Regulations, Rules of Procedure and decisions reflected only in WRC minutes), and it was therefore difficult for administrations to locate the relevant decisions in all the different sets of minutes. Moreover, the status of such decisions had remained somewhat vague for administrations until it had been clarified by the ITU Legal Adviser in 2014. Based on the material in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, the Bureau's practices deriving from WRC decisions should, where still relevant, be reflected in rules of procedure, as called for in No. **13.13** of the Radio Regulations.

4.26 **Ms Wilson** noted that No. 13.0.1 called for the development of rules of procedure "only when there is a clear need with proper justification". She therefore questioned whether rules should be produced to cover matters which had posed no problems since WRC-03.

4.27 The **Chairman** noted that to develop a new rule of procedure reflecting practices that could be new to administrations might result in retroactive consequences for some administrations.

4.28 **Chief SSD** said that the decisions taken by WRC-03 as indicated under item 17 had been applied by the Bureau since 2003 and to develop a rule reflecting the Bureau's practice should, in his view, make no real difference to administrations save to clarify matters.

4.29 The **Director** commented that the fact that implementation of WRC-03's decisions had given rise to no problems thus far was no guarantee that no problems would arise in the future. It should not be overlooked that implementation of Resolution **49** had regulatory impacts affecting the rights of administrations.

4.30 **Mr Bessi** said that if a rule of procedure was drafted it would be sent out to administrations for comment, and as a consequence might not be approved without change. What then would happen to the cases already dealt with by the Bureau since 2003?

4.31 **Mr Koffi** agreed with Mr Bessi, and said he preferred not to develop a rule of procedure for a practice that had never given rise to any problems.

4.32 **Mr Magenta** agreed: the Bureau should not tamper with a mechanism that had worked perfectly well to date.

4.33 The **Director** said that, even if administrations voiced opposition to the Bureau's practice were it to be brought to their attention in a draft rule of procedure, the Bureau would have to respond

that it had no option but to implement the WRC decision as best it saw fit, recognizing that WRC decisions had higher status than rules of procedure.

4.34 **Mr Khairov** supported Mr Strelets' comments in favour of developing draft rules of procedure, thereby increasing transparency regarding the Bureau's work. He nevertheless wondered whether there was a real need for a rule for the specific WRC decision under consideration, and how much work the development of a rule would entail for the Bureau and administrations. The best approach might be to identify all the rules of procedure that might be developed based on Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, and then give them an order of priority in terms of immediate or subsequent development.

4.35 **Mr Strelets** reiterated that the document before the Board had been produced further to concerns expressed by administrations at the Special Committee meeting regarding the difficulty of identifying and coming to grips with WRC decisions reflected in WRC minutes, as well as the need to ensure that all BR practices were enshrined in rules of procedure in order to simplify and ensure maximum transparency in the work of the Bureau. Anything the Board could do to increase transparency and efficiency in the application of the Radio Regulations could only be to the Board's credit, and it should therefore develop rules of procedure and in doing so make the best possible use of the valuable material contained in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2. He asked the Director what he intended to do with the document, and if he intended to include it in his report to WRC-15.

4.36 The **Director** said that it was entirely up to the Board to decide what to do with the material contained in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2. Moreover, the material had been published on the web, therefore administrations could react to it too. In view of the discussions at the Special Committee meeting, he would not simply be including it in his report to WRC-15.

4.37 The **Chairman** suggested that the best way forward might be to request the Bureau to develop a rule of procedure on that part of item 17 in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2 that was still relevant, for consideration by the Board at its 69th meeting.

4.38 **Ms Wilson** saw no objection to the Chairman's suggestion, but said that a distinction should be drawn between cases for which there was a clear need for a rule of procedure, and those for which there was not. She was not convinced that there was a clear need for a rule on any part of item 17.

4.39 **Ms Jeanty** said that she could support the Chairman's suggestion, in the light of the comments made by Mr Strelets and Mr Khairov, and would favour establishing some order of priority once areas calling for a rule of procedure had been identified.

4.40 **Mr Koffi** said that the way forward proposed by the Chairman could be applied to all areas of Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2 identified by the Bureau as possible candidates for rules of procedure.

4.41 The **Director** stressed that it was up to the Board to decide for which areas of Addendum 1 rules of procedure should be developed.

4.42 **Mr Bin Hammad** supported the Chairman's proposed way forward, but wondered what would ensue if the Board requested a given rule for consideration at its 69th meeting and then decided there was no need for it.

4.43 **Mr Bessi** drew attention to No. **13.0.2** of the Radio Regulations, according to which: "If such a need is not identified under No. **13.0.1**, the Board shall submit also to the coming world radiocommunication conference the necessary modifications to the Radio Regulations to alleviate such difficulties or inconsistencies."

4.44 The **Chairman** saw no need for the Board to bring the specific matter under consideration to the attention of the conference: the conference had issued instructions on it, and those had been implemented for over ten years without giving rise to difficulties. He noted that agreement appeared to be emerging that a rule of procedure should be developed on relevant elements in item 17.

4.45 **Mr Hoan** agreed with the Chairman that there was no need for the Board to bring item 17 to the attention of the conference. It should request the Bureau to prepare a draft rule of procedure on it, for consideration by the Board at its 69th meeting.

4.46 **Chief SSD** recalled that the usual procedure for developing draft rules of procedure involved sending the drafts out to administrations for comment 10 weeks prior to the meeting at which they were to be considered by the Board. Regarding the material in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, the best approach might be for the Bureau to identify and consolidate in a separate document all elements of Addendum 1 for which rules of procedure might be developed, based on which the Board or its Working Group on the Rules of Procedure could identify at the Board's 69th meeting those areas for which draft rules should be prepared. The drafts would be prepared by the Bureau following the 69th meeting, and sent out for comment in the usual manner.

4.47 The **Director** said that items 16, 17, 22, 27, 30, 34 and 36 contained elements for which consideration might be given to developing rules of procedure, in so far as those elements were implemented in the form of BR practices that might not necessarily be known to administrations.

4.48 Regarding item 16 in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2, **Chief SSD** said, in reply to a question by **Mr Bin Hammad**, that the instructions issued by the WRC regarding the implementation of Resolution **539 (Rev.WRC-03)** were clear, and extended to that resolution the approach enshrined in other regulatory provisions whereby, when assistance was provided by the Bureau, an administration's failure to reply was taken as tacit agreement. It was a case for which a rule of procedure might indeed be developed.

4.49 The **Chairman** noted the Board's general agreement that a rule of procedure should be developed for item 16.

4.50 Regarding item 22, following various comments by **Mr Strelets**, **Ms Wilson** and **Chief SSD**, the **Director** said that without a clear picture of what had been decided by WRC-07 (Document 378 as amended by the conference), it would be difficult to ascertain what elements might be candidates for the development of rules of procedure.

4.51 **Mr Bessi** suggested that, given the complexity of the issues under discussion, the Board should suspend the present debate and request the Bureau and the Board's Working Group on the Rules of Procedure to study further the seven items in Addendum 1 identified as containing elements for which rules of procedure might be developed. On that understanding, the Board would resume its consideration of the matter at its 69th meeting.

4.52 The **Chairman** suggested that a circular letter should be sent out to administrations informing them of the action being taken by the Board, and making it clear that the decisions in the seven items were being implemented by the Bureau, but were not the subject of rules of procedure.

4.53 The **Director** said that the Chairman's suggestion would be in line with the exercise conducted by the Bureau following WRC-12, when, at the request of the conference, it had sent out to administrations a circular letter containing the decisions taken by the conference enshrined in its minutes. It was clear that any endeavour to develop rules of procedure and consulting administrations in the process may lead to reopening the debates that had taken place at the corresponding conferences. The Bureau would therefore simply prepare a document quoting those decisions taken by the WRC since WRC-95 regarding which there was no rule of procedure, i.e. the seven items he had identified in Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2.

4.54 **Mr Strelets** said that Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2 was extremely useful to Board members and administrations, and he suggested it be posted on the Board's webpage.

4.55 It was so **agreed**, on the understanding also that the Director would issue a circular letter drawing the attention of administrations to the specific identified decisions of past WRCs that were of an interpretative nature.

Coordination of satellite networks around 116° E (Addendum 2 to Document RRB15-1/2)

4.56 Drawing attention to Addendum 2 to Document RRB15-1/2, the **Director** said that, following the first round of meetings which had been reported to the 67th meeting of the Board, the Bureau had invited delegations from China, the Republic of Korea and Papua New Guinea to continue coordination under the auspices of the Bureau. Representatives of the Administrations of China and the Republic of Korea, as well as satellite operators from both countries, had met in Bangkok on 4-6 February 2015. The same delegations plus representatives of the Papua New Guinea Administration and satellite operator had met at the same venue on 6-8 February 2015. The positive results achieved by the meetings relating to the Ku and Ka bands were reflected in § 8 of Addendum 2. Other administrations were involved in coordination at 116° E, but they faced fewer difficulties in coordinating and there was no need for the involvement of the Bureau. Responding to queries from **Mr Bin Hammad** and **Mr Bessi**, he explained that the agreement had been based on the compatible use of steerable and fixed beams. The parties had agreed to protect only those beams that had actually been used in the past year. The results of the coordination process were in the spirit of the Radio Regulations but it would be premature to attempt to derive regulatory provisions from that experience. The text of the agreement itself was confidential.

4.57 **Mr Bessi** suggested that the principle upon which the agreement had been based might be used in similar cases.

4.58 **Mr Strelets** said that such agreements should remain confidential and should not be seen by Board members. He noted that the last sentence of § 4 of Addendum 2 appeared to imply that implementation of No. **13.6** had been halted because of a decision taken by the Administration of Papua New Guinea. In his understanding it was for the Bureau rather than an administration to decide on the application of No. **13.6**.

4.59 The **Director** recalled that Mr Strelets had raised a similar concern at the 67th meeting. The Administration of Papua New Guinea had invoked No. **13.6** because responsibility for the satellite had been unclear. Once the two countries concerned had agreed on the date of transfer of responsibility, which had been the basis for the Bureau's decision, the Bureau had been able to conclude its investigation and had decided not to pursue application of No. **13.6**. He agreed with Mr Strelets that it was up to the Bureau rather than an administration to decide on the application of No. **13.6**.

4.60 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board should express its appreciation of the efforts of the Bureau in resolving the complex issue, which provided a good example in ITU of how a difficult problem could be resolved through goodwill and mutual efforts, as called for in the Constitution.

4.61 It was so **agreed**.

4.62 The Director's report (Document RRB15-1/2 and Addenda 1 and 2) was **noted**.

5 Submission by the Administration of the United States requesting the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network (Document RRB15-1/3)

5.1 The **Chairman** noted that, under No. 98 of the Constitution, Ms Wilson was to refrain from intervening in the debate because it concerned the Administration of her country.

5.2 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)**, introducing Document RRB15-1/3, recalled that the due date for payment of the invoice relating to the USOBO-12A satellite network had been 12 March 2014. The Bureau had sent a reminder to the administration on 17 January 2014 and, no payment having been received, the Bureau had decided at its BR IFIC weekly meeting held on 12 June 2014 to cancel the network filings. On 12 December 2014, the Administration of the United States had requested reinstatement of the network, explaining that payment had been made on 22 September 2014, having been delayed as a result of internal financial accounting matters. On 21 January 2015, the Bureau had informed the administration that the matter could be raised at the present meeting of the Board, an approach that the administration had requested on 10 February 2015.

5.3 The **Chairman** observed that, according to the letter dated 12 December 2014 from the Administration of the United States, the responsible satellite operator had received the invoice only in December 2013. He expressed surprise at the delay.

5.4 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)** said that the ITU Finance Department had confirmed that the invoice dated 12 September 2013 had been properly sent and had been received by the administration. The delay in the invoice reaching the operator appeared to stem from internal US processes. Responding to a query by **Mr Strelets**, he drew attention to the explanation provided by the administration in its letter dated 12 December 2014, namely that the operator had submitted funding to the administration's internal finance department in January 2014 to cover the cost of the invoice but because the invoice was dated 2013, only fiscal year 2013 funds could be used for payment. That had required the reprogramming of fiscal year 2014 funds to settle a fiscal year 2013 obligation, a process that had taken several months to accomplish.

5.5 **Mr Bessi** recalled that the Board had agreed at its 34th meeting that the Bureau should cancel network filings if payment had not been received by the time of the relevant BR IFIC meeting. He said that the Board's decisions should be consistent and asked for information on similar cases.

5.6 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)** noted that invoices had to be paid even if networks had been cancelled. He recalled that the Board had in the past always accepted requests by administrations for the reinstatement of their networks cancelled by the Bureau (because of non-payment at the time of the relevant BR IFIC meeting), provided the invoices had ultimately been paid.

5.7 **Ms Jeanty** confirmed that the Bureau had acted correctly in the case at present before the Board. She asked whether reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network would have an impact on other networks. It appeared that the delay in payment had been caused by administrative difficulties.

5.8 **Chief SSD** observed that cancelling a satellite network system was always advantageous to other systems submitted subsequently because they would have one less system with which to coordinate. In the present case, the matter before the Board related to cost recovery and whether to apply the cost-recovery provisions strictly. Happily, there had been few cases in the past where administrations had paid their invoices late and requested the Board to reinstate their networks. In all of those cases the Board had agreed that the networks should continue to be taken into account.

5.9 **Mr Bessi** stressed that the Board should be consistent. All previous such requests had been considered on a case-by-case basis, and had been accepted on the basis of specific arguments. In the present case, the network was real but payment had been delayed because of difficulties with internal financial procedures. The Board should accept the administration's request for the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network. In his view, the filing should be maintained in the MIFR.

5.10 **Mr Strelets** recalled that past cases had generally concerned developing countries and had often hinged on postal difficulties. In the case of the USOBO-12A satellite network, however, more than six months had elapsed before the administration had flagged the problem to the Bureau. He expressed concern that, by reinstating the network, the Board would set a precedent that would undermine Council Decision 482 and would be obliged to grant requests for reinstatement perhaps a year or two after filings had been cancelled by the Bureau. Administrations would see that the concept of "late payment" was meaningless. He recalled that the cancellation of the USOBO-12A satellite network had been reported to the 66th meeting of the Board in the Director's report and there had been no reaction from the Administration of the United States. The Board should examine the impact of reinstatement on other administrations.

5.11 **Mr Terán** agreed with Mr Bessi that the Board should consider such matters on a case-by-case basis. It seemed that the network had been brought into use in accordance with the declared characteristics, and he therefore thought that it should be maintained. He nevertheless shared the concern expressed by Mr Strelets that such a decision by the Board would risk undermining Council Decision 482.

5.12 **Mr Koffi** noted that the Bureau had informed the Board that the regulatory provisions had been met, the network was in service, and the invoice had been paid although payment had been delayed because of financial accounting difficulties. In his view, the network should not be cancelled.

5.13 **Ms Jeanty** pointed out that in this case there seem to be no direct adverse effects on other administrations. However, cancelling the USOBO-12A satellite network would be detrimental to the United States. She said that the Board therefore should accept the administration's request in this particular case.

5.14 **Mr Hoan** stressed the importance of respecting deadlines but said that, in the present case, he agreed with Ms Jeanty since there would be no adverse effect on other administrations.

5.15 **Mr Bin Hammad** suggested that, in concluding, the Board should note that reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network would not have an adverse effect on other administrations.

5.16 **Chief SSD**, informed the Board that the USOBO-12A satellite network was in fact still at the coordination stage and was not yet in service as previously indicated.

5.17 The **Chairman** observed that the corrected information changed the basis of the debate.

5.18 **Mr Strelets** asked the Bureau what other networks would be affected by the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.19 **Chief SSD** provided a list of networks that had to coordinate with USOBO-12A at 51.5°E because the coordination requests for those networks had been submitted after that of USOBO-12A. He observed that some of those networks were located close to USOBO-12A and coordination might prove difficult.

5.20 **Mr Strelets**, noting that there were around 17 administrations on the list, said that there were no grounds on which the Board could accede to the request by the Administration of the United States. Given that WRC-15 was imminent, he proposed that the Board should reject the request and suggest that the administration bring the matter up at the conference.

5.21 **Mr Magenta** pointed out that administrations always had the option of raising matters at the conference, whether or not the Board suggested such an approach. The Board's task was to apply the rules and regulations.

5.22 **Mr Bessi** observed that cancelling a network that was in service would create serious problems, and his earlier comments had reflected that concern. Now that it had been made clear that the USOBO-12A satellite network was still at the coordination stage, he thought that the Board should strictly apply the Radio Regulations, leaving it to the conference to reinstate the network if it saw fit.

5.23 **Mr Bin Hammad** agreed with previous speakers that the Board had to apply the Radio Regulations and Rules of Procedure.

5.24 **Mr Koffi** said that, while he had been in favour of maintaining the USOBO-12A satellite network on the understanding that it was in service, he now felt that the Board had to apply the provisions strictly and cancel the network. The Administration of the United States would be able to raise the matter at the conference.

5.25 **Mr Hoan** said that the Board had seemed earlier to have been moving towards concluding that it could accept the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network on the understanding that such a decision would not have any impact on other administrations. It appeared from the list provided by the Bureau, however, that other administrations would be affected. No provision of the Radio Regulations or rule of procedure would appear to allow the network to be retained. Obviously, an administration had the right to submit a case to the WRC, but there was no need for the Board to encourage an administration to do so.

5.26 **Ms Jeanty** said that, as a matter of principle, the timing of the WRC should not influence the Board's decision. She recalled that the Board had previously accepted similar requests from administrations and said that its present decision should be aligned with past practice. She had not

studied all earlier cases in depth, but she imagined that a similar coordination list could have been drawn up each time. She was in favour of not cancelling the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.27 **Ms Wilson** raised two questions of a general nature, relating to the practice of the Board. First, was it usual for the Board to examine coordination activity? Second, if the networks of different countries were involved, were Board members from those countries entitled to participate in the discussion?

5.28 The **Chairman** said that the Board did not look at coordination in detail but simply ascertained whether networks were affected. With regard to Board members participating in discussions, he hoped that members from countries with affected networks would be circumspect in their comments. If he forbade them to speak, and a large number of networks were involved, then there might be nobody left to participate in the discussion.

5.29 **Mr Khairov** suggested that the Board defer its consideration of the sensitive matter of the USOBO-12A satellite network to its next meeting. That would leave time to elicit the views of the Administration of the United States on the possibility of submitting a new coordination request for the network.

5.30 **Mr Strelets** urged the Board to consider the compromise suggested by Mr Khairov, since the crux of the problem related to priorities. Given that the USOBO-12A satellite network had been cancelled some six months previously, its reinstatement might pose problems to the Bureau.

5.31 **Mr Bessi**, responding to the remarks made by Ms Jeanty, requested information on previous similar cases to enable the Board to check that its decisions were consistent. To his recollection, the Bureau had always assured the Board that reinstatement would not cause problems for other networks.

5.32 **Chief SSD** provided two further documents for information: one listing 14 cases since 2006 where the Board, at the request of an administration, had reinstated a network that had been suppressed by the Bureau for no payment under Decision 482; the other giving details of the Board's consideration of each case. The geostationary orbit was now much more crowded than it had been in 2006, with more than one network per degree, making it difficult to compare the list of affected networks in the current case with similar lists in previous cases. In general, however, cancellation of a network made coordination easier for the remaining networks. He added that the Board had taken its decisions on a case-by-case basis, treating each case on its own merits and not setting a precedent. So far, the Board had accepted every request for reinstatement. There had, of course, been other cases of late payment where the Bureau had cancelled a network but where the administration concerned had not submitted a request to the Board for reinstatement of its network, even though the invoice had subsequently been paid.

5.33 **Mr Strelets** observed that a list of networks cancelled because of late payment of invoices was circulated in the Director's report to each meeting of the Board. He expressed concern that, if the Board reinstated the USOBO-12A satellite network, then any of the administrations whose networks had been cancelled by the Bureau might request reinstatement.

5.34 **Mr Koffi** asked whether any of the previous cases was similar to the case of the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.35 **Chief SSD** said that none of the networks (whether in the planned or non-planned services) had been in service when the administration concerned had requested reinstatement. Only OPTOS (Spain) and GOKTURK-1 (Turkey) had been put into service directly after the Board's decision to reinstate them.

5.36 **Mr Magenta** said that the information provided by the Bureau showed that previous cases were similar to the case currently before the Board. The information had caused him to change his mind and he now considered that the Board should accede to the request by the Administration of the United States.

5.37 **Mr Strelets** said that he had reviewed the information provided by the Bureau but was not ready to change his mind so quickly, having noted differences among the cases. For example, the Administration of Papua New Guinea had reported that it had not received the reminder sent by the Bureau concerning the deadline for payment of the relevant invoices. As another example, in the case of Ukraine, the Board had taken account of the fact that the request related to Ukraine's first national satellite network and that Ukraine had executed a contract to procure a satellite.

5.38 **Mr Hoan**, noting the information provided by the Bureau, emphasized the importance of consistency in the Board's decisions. Some of the Board's previous decisions had stated that there was no adverse impact to any other network. Nevertheless, in terms of priority, other networks would have lost any advantage that they might have gained from the cancellation of a network.

5.39 **Mr Bessi** thanked the Bureau for providing information on previous cases, which clarified the matter in particular in regard to impact on other networks. In the case of Papua New Guinea, the Board had reinstated the network despite adverse effects on Israeli satellite networks. The Board had dealt with all previous cases on a case-by-case basis. In each case the Board had decided to accept the administration's request. In the present case of the USOBO-12A satellite network, it would be inconsistent for the Board to refuse to reinstate the network.

5.40 **Mr Kibe** agreed with Mr Bessi. Although adopting a case-by-case approach did not set a precedent, the Board should be consistent. At its 58th meeting, the Board had been informed that reinstatement of the Papua New Guinea satellite network filings would make coordination difficult for the Administration of Israel. In the present case, there was a list of networks that had to coordinate with USOBO-12A. Information on the USOBO-12A satellite network was, however, in the public domain and if any administration would be affected by the reinstatement of USOBO-12A it would have submitted its concern to the Board, as Israel had done in the case of Papua New Guinea. Any effects on other networks could be resolved through coordination. He recommended that the Board accede to the request by the Administration of the United States.

5.41 **Ms Jeanty** thanked the Bureau for providing information on previous cases, noting that all of the networks had been at the coordination stage. The case of the USOBO-12A satellite network was similar to previous cases and was even less complicated than the case of Papua New Guinea, as explained by Mr Bessi and Mr Kibe. Reiterating her previous comments, she said that the Board should accede to the request by the Administration of the United States to reinstate the USOBO-12A satellite network. The Board had certainly looked deeply into this case and therefore could be considered to have fulfilled the requirements to look at matters on a case-by-case basis.

5.42 **Mr Khairov** emphasized the serious consequences of late payment of invoices. He suggested that the Administration of the United States be given the opportunity to coordinate with the affected networks, and that the Board take a final decision on the cancellation of the USOBO-12A satellite network at its next meeting.

5.43 The **Chairman** urged the Board to decide at the present meeting, noting that administrations were awaiting its decision.

5.44 **Mr Koffi** referred to the case of Ukraine, which the Board had discussed at its 53rd meeting. The Bureau had cancelled Ukraine's network for non-payment of invoice. The invoice had subsequently been paid and the Administration of Ukraine had requested reinstatement of the network. The Board had acceded to that request, despite opposition from the Administrations of Greece and Cyprus. In the case at present before the Board, no administration had opposed the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network. He was therefore in favour of acceding to the request by the Administration of the United States. The Board could request evidence of the existence of a contract to manufacture the satellite, but that would delay the Board's decision.

5.45 The **Chairman** observed that contracts always contained confidential information, and the Board did not deal with such information. The Board's decisions had to be taken on the basis of available and reliable information.

5.46 **Mr Terán** said that the Board was approaching consensus on the basis of its previous decisions, the information that had been made available and the spirit of collaboration. He had listened to previous speakers, in particular Mr Koffi, and noted that in the present case concerning a request by the Administration of the United States no other administration had raised any concerns. That being the situation, he considered that the Board should reinstate the USOBO-12A satellite network so that coordination could be completed as soon as possible. The Board should urge administrations to make payments in a timely manner under Council Decision 482. He hoped to see fewer and fewer late payments.

5.47 **Mr Hoan** questioned the meaning of the terms “similar” and “adverse impact”, recognizing that priority was important to administrations and that a decision by the Board would change priority in coordination. The Board would have to examine the previous cases in depth in order to determine their similarity to the present case and to compare the levels of adverse effects on other administrations. He suggested that, in the present case, the Board request the opinions of the affected administrations and meanwhile defer its decision on the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.48 The **Chairman** observed that a philosophical discussion of the meaning of the terms “similar” and “adverse impact” would never end. The fast-moving world of satellite networks needed a decision from the Board. The information provided by the Bureau showed that the present case was similar to previous cases, given that the priorities of administrations would change whenever a network was cancelled. He pointed out that, in coordination, priorities could be adjusted internally.

5.49 **Mr Hoan** pointed out that administrations would have no reason to complain if they were expecting the Board to strictly apply the Radio Regulations and Rules of Procedure, rather than base its decision on precedent.

5.50 **Mr Bessi** emphasized that the Board took a case-by-case approach. He did not anticipate any complaints from administrations if the Board were to decide to reinstate the USOBO-12A satellite network because, in any event, problems would have to be resolved through coordination. In the case of Papua New Guinea, for example, where a complaint had been received from Israel prior to the Board’s discussion, no administration had complained after the Board’s decision to reinstate Papua New Guinea’s network because the administrations concerned had to coordinate. If any administration was unhappy with the Board’s decision, it could bring the matter to the Board and the Board would deal with it.

5.51 **Mr Strelets** said that he had heard no argument that would justify reinstating the USOBO-12A satellite network, contrary to Council Decision 482 and to the Rules of Procedure. The Bureau had indeed acted correctly, while the administration had not responded until December 2014 to the July 2014 communication from the Bureau stating that the network had been cancelled. Furthermore, the current coordination situation was more challenging than that obtaining when the Board had discussed previous cases. Nowadays, multiple administrations might be interested in a single orbital location. It would be unfortunate, on the eve of WRC-15, if the Board were to take a decision that was contrary to Council Decision 482 and to the Rules of Procedure.

5.52 **Mr Koffi** said that the reasons given by the Administration of the United States in its letter dated 12 December 2014 appeared to be valid.

5.53 **Mr Bin Hammad** said that, as a new member of the Board listening to the debate, he understood that there was no precise way of dealing with such cases. The Board appeared to be moving towards agreement to reinstate the USOBO-12A satellite network based on a consideration of previous cases. Yet, at the same time, the Board was supposedly adopting a case-by-case approach. While he had full sympathy with the Administration of the United States, he stressed that the Board should also bear in mind any adverse effects that other administrations might suffer as a result of reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.54 **Mr Hoan** said that, like Mr Bin Hammad, he was attending the Board for the first time, and he was willing to rely on the experience of the Chairman and the Director, who had assured the Board

that the present case was similar to previous cases. He nevertheless found it difficult to accede to the request by the Administration of the United States. If the Board were to do so, it would give countries the feeling that they could blithely ignore payment deadlines. In order to avoid increasing the workload of the Bureau, he suggested that the Board should clarify the criteria for the reinstatement of networks when invoices had been paid late.

5.55 **Ms Jeanty**, reacting to the comments made by Mr Strelets, agreed that coordination of satellite networks was difficult but said that the difficulty was not greater in the present case than in previous cases. She saw no difference between the present case and previous cases except that payment had been made somewhat later. In her opinion, that did not constitute sufficient grounds for different treatment. The Board was probably looking at the last such case prior to WRC-15, and would be on dangerous grounds and inconsistent if it did not reinstate the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.56 **Mr Magenta** said that, according to the information provided by the Bureau, all previous cases had been in the coordination stage and the time lag from due date to payment had been 2-5 months. The Administration of the United States had paid the invoice and the USOBO-12A satellite network was real. In many of the previous cases, as well as in the present case, payment delays had been caused by administrative factors, of which any country could fall foul. In the present case, unlike in the case of Papua New Guinea, no administration had reacted to the request by the Administration of the United States for reinstatement of the network. The Board had always called on administrations to respect Council Decision 482, and no administration had abused the reinstatement of its network to disadvantage another administration. The present case was similar to previous cases, and any administration that wished to challenge the Board's decisions could bring the matter to WRC-15. If the conference concluded that the Board had been wrong in the past, then the Board could change its approach. At present, the Board should continue to be consistent.

5.57 **Mr Strelets** said that the present case was unlike previous cases because of the time that had elapsed. The Board had to take account of the adverse effect of reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network on other administrations which had presumably been engaged in coordination on the basis of a list provided by the Bureau that did not include the USOBO-12A satellite network.

5.58 **Chief SSD** explained that there was a delay between a decision by the Bureau at the BR IFIC meeting to cancel satellite network filings for non-payment of invoice and the actual implementation of that decision. In the case of the USOBO-12A satellite network, during that lapse of time the Administration of the United States had indicated that the invoice would be paid and had asked the Bureau not to cancel the filings. Whenever such a decision by the Bureau was contested, the Bureau suspended cancellation process to further investigate the issue, particularly in case where the Board might be involved. Thus the cancellation of the USOBO-12A satellite network had not yet been implemented pending a Board's decision and its reinstatement would have no impact on the work of the Bureau.

5.59 **Mr Magenta** asked whether the same would have been true for previous cases.

5.60 **Chief SSD** said that, for example, in the case of the request by the Administration of Italy for the reinstatement of the ALPHASAT TDP5 filing, some 15 networks would have been affected in an equivalent period but the effects – whether positive or negative – would have been alleviated during coordination. Nowadays, coordination commonly involved 30, 40 or even more satellite networks. Having one more or one less network with which to coordinate would have only a minimal impact. The cancellation of a network would make it only marginally easier to coordinate.

5.61 **Mr Strelets** noted that, based on the correspondence reproduced in Document RRB15-1/3, the Administration of the United States had reacted only on 12 December 2014 although the decision to cancel the network had been taken on 12 June 2014. He asked why the Bureau had not immediately removed the cancelled network from the list of networks with which administrations had to coordinate.

5.62 **Chief SSD** explained that the delay in implementing cancellation was linked to the Bureau's resources, not to the administration concerned. With limited resources, the Bureau gave priority to meeting regulatory deadlines for publication. The **Director** added that cancellation of a network involved a lot of work for the Bureau. The Bureau's resources were scarce, and it did not seem to be a good use of those resources to embark on the arduous procedures for cancelling a network when there was a high likelihood that the Board would reverse the Bureau's decision to cancel the network.

5.63 **Mr Strelets** said that the Bureau's decision to cancel a network because of late payment was a "final" decision in conformity with Council Decision 482. That decision could be reversed by the Board, just as a "final" decision by the Board could be reversed by the WRC. Initially his view had been that the decision concerning the USOBO-12A satellite network should be deferred to the conference. He was grateful for the enormous amount of work that the Bureau accomplished with scarce resources, but he stressed that, irrespective of the time it took to implement cancellation of a network, the USOBO-12A satellite network should not have appeared on the list sent out after 12 June 2014 indicating the networks with which subsequent networks had to coordinate.

5.64 The **Director** said that, by removing the network from the coordination list, the Bureau could be seen as pre-empting the Board's decision by making it more difficult to reinstate the network.

5.65 **Ms Jeanty** observed that the Bureau had followed the same procedures in carrying out its work as it had done in previous cases.

5.66 **Mr Strelets** said that the Bureau's practice of maintaining a cancelled network on the coordination list was absurd. It had done so for six months in the case of the USOBO-12A satellite network. If the Board agreed to reinstatement after such a lengthy period, the next case might involve a five- or ten-year delay.

5.67 **Mr Bessi** pointed out that because the Bureau had not deleted the USOBO-12A satellite network filing from its database, reinstatement of the network would not change coordination for other administrations. In his understanding, once the Bureau had decided to cancel a network for non-payment, it could go ahead with implementing the cancellation without any confirmation of its decision by the Board.

5.68 **Chief SSD** confirmed that understanding. Nevertheless, until the complex procedures involved in cancellation had been concluded and published in a special section of the BR IFIC, the network continued to be shown as "valid" in the database. During that time, if the Bureau was informed that the administration had paid the invoice and wanted to take its case to the Board, the Bureau kept the network pending in the database to avoid the workload involved in cancelling and reinstating the network. For that reason, the Bureau could state that reinstatement would have no impact on subsequent coordination requests from other administrations.

5.69 **Mr Strelets** said that he understood the Bureau's actions but considered them to be inconsistent. In the case of the USOBO-12A satellite network, the 66th meeting of the Board had been informed through the Director's report of the cancellation of the network. That was two meetings ago, and no objection had been received at the 67th meeting. The report of the Director to the current meeting (Document RRB15-1/2) indicated that hundreds of coordination requests had been suppressed in recent years. It was a cause for concern if networks were still being taken into account six months after the date of suppression. The Board had to protect the MIFR. Even if it took time physically to remove a network from the database, the Bureau should strictly follow the regulations and rules in force.

5.70 The **Chairman** said that, notwithstanding the views expressed by Mr Strelets, there appeared to be a consensus that the Board should accede to the United States' request. He therefore proposed that the Board conclude as follows:

"The Board carefully considered the submission in Document RRB15-1/3 regarding the request for the reinstatement of the USOBO-12A satellite network filing which has been cancelled by the Bureau for non-payment of the related invoices within the deadline. The

Board noted that in accordance with RR No. **9.38.1** and with Council Decision 482 (C-13), the BR had acted correctly in cancelling the USOBO-12A filing. Taking into account the fact that the payment was made by the Administration of the United States on 22 September 2014, the Board, in view of similar decisions in the past for similar cases, decided to instruct the Bureau to reinstate the USOBO-12A satellite network filing. The Board also invited the Administration of the United States and other involved administrations in the coordination procedure to continue making all efforts to complete the coordination.

The Board reiterated the requirement for administrations to meet deadlines, including those relating to payment under Council Decision 482 (C-13).”

5.71 It was so **agreed**.

6 Consideration of the status of the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network (Documents RRB15-1/4 and RRB15-1/6)

6.1 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB15-1/4, in which the Bureau requested the Board to take the decision to cancel the frequency assignments to the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz under No. **13.6** of the Radio Regulations. Outlining the background to the case as presented in Document RRB15-1/4, he said that on 9 May 2014 the Administration of Indonesia had confirmed to the Bureau the date of bringing into use of the frequency assignments to PALAPA-C4-A as 20 January 2014 in accordance with the provisions of No. **11.44B** of the Radio Regulations. On 23 June 2014, the Bureau had informed Indonesia that based on publicly available information it had been unable to verify the existence of the bands 3 402-3 698 and 6 425-6 723 MHz on board the currently operational PALAPA C2 satellite at 150.5° E. During its investigation, the Bureau had noted that the Administration of Indonesia had recorded assignments at the same orbital position in the bands 3 402-3 698 and 6 425-6 663 MHz for the PALAPA-C4 satellite network, and had informed Indonesia, in the same correspondence, that it had been unable to verify the existence of those bands on board PALAPA C2 either. In accordance with No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations, the Bureau had then requested the Administration of Indonesia to provide evidence of continuous operation of all the above-mentioned bands relating to PALAPA-C4-A and PALAPA-C4. On 23 September 2014, the Administration of Indonesia had confirmed the existence of the bands 3 402-3 698 and 6 425-6 723 MHz on board the PALAPA C2 satellite and had provided evidence through a frequency plan for the bands 3 402-3 698 and 6 425-6 665 MHz. On 2 October 2014, the Bureau had informed the Administration of Indonesia that it took note of the continuous use of the frequency assignments to networks PALAPA-C4-A and PALAPA-C4 in the frequency bands 3 402-3 698 and 6 425-6 665 MHz but could not consider the frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz relating to the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network to have been brought into use based on the information annexed to the correspondence dated 23 September 2014. In the absence of a response from the Administration of Indonesia, the Bureau had sent a first reminder on 12 November 2014. On 12 December 2014, the Administration of Indonesia had requested the Bureau not to cancel the frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz relating to the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network as it planned to use those assignments no later than 2016 and already had a contract for the manufacture of a new satellite. On 16 December 2014, it had informed the Bureau of the suspension of operation of the PALAPA-C4-A and PALAPA-C4 satellite networks from 31 October 2014 under No. **11.49** of the Radio Regulations. On 22 December 2014, the Bureau had informed the Administration of Indonesia that, in the absence of evidence, it was not in a position to accept the confirmation of bringing into use of the frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz to the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network under the provisions of No. **11.44B** of the Radio Regulations and that it would inform RRB of the disagreement of the Administration of Indonesia on the matter. In view of the foregoing, the Bureau requested the Board to take the decision to cancel the frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz to the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network in accordance with the provisions of No. **13.6** of the Radio Regulations.

6.2 He went on to draw attention to Document RRB15-1/6, containing a letter from the Administration of Indonesia to the Director of BR, indicating that it was in the process of procuring a new satellite to be launched no later than 2016 at 150.5° E, for which purpose it had signed a contract with Space System/Loral LLC on 28 April 2014 covering the frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz, where those frequency assignments would be used for telecommand operations in order to complement telemetry operations in the 3 640-3 700 MHz band. The Indonesian Administration further added that suppression of the aforementioned frequency assignments would lead to delay of the satellite procurement plan, and requested that those considerations be borne in mind by the Board when it took up Document RRB15-1/4. He further noted that Document RRB15-1/6 indicated that it contained an attachment in the form of an extract from a contract between PT BRI (Persero) Tbk and Space System/Loral LLC.

6.3 Responding to a query by **Mr Hoan**, **Chief SSD** said that the attachment referred to information of a proprietary nature, which could therefore not be made available to the Board, as per former Board's decision on similar matter.

6.4 **Mr Bessi** noted that Indonesia had requested suspension of the operation of satellite networks PALAPA-C4-A and PALAPA-C4 as from 31 October 2014 under No. **11.49** of the Radio Regulations. While that request could be accepted for those bands for which evidence of bringing into use had been submitted, it could not be accepted for bands for which no such evidence had been received by the Bureau, namely 6 665-6 723 MHz. The fact that the latter band had not been brought into use had been recognized implicitly by the Indonesian Administration in requesting acceptance of its bringing into use in 2016. He therefore did not see how the Board could agree to the band's suspension under No. **11.49** if it had not been brought into use in compliance with the applicable regulatory provisions. He saw no obstacle to accepting suspension for all the other bands concerned, which had been brought into use in compliance with the relevant regulations.

6.5 The **Chairman** said that he shared Mr Bessi's understanding. He saw no option but for the Board to agree to cancel the band 6 665-6 723 MHz.

6.6 **Mr Strelets** said that, to his understanding, the band in question was used for the uplink only for telecommand purposes providing telemetry transmission. Given that there would be radiation only by the earth station concerned, rather than the space station, and in a very narrow band, he wondered on what information the Bureau had based its conclusion that the band was not used.

6.7 **Chief SSD** said that one means of checking whether a band was used or not was to access a description of the satellite purportedly used, and there was indeed ample information available on satellite PALAPA C2. That information failed to bear out the existence of certain bands on the satellite, and the Bureau had therefore requested the Indonesian Administration to clarify the matter. Indonesia had provided plausible information regarding the use of all the bands queried, with the exception of the band 6 665-6 723 MHz, and for that reason the Bureau had concluded that the latter band was not being used and should be cancelled on the grounds of not having been brought into use.

6.8 Adding further details following an additional query by **Mr Strelets**, regarding Indonesia's request for suspension under No. **11.49**, he said that satellite PALAPA C2 had been used at 150.5° E up until a certain date before being moved elsewhere, and the date of that move had preceded the date requested by Indonesia for commencement of the suspension period. That had prompted the Bureau to look at the description of the satellite and the frequencies it used, leading it to accept the fact that certain bands could have been used, but not the band 6 665-6 723 MHz. The only information provided on that band by Indonesia was that it would be catered for as from 2016.

6.9 **Mr Kibe** said that he was satisfied that the Bureau had acted correctly in the present case, including in requesting the cancellation of Indonesia's assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz. The request for suspension of use of the band was not receivable because the requirement for continuous use under No. **11.44B** had not been fulfilled. In view of § 1.6*bis* of its working methods (Part C of the Rules of Procedure), it was his understanding that the Board could not make any use of the confidential information in the attachment to Indonesia's submission in Document RRB15-1/6.

6.10 **Chief SSD** said that the attachment was clearly marked confidential. He could inform the Board that it contained extracts of a contract which indicated that certain frequencies would be used in 2016, including the band 6 665-6 723 MHz for the FSS uplink for public correspondence.

6.11 **Mr Bessi** said that to his understanding Indonesia had requested the suspension of all bands assigned to networks PALAPA-C4 and PALAPA-C4-A as from 31 October 2014, whereas the PALAPA C2 satellite had been moved from 150.5° E on 21 October 2014. The case under consideration therefore presented two difficulties. First, suspension for all the bands should have been requested as from 21 October 2014, rather than 31 October; and second, the band 6 665-6 723 MHz could not be suspended because apparently it had never been brought into use. It would be useful to know whether the other bands had been used between 21 and 31 October 2014.

6.12 The **Chairman** recalled that the Board had dealt with a similar case at its 67th meeting: it had been requested to retain an entire band, but based on information provided by the Bureau that part of the band had not been used, it had decided to cancel that part of the band.

6.13 **Mr Khairov** welcomed that information on the similar case dealt with by the Board at a past meeting. He suggested that the Board might be able to approach the matter from the angle suggested earlier by Mr Strelets, regarding the use of an uplink which would have no effect on other networks and be used over the national territory only.

6.14 **Mr Strelets** said that the case now before the Board differed from the one it had dealt with at its previous meeting. He wished to focus on the use to be made by Indonesia of the band now under consideration, and on the technical aspects of the case. To his understanding, the band would be used for specific, non-commercial purposes, and for telecommand only. Moreover, he found it questionable to accept certain bands for the system under consideration while suppressing another band that went with them. Noting that the Bureau had access to confidential information regarding the case, he said it was important for the Board to have more technical information on the proposed system before taking a decision.

6.15 The **Chairman** said that the case before the Board was not technical, but hinged upon whether a band had been brought into use or not.

6.16 **Ms Jeanty** said that she supported the views expressed by Mr Bessi.

6.17 **Chief SSD** said that Indonesia had indicated in its original satellite network filing that the uplink would be used in the FSS for public correspondence. Although such terminology did not specifically exist within the framework of the Radio Regulations, he considered it reasonable to assume that the use intended would be commercial. Indonesia further indicated in its late document that the involved frequency bands would be used for telecommand operations. Regarding the use of confidential information, he said that Indonesia had openly provided information to the effect that the band 6 665-6 723 MHz would be used on a future satellite that would be launched in 2016, thus the Bureau had not made use of any confidential information in accepting certain bands and rejecting others. As to the dates of suspension requested for those bands that had been accepted as having been brought into use, the Bureau was seeking to clarify the matter with the Administration of Indonesia. The request before the Board pertained solely to the cancellation of a specific band on the grounds that it had not been brought into use within the applicable regulatory period, and the Board need not address the question of the dates of suspension.

6.18 The **Chairman** said that the band in question had not been brought into use and, according to the Indonesian Administration, would not be brought into use before 2016. If the Board decided not to suppress the band, it would be extending the relevant regulatory period, and that went beyond the Board's competence.

6.19 **Mr Hoan** said that he fully supported the Bureau's work in seeking to keep the MIFR as up-to-date and RR-compliant as possible, and recognized that the Bureau had applied the provisions of the Radio Regulations correctly. Nevertheless, Indonesia was a developing country with special needs and a specific geographical situation in that it comprised thousands of islands, making satellite

deployment and TT&C essential to it. He therefore hoped that Indonesia could be given more time to explain the situation, and that the case could be analysed from a technical angle in order to find a solution.

6.20 The **Chairman** said that, while he sympathized with Indonesia's situation, the Board was required to implement the provisions of the Radio Regulations strictly, recognizing that if an administration wished to receive special treatment, it must seek it from the WRC. The Board was not authorized to grant extensions of regulatory deadlines or in any way relax application of the Radio Regulations.

6.21 **Mr Kibe** endorsed the Chairman's comments. The Board had to apply the existing provisions of the Radio Regulations and base itself on precedent where appropriate. It could not involve itself in what precise use was to be made of given bands, or whether they were to be used for uplinks or downlinks, but must base its decisions on the information available to it. If Indonesia sought special treatment, it must do so from the WRC. The Bureau had applied the Radio Regulations correctly, and the Board should accede to its request to cancel Indonesia's frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz.

6.22 **Mr Strelets** said that the Board would shortly be taking up its report to WRC-15 under Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**, and he noted that the Board's previous reports to the conference, annexed to Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-03), referred specifically to the difficulties faced by developing countries in their efforts to deploy satellite systems, and, *inter alia*, suggested, in regard to extending regulatory time-limits for bringing into use, that "conditions could be specified under which extensions might be granted on an exceptional basis to developing countries when they are not able to complete the regulatory date requirements...". Thus, regulatory texts did refer to the possibility of granting such extensions to developing countries facing difficulties. Mr Hoan had referred to the exceptional geographical situation of Indonesia, and Indonesia referred in its letter to the specific uses for which the band under consideration would be used. The Board was therefore faced with the concrete requirement of a developing country to which it should be able to respond positively.

6.23 The **Chairman** agreed that Resolution **80** made several references to special measures for developing countries, but those measures were still under debate, which was why the Board was asked to provide further input under the resolution. He recalled that whenever the WRC discussed the possible granting of extensions to regulatory time-limits, many countries expressed reluctance. The Board had clear instructions not to relax the provisions of the Radio Regulations, it being recognized that countries could always submit their cases to the WRC. Resolution **80** could not be used as justification for relaxing the provisions of the Radio Regulations.

6.24 The **Director** said that it was safe to assume that other administrations, including developing countries, had satellite systems in the vicinity of 150.5° E, and to accede to Indonesia's request would likely be to breach the rules in favour of one developing country to the detriment of others. In the case under consideration, the key point was that, despite two letters from the Bureau, Indonesia had failed to provide evidence that a particular band had been brought into use, indicating instead that it would be used as from 2016.

6.25 The **Chairman** said that, despite the sympathy which he and other Board members felt for Indonesia in the present case, the Board had no option but to suppress the frequency assignments in the band 6 665-6 723 MHz. He proposed that the Board conclude as follows:

"The Board carefully considered the submissions in Documents RRB15-1/4 and RRB15-1/6 received from the BR and the Administration of Indonesia, respectively, regarding the cancellation of the frequency assignments in the frequency band 6 665-6 723 MHz of the PALAPA-C4-A satellite network of the Administration of Indonesia at 150.5° E.

The Board, on the basis of the results of the investigations by the Bureau under No. **13.6** of the Radio Regulations and taking into account the absence of additional information from the Administration of Indonesia in the said frequency band, decided to cancel the frequency

assignments of PALAPA-C4-A satellite network in the frequency band 6 665-6 723 MHz from the MIFR.

The Board instructed the Bureau to suppress the corresponding assignments from the Master Register and to bring this decision to the attention of the Administration of Indonesia.”

6.26 It was so **agreed**.

6.27 **Mr Strelets** said that he had serious misgivings about the decision just taken, in that the Indonesian Administration had provided evidence that it would use the frequency band 6 665-6 723 MHz as from 2016 for an essential function which would nevertheless involve operation for only several minutes a day. The Board should endeavour to work humanely and constructively, doing its best to accommodate administrations with authentic difficulties, on a case-by-case basis. While pursuing its fight against paper satellites, the Board should do its utmost to defend genuine satellite projects, applying not only the provisions of the Radio Regulations but also those of Resolution **80**. He was nevertheless obliged to accept the decision taken by the Board.

6.28 The **Chairman** reiterated that, as custodians of the Radio Regulations, the Board was obliged to apply the Radio Regulations strictly, particularly in regard to regulatory deadlines, in the knowledge that, as on several previous occasions, the WRC could subsequently decide in favour of the administration if the latter took the matter to the conference.

7 Requests for suspension of satellite networks under No. 11.49 of the Radio Regulations received more than six months after the date of the suspension (Document RRB15-1/5)

7.1 **Chief SSD** recalled that under No. **11.49**, whenever the use of a recorded frequency assignment to a space station was suspended for more than six months, the notifying administration had the responsibility to inform the Bureau as soon as possible but no later than six months from the start date of the suspension. In accordance with the rule of procedure on No. **11.49**, the Bureau examined whether or not the frequency assignment to be suspended was in use up to the requested date of suspension, adjust the duration of the suspension accordingly and maintained the assignment in the MIFR even if information of the suspension was received beyond the six month limit set in the provision. He hoped that WRC-15 would clarify the matter.

7.2 **Mr Strelets** stressed that the Board was simply being asked to take note of the Bureau’s decision. The Board could not approve a decision that clearly violated a provision of the Radio Regulations that stated that information on suspension must be sent to the Bureau not later than six months after the start of the suspension. In the cases listed in Document RRB15-1/5, the date of receipt of the requests for suspension was more than two years after the date of the start of suspension. He asked whether No. **13.6** should be applied.

7.3 The **Chairman** recalled that the Board had often dealt with such cases and each time had recognized that, despite requiring suspension to be reported within six months, the provision was silent on what should happen to administrations if that requirement was not met. Thus No. **11.49** was an example of a regulation without sanctions. The Board had already decided to raise the problem at WRC-15. The current practice, as decided by the Board at its 65th meeting, was that the Bureau would accept such late requests for suspension and bring its decisions to the attention of the Board. He said that the Board had to be consistent in its actions and noted that similar situations might arise under No. **11.44B**, where again there was no indication of the consequences to administrations of non-respect of the provision.

7.4 **Mr Strelets** reiterated that the Board could not endorse an approach in which the Radio Regulations were not met. He understood that the Bureau informed the Board of such cases, and the Board simply noted the information.

7.5 The **Chairman** pointed out that the Board would not accept a suspension beyond the three-year period allowed in the Radio Regulations.

7.6 **Chief SSD** confirmed that, as in previous cases, the Board was simply being asked to note the Bureau's decision taken in conformity with the rule of procedure on No. **11.49**. He recalled that in its previous discussion of the matter the Board had been unable to find an alternative approach. Responding to the query by Mr Strelets regarding the application of No. **13.6**, he explained that the Bureau had asked the Administration of the United States to clarify the use of certain frequency assignments at 178°E and was convinced that the assignments had been in use up to 27 July 2012, hence the request for suspension had been acceptable. He recalled that implementation of No. **13.6** could be triggered as a result of clarification sought by the Bureau or by a request from another administration.

7.7 **Mr Hoan** observed that there were two limits in No. **11.49**, namely six months for notifying the Bureau of the suspension and three years for bringing the network back into use. The Board should bring the general problem of the lack of sanctions to the attention of WRC-15 and meanwhile note the Bureau's actions in particular cases.

7.8 **Ms Wilson** observed that the problem was a recurring one, and for that reason the Board should bring it to the attention of the conference.

7.9 The Board **agreed** to conclude as follows:

“In relation to the request for the suspension of the satellite networks INTELSAT 6 178E and INTELSAT 9 178E, the Board noted that the Bureau had applied the RR provisions and the Rules of Procedure on No. **11.49** correctly and took note of the decision of the BR to accept the requests for suspension of these satellite networks mentioned in Document RRB15-1/5.

As the delay of a request for suspension of a satellite network beyond the six-month deadline for such requests has become a recurring situation, the Board decided to bring the matter to the attention of WRC-15.”

8 Election of the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the Board's working groups

8.1 Mr Bessi, former Vice-Chairman of the Board's Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, was **elected** Chairman and Mr Bin Hammad was **elected** Vice-Chairman of the Board's Working Group on the Rules of Procedure.

8.2 Ms Wilson was **elected** Chairman of the Board's Working Group on Resolution **80**. It was **agreed** that there was no need to elect a vice-chairman for the working group at the present juncture.

9 Consideration of the report of the Board's Working Group on the Rules of Procedure (Document RRB12-1/4(Rev.12))

9.1 The **Chairman** invited Mr Bessi, as Chairman of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, to lead the discussion on the report of the working group.

9.2 **Mr Bessi** drew attention to Document RRB12-1/4(Rev.12), which was a constantly evolving document containing a list of proposed rules of procedure considered by the Board and its Working Group on the Rules of Procedure since WRC-12, divided into the four categories described on the first page of the document. Category 1 contained 24 rules, 23 of which had been approved; the rule on No. 11.44B had not been approved, since the Board had decided to refer the matter to WRC-15 in its report under Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**. Under category 2, ten rules had been approved; the rule on satellite launch failure within ninety days had not been approved, it too being referred to WRC-15 in the report under Resolution **80**, in view of the fact that several methods were still under study. Also under category 2, no rule on Resolutions **552 (WRC-12)** and **553 (WRC-12)** had been approved; the matter was to be taken into consideration under WRC-15 agenda item 9, and would possibly be included in the Director's report. Under categories 3 and 4, three and five rules had been approved, respectively.

9.3 **Mr Strelets** confirmed what Mr Bessi had said about a possible rule on satellite launch failure: the Board was to have approved a rule based on the findings of ITU-R studies, but those studies had not been completed, and findings to date had produced diametrically opposed views, including the view that there should be no regulations or rules on the matter, and that cases should be dealt with case by case by the Board.

9.4 **Mr Bessi** said that views were indeed very diverse, ranging from the requirement for a simple declaration of launch failure from the administration concerned, to submission of the case to the Board for decision. The situation would be reflected under “status” opposite that rule.

9.5 **Mr Strelets** asked what was to be done with the new document being prepared by the Bureau further to the Board’s consideration of Addendum 1 to Document RRB15-1/2. The document was to list items for which rules of procedure might be prepared, but surely those items should be incorporated in a further revision of Document RRB12-1/4, rather than having two documents in parallel, both on future rules of procedure.

9.6 The **Director** said that the document under preparation would be posted on the Board’s website and sent out to administrations in a circular letter. However, as he had suggested earlier in the meeting, it might be preferable not to develop rules on the conference decisions it covered, since to do so might reopen the debates of past WRCs when the draft rules were sent out to administrations for comment, although the conference’s decisions on the subjects had been definitive. For most of the issues, rules could be developed but were not necessarily needed, whereas there were one or two areas of great sensitivity for which the development of a draft rule might prove difficult.

9.7 **Mr Strelets** said that his concern was that the status of decisions reflected in WRC minutes was still somewhat unclear, and administrations were faced with too many regulatory texts, as well as requirements reflected in circular letters. The Working Group on the Rules of Procedure might therefore look at the seven items in the document under preparation to see which could be readily added to Document RRB12-1/4, leaving aside those that might prove too sensitive. He could nevertheless agree to the Director’s proposed way forward.

9.8 **Mr Bessi** said that it was his understanding that the document under preparation would be analysed by the Bureau and the Working Group to identify any elements that might be candidates for rules of procedure, and those would be incorporated in Document RRB12-1/4, as appropriate.

9.9 The Board **agreed** to update Document RRB12-1/4(Rev.12) and post it on the RRB website for further review at the 69th meeting.

9.10 The **Chairman** thanked Mr Bessi for all the work he had done on the rules of procedure.

9.11 **Mr Bessi** noted that thanks were due especially to Mr Ebadi, for all his work on the subject in his eight years as a Board member.

10 Consideration of the draft report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-15 under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) (Document RRB15-1/1)

10.1 The **Chairman** invited Ms Wilson, as Chairman of the Working Group on Resolution **80**, to lead the discussions on the Board’s draft report to WRC-15 under Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**.

10.2 **Ms Wilson** drew attention to Document RRB15-1/1, containing the draft report of the Board to WRC-15 under Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**. Referring to § 9 of the minutes of the Board’s previous meeting (Document RRB14-3/9), she recalled that, with Ms Zoller chairing the working group, an initial draft in the form of an information document had been considered by the Board at its 67th meeting, and numerous inputs had been incorporated, including new text from Mr Ebadi on satellite failure. At the end of the 67th meeting, the decision had been taken to translate the draft report into all languages of the Union for further consideration at the present meeting. It had also been disseminated in a circular letter to administrations, eliciting comment and input in time for consideration by the Board at its 69th meeting. Her intention was to conduct an initial review of the

draft report at the present meeting, with a view to finalizing it at the 69th meeting. She invited members to first make general comments, before moving on to reviewing the draft report section by section.

10.3 In the ensuing discussions, various minor or editorial amendments were suggested, and the following main comments were made.

10.4 **Mr Strelets** said that the report should put forward precise and concrete proposals from the Board, bearing in mind that proposals made by the Board to WRC-12 had provided the basis for a number of conference decisions.

10.5 Regarding § 4.1 dealing with No. **13.6** of the Radio Regulations, **Mr Strelets** said that No. 13.6 indicated the deadlines applicable to replies from administrations, but failed to give deadlines for the correspondence to be sent by the Bureau. Responding to a query by **Ms Jeanty** regarding the meaning of the sentence “In practice, it is difficult to apply No. **13.6** retroactively to circumstances that may have existed in the distant past”, he said that No. **13.6** contained an implicit element of retroactivity, in that it did not exclude investigations into whether or not a recorded assignment had been brought into use, say, a decade ago, whereas such investigations were surely not intended. Moreover, bringing into use had to be checked in accordance with No. **11.44B**, but that was a new provision introduced by WRC-12, which had at the same time introduced some confusion by removing the concept of “regular use” which had existed until then. Hence also the confusion in the application of No. **11.49**. It would be useful to clarify those points, including the concept of regular use, in order to simplify the work of the Bureau.

10.6 The **Chairman** said that the sentence queried by Ms Jeanty related to investigations, which had indeed come before the Board, into cases involving so-called first-generation satellites that had existed some ten years ago and had since been replaced by second-generation satellites. The Board had been of the view that such investigations were not intended under No. **13.6**.

10.7 Referring to the second paragraph in § 4.1.1 (on the meaning of “reliable information”) and the information accepted by the Board as being “reliable”, **Mr Bessi** said that the text should be amended to reflect the fact that information provided by an administration further to a request by the Bureau could be confirmed by the Bureau in the steps it took under No. **13.6**, or could be shown to be inaccurate. The text should refer to the response by the notifying administration “supported, as appropriate, by the BR in the application of No. **13.6**”.

10.8 **Mr Strelets** said that the “reliable information” referred to at the beginning of No. **13.6** should be sent by the Bureau, quoting its source, to the notifying administration concerned, in order to ensure fair treatment of that administration.

10.9 **Mr Khairov** suggested that reference be made to the international monitoring system, which surely played a key role when it came to “reliable information”, and to determining causes of interference, use of frequency assignments in non-compliance with notified characteristics, etc. **Mr Hoan** agreed.

10.10 **Mr Strelets** commented that the question of international monitoring was sensitive and complex, and had been discussed for some time now, including at the plenipotentiary conference. It entailed the risk of bringing the interests of third parties into play, and raised significant questions, for example in terms of financial impact and human resources, and whether or not content was to be monitored. Agreement had not been reached on it at ITU-level, therefore it remained a matter for individual administrations for the time being. He would be against referring to it in the section now under consideration.

10.11 **Ms Wilson** said that international monitoring was dealt with elsewhere in the draft report, and the **Chairman** added that it would be better not to list possible sources of information, since problems might then arise stemming from whether any such list was intended to be exhaustive or not.

10.12 **Mr Strelets** said that the concept of “reliable information available” was applicable only to the first stage of No. **13.6**, initiating the process of investigation. It would be inappropriate for the Board to qualify as “reliable” or not the information subsequently provided by the notifying administration in response to the Bureau’s request for clarification. It should be made clear that it was the Bureau that decided, in the initiation phase of No. **13.6**, what it should take as “reliable information”, on a case-by-case basis. **Mr Magenta** endorsed those comments.

10.13 **Ms Wilson** said the text would be amended to reflect those concerns.

10.14 Regarding § 4.1.2 (on the meaning of “brought into use” or “is no longer in use”), **Mr Strelets** said that although No. **11.44B** dealt with bringing into use, No. **13.6** also raised the question of whether or not an assignment had been brought into use, thereby creating doubts regarding the Bureau’s action under No. **11.44B** and introducing an element of retroactivity. A clear distinction should be drawn between the purposes of the two provisions and the concepts they covered. In his view, No. **11.44B** should deal exclusively with bringing into use, whereas No. **13.6** should deal solely with the action taken by the Bureau to check whether a satellite was present at a given orbital position and in use operating in accordance with the notified characteristics. It seemed, nevertheless, that § 4.1.2 lumped everything together.

10.15 **Mr Bessi** said that views differed regarding whether or not there should be a link between No. **13.6** and Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B**. Some were of the view that the Bureau should not apply No. **13.6** when dealing with submissions under Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B**, whereas others, in line with the concept of “reliable information”, were of the opposite view. The draft CPM Report dealt with the issue by putting forward a footnote to Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B** indicating the applicability of No. **13.6** when reliable information pointed to it. He would be in favour of adding a paragraph to § 4.1.2 covering the applicability of No. **13.6** vis-à-vis Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B**.

10.16 **Mr Strelets** said that to link No. **13.6** with Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B** would overcomplicate matters and the work of the Bureau, and he saw no rationale for doing so. The Bureau had considerable leeway under No. **11.44B** to require whatever evidence was needed from an administration to confirm bringing into use. He reiterated that bringing into use and regular operation (90 days) were two entirely different things: previously, the latter had been reflected in No. **13.6**, whereas now it appeared in No. **11.44B**. Moreover, there was no link between the application of No. **11.49** and bringing into use. To clearly establish the distinctions he was drawing would greatly simplify matters for both administrations and the Bureau.

10.17 **Mr Bessi** said that Mr Strelets’ views were shared by a number of administrations. It would nevertheless be preferable for the Bureau and Board to be able to check any information provided by administrations regarding the bringing into use and regular operation of their assignments, and he would therefore like to propose to the conference, in line with the concept of reliable information, to authorize the Bureau to apply No. **13.6** whenever it deemed it necessary, including upon the receipt of information under Nos. **11.44** and **11.44B**.

10.18 **Ms Wilson** said that a new paragraph would be added to reflect the elements referred to by Mr Strelets and Mr Bessi.

10.19 Regarding § 4.5.1 (on additional considerations regarding No. **11.44B**: linkage between bringing into use and notification for recording in the MIFR), the **Chairman** said that the subject had been discussed at some length at the Board’s 67th meeting, and he had endeavoured to incorporate all the comments made. Views were divided on the basic issue of whether or not it had been WRC-12’s intention for there to be a link between date of notification and date of bringing into use. He had looked into the conference documentation, minutes, etc., and had even consulted the Chairman of Committee 5 of WRC-12, but had found no answers. In § 4.5.1, he hoped he had reflected all elements of the problem, including the Board’s attempts to adopt a rule of procedure covering all areas of No. **11.44B** where such a rule might be necessary.

10.20 **Mr Strelets** said that difficulties arose regarding No. **11.44B** because an attempt had been made to incorporate the concept of regular operation in text that dealt with bringing into use, whereas the two concepts were, to his mind, separate and different. In the present report, the Board might highlight the difficulties, and ask the conference to indicate what specific action should be taken when implementing No. **11.44B**. Under No. **11.44B**, the Bureau needed to ascertain only that bringing into use had taken place, i.e. that a space station had been deployed at a given orbital position with the capability of transmitting or receiving the frequency assignment in question. The Bureau could ask the notifying administration to provide all necessary information as evidence of bringing into use, and it was in the administration's obvious interest to do so, hence there was no need to seek to apply No. **13.6** under No. **11.44B**. Regular operation did not come into consideration in regard to bringing into use. Thus, and since the concept of regular operation, be it in terms of 90 days or any other period, was fundamental to No. **11.49**, it should be incorporated in that provision rather than in No. **11.44B**. Having referred to the difficulties encountered by the Board in its efforts to approve a rule of procedure on No. **11.44B** and the reasons for its decision to abandon those efforts, he said that bringing into use could come in two different forms: an assignment already recorded provisionally under No. **11.47** could be brought into use, in which case No. **13.6** could apply, since it was applicable to recorded assignments; or an unrecorded assignment could be brought into use, in which case No. **13.6** could not apply. Thus, the application of Nos. **11.44B** and **13.6** differed fundamentally, in that the former concerned acceptance for recording purposes, the latter the removal of something already recorded.

10.21 The **Chairman** said that the points made by Mr Strelets were valid, but to his understanding no longer necessarily pertinent. Previously, there had been no mechanism enabling the Bureau to check the validity of bringing into use announced by an administration. When the matter had been discussed at the Board's 63rd and 64th meetings, he had argued that a mechanism similar to No. **13.6** would serve the purpose of checking validity, but it had then been pointed out that No. **13.6** could perfectly well serve the purpose, allowing the Bureau to cancel a notification if appropriate. That approach had been endorsed, circulated to administrations for comment, and approved, giving rise to the present and very clear situation. The section of the report now under consideration sought to cover those parts of No. **11.44B** that remained unclear.

10.22 **Mr Bessi** agreed with the Chairman that issues relating to No. **13.6** were not the source of the problems encountered relating to a possible link between bringing into use and notification for recording in the MIFR. He considered the text of § 4.5.1 to be an accurate summary of the issue, but said the conclusions should include a clear request for WRC-15 to explain the possible linkage between bringing into use and notification for recording in the MIFR in the application of No. **11.44B**.

10.23 **Mr Magenta** said that the concept of regular operation had been discussed at length in the past, and had given rise to acceptance by WRC-12 of the ninety-day period reflected in No. **11.44B**, which now appeared to be a well-accepted provision. The basic problems that now needed to be addressed were the consequences when an administration did not meet the conditions set forth in No. **11.44B**, and the matter of a possible linkage between bringing into use and notification. He therefore endorsed Mr Bessi's suggestion.

10.24 **Mr Strelets** said that the decisions taken by WRC-12 had complicated the work of the Bureau and Board, resulting *inter alia* in the loss of the concept of regular use – which, he reiterated, should be associated with No. **11.49** rather than with No. **11.44B** – and incorporation of the ninety-day period in No. **11.44B**. When ascertaining whether bringing into use had taken place, thus ensuring recording in the MIFR, the Bureau should check that two conditions had been fulfilled: that a complete filing had been submitted to the Bureau, and that a satellite was in position at the corresponding orbital position capable of transmitting or receiving the assigned frequency.

10.25 The **Chairman** stressed that No. **11.44B** was complete save that it failed to indicate the consequences of non-compliance with the thirty-day deadline it contained, thus creating the question of whether or not there should be a link between date of bringing into use and date of notification.

10.26 **Ms Wilson** said that the conclusion to § 4.5.1 would be amended as suggested by Mr Bessi.

10.27 Regarding § 4.5.2 (on the period of in-orbit testing (IOT) and bringing into use), **Mr Hoan** said that in order to avoid abuse in regard to bringing into use, in-orbit testing at a location other than the notified orbital position could not be accepted as part of the ninety-day period referred to in No. **11.44B**. He suggested that the text of § 4.5.2 be amended accordingly.

10.28 The **Chairman** said that in past discussions the Board had been of the view that IOT could not count as part of the period of operation considered to constitute regular operation. The latter concept had nevertheless been suppressed by WRC-12 and the ninety-day period introduced. The purpose of the text under consideration was to ask the WRC to clarify whether or not IOT could be counted in the ninety-day period.

10.29 **Mr Strelets** said that, leaving aside the fact that operators could conduct IOT at an orbital position other than the one notified, it was impossible for the Bureau or Board to determine when a satellite was being tested as opposed to being operated normally. Under some circumstances, some transponders of a satellite could be operational while other transponders remained under testing, possibly for years, even when the requirements of No. **11.44B** were satisfied. Details regarding IOT were often privy only to the operator. All the Bureau and Board could do was check under No. **11.44B** whether a satellite with the capability of transmitting or receiving the assigned frequency was deployed at the notified orbital position. The section of the report under consideration complicated matters and should perhaps be removed.

10.30 **Mr Bessi** preferred to leave the wording of § 4.5.2 unchanged, as it would better reflect the Board's past discussions, and to ask the conference to clarify whether IOT should count in the bringing-into-use period.

10.31 **Mr Hoan** supported the views expressed by Mr Strelets regarding the conditions to be satisfied for bringing into use. The section of the Board's report under consideration should reflect the fact that the matter had been discussed at length by numerous bodies, including the Board.

10.32 **Mr Magenta** said that the point under discussion was extremely sensitive and related closely to what action the Bureau should take when faced with incomplete information, to the question of what constituted bringing into use and regular operation, and to whether or not IOT could be counted for the purposes of the ninety-day period. The Board should not express its support of any particular viewpoint, but should simply request the conference to clarify the ninety-day period in No. **11.44B**.

10.33 **Mr Koffi** said that the text of § 4.5.2 should be left unchanged, as it adequately reflected the Board's past discussions. It should not reflect any particular viewpoint as being the position of the Board.

10.34 **Ms Wilson** suggested that the text be modified to reflect the amendment requested by Mr Hoan and the points made by the Chairman, and that the entire section be placed in square brackets for further discussion.

10.35 It was so **agreed**.

10.36 Regarding § 4.6.1, it was **agreed** that the conclusion would be placed in square brackets with a view to rewording.

10.37 It was **agreed** to make certain amendments to § 4.6.4 to reflect aspects of Resolution **186 (Busan, 2014)**.

10.38 Regarding § 4.7 (on satellite leasing) and § 4.7.2 in particular (on further interpretation of the minutes of the 13th plenary meeting (Document CMR12/554)), **Mr Strelets** said that it was questionable to what extent leasing, be it of satellites or frequency bands and assignments, fell within the competence of ITU. ITU was responsible for the regulatory use of spectrum and orbit, and for resolving cases of interference when they arose. It appeared now to be getting involved in coordination matters between operators and in their commercial activities. ITU's links were with administrations, and the latter leased neither to nor from anyone; they issued licences to operators for

activities, and regulated those activities in compliance with international and national legislation. ITU could not involve itself in the deals struck between operators, lest it be seen to be inviting them to trade frequency bands, orbital positions, etc. Moreover, the general understanding under international space law appeared to be that no part of space could belong definitively to any given country. The Board should be wary of the signal it might be sending out in that section of its report, lest operators take it as authorizing the purchase of spectrum or orbital resources.

10.39 The **Chairman** said that the basic purpose of the Board's report under Resolution 80 was to identify ways to foster fulfilment of the intent of the resolution. In that pursuit, the Board had encountered certain difficulties, and had deemed it appropriate to bring those difficulties to the attention of the WRC in its report – including the phenomenon of leasing satellites, which was very much a part of the satellite world today. The intention was to draw attention to leasing from the regulatory viewpoint, not from the commercial viewpoint, and make it clear – as the report did subsequently – that while the leasing of satellites for the purposes of bringing into use was fairly commonplace, the leasing of orbital positions was prohibited.

10.40 **Mr Strelets** said that the use of one administration's satellite by another did not necessarily involve leasing, but might occur under, for example, a joint venture. Moreover, reference was also made in the report to the lease of frequency assignments. Various nuances were necessary in the text under review.

10.41 **Ms Wilson** said that, in view of the comments made, the context of § 4.7.2 should be made much clearer to the reader of the report, by providing the text of the decision taken by WRC-12, which referred to the use of one administration's satellite by another administration to bring assignments into use at a given orbital position, and making it clear that the Board was dealing with the phenomenon of leasing from the regulatory rather than the commercial viewpoint, and thus within the remit of ITU. The text should also indicate that such arrangements did not always necessarily involve leasing, but other forms of use agreed on by parties involved.

10.42 It was **agreed** that § 4.7.2 would be placed in square brackets, pending revision in line with the comments made.

10.43 Regarding § 4.7.3 (on leasing of satellites for the bringing into use of multiple frequency assignments in multiple orbital positions), **Mr Strelets** said that the section was intended to deal with satellite hopping, which might not necessarily involve leasing; one administration could use a single satellite to bring frequency assignments at more than one orbital position into use.

10.44 It was **agreed** that the title of § 4.7.3 would be amended to refer to the “use of a single satellite”, and that consideration would be given to indicating the possibility of moving that subsection out of the section dealing with satellite leasing.

10.45 Regarding § 4.7.4 (on differences in characteristics between leased satellites and assignments in the MIFR), following a query by **Mr Strelets** on the reference to the use of a new rule of procedure, the **Chairman** explained that the intention was to take account of the fact that No. **11.44B** referred to the deployment of a satellite with the “capability” to receive or transmit the frequency assignment concerned, but did not speak of actual operation and compliance with the Appendix 4 data submitted. Thus a system could be declared as having been brought into use, but not in fact be capable of operating in compliance with the precise notified characteristics.

10.46 **Mr Strelets** said that to his understanding mechanisms already existed to deal with such cases, allowing the cancellation of frequency assignments if it became apparent that the satellite deployed lacked the required capability. The Bureau was at liberty to request whatever details it deemed necessary, and if difficulties arose, No. **13.6** could be applied. He wondered what precisely was being presented to the conference in that section.

10.47 The **Chairman** said that the intention was to reflect what was actually happening in the satellite world. When an administration wished to declare bringing into use, it might lease a satellite with slightly different characteristics from those notified, and replace it subsequently with a satellite

with the correct characteristics. To be overly strict in insisting that the characteristics corresponded at the bringing into use stage could have disastrous effects at business level. The purpose of § 4.7.4 was to cover such cases.

10.48 **Mr Strelets** said that the case evoked might not apply only to leased satellites. It might involve setting an interesting precedent, with a satellite being used for bringing-into-use purposes without being in strict compliance with the characteristics notified, and No. **13.6** nevertheless not being applicable. The matter required further reflection.

10.49 **Ms Wilson** said that further explanatory text was needed, and she suggested that the Chairman and Mr Strelets might prepare it together.

10.50 It was **agreed** that the title of § 4.7.5 should read “Leasing of transponder capacity”.

10.51 Regarding § 4.7.6 (on leasing of frequency assignments and orbital positions), further to a question by **Mr Strelets**, the **Chairman** said that the purpose of the section was to make it clear that it was prohibited to lease either orbital positions or frequency assignments. He recalled the “paper satellites” phenomenon that had been particularly prevalent in years past, whereby orbital positions were reserved and then their sale attempted.

10.52 **Mr Bessi** said that he understood the Chairman’s concern, but that the section should be reviewed in light of the fact that frequency assignments and orbital positions could not actually be sold, since under the Radio Regulations they would remain the responsibility of the administration that had registered them. The problem of paper satellites had to be resolved through regulatory provisions, and that was under way.

10.53 **Mr Strelets** said that the section needed to take account of various scenarios, including the fact that the assignments concerned might not already be recorded in the Master Register, but be at the coordination stage, and that legitimate arrangements might exist in which, say, a satellite was manufactured by one party and the frequency assignments provided by another. More work was also required on § 4.7.7 (on complex situations), for example to remove any suggestion that orbital positions could be leased.

10.54 **Ms Wilson** said that § 4.7.6 should make it clear that leasing of orbital positions was prohibited. She noted that some of the concepts identified in that section were outside the scope of the Radio Regulations.

10.55 **Mr Bessi**, questioning the title of § 4.7.7, suggested that §§ 4.7.6 and 4.7.7 be merged and the entire new section placed in square brackets, to be reviewed *inter alia* to remove any suggestion that the Board encouraged the practices it referred to.

10.56 It was so **agreed**.

10.57 Regarding § 4.8 (on the meaning of “responsible administration”), **Mr Strelets** said that the title did not reflect the content of the section, in which it should be clear that ITU’s responsibility lay with the registration of frequency assignments, and not with that of space apparatus.

10.58 **Mr Magenta** said that the main point of the section lay in its last sentence: “The administration wishing to use a space station under the responsibility of another administration or intergovernmental organization must directly inform that administration or intergovernmental organization”.

10.59 **Mr Strelets** said that the Board had had to deal with a specific case involving the issue dealt with under § 4.8, and had concluded that an administration wishing to use a space station under the responsibility of another administration had to obtain that administration’s agreement, and lack of objection did not mean agreement in that context. The matter perhaps called for a rule of procedure.

10.60 It was **agreed** that the title of § 4.8 would be placed in square brackets, and comprise two suggested wordings.

10.61 **Ms Wilson** said that § 4.10 comprised new text put forward by former Board member Mr Ebadi.

10.62 **Mr Strelets** said that the title of § 4.10.1 (“Consideration of the ITU-R studies”) should be reviewed, as it appeared to contradict § 2 of the draft report which stated that the report would focus on new concepts “rather than... options under discussion elsewhere in the ITU-R.”

10.63 The **Chairman** stressed the importance of § 4.10 (on satellite failure during the ninety-day bringing-into-use period) in dealing with an item with considerable impact on realization of the intentions enshrined in Resolution **80**. The basic purpose of the Board’s report was to bring to the conference’s attention all obstacles to fulfilling those intentions.

10.64 **Mr Bessi** recalled that the Board had been called upon by WRC-12, at its 13th plenary meeting, to consider the development of a rule of procedure taking into account the results of the ITU-R studies if they became available. The section under consideration reflected that background.

10.65 **Mr Hoan** said that the section should refer to output from the Special Committee, which was putting forward methods for inclusion in the CPM Report.

10.66 **Mr Strelets** noted with regard to § 4.10.2 that there were more than three methods under study, and the text should be revised accordingly.

10.67 **Ms Wilson** said that § 4.10.1 and § 4.10.2 would be merged and given a new title, and revised in line with the comments made.

10.68 Regarding § 4.11, the **Director** suggested that the title be amended to refer to “the status of WRC decisions recorded in the minutes from a world radiocommunication conference...”, and that the conclusion be amended to simply record the decision taken at the present meeting instructing the Bureau to publish a circular letter containing all WRC decisions recorded in its minutes which are of an interpretative nature and which are still relevant with regard to actions taken by the Bureau.

10.69 **Ms Wilson** said that consideration would be given to adding at the end of the section a sentence in bold relating to actions that WRC-15 might consider.

10.70 When the Board had completed its consideration of the entire draft report, **Ms Wilson** said that the report would be amended in line with the comments made and a revised version issued immediately.

10.71 It was **agreed** that the draft report as revised at the present meeting would be posted on the RRB website and be further reviewed by the Board at its 69th meeting; and that a circular letter would be sent out to administrations drawing their attention to the fact that the document had been updated.

11 Confirmation of the dates of the next (69th) and subsequent (70th) meetings in 2015

11.1 The Board **agreed** to confirm the dates of its 69th meeting as 1-9 June 2015 and those of its 70th meeting as 19-23 October 2015.

12 Approval of the summary of decisions (Document RRB15-1/7)

12.1 The summary of decisions (Document RRB15-1/7) was **approved**.

13 Closure of the meeting

13.1 **Mr Magenta** complimented the Chairman on his able handling of the first meeting of his tenure as chairman. The Board had successfully tackled some very difficult issues, and with Mr Ito it was in very good hands for the WRC year.

13.2 The **Chairman** thanked everyone who had supported him and contributed to the success of the present meeting. He closed the meeting at 1105 hours on Friday, 20 March 2015.

The Executive Secretary:
F. RANCY

The Chairman:
Y. ITO