



**Radiocommunication Bureau (BR)**

Circular Letter  
**CR/436**

26 September 2018

**To Administrations of Member States of the ITU**

**Subject: Minutes of the 78<sup>th</sup> 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 78<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Radio Regulations Board (16 – 20 July 2018).

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 blue ink, appearing to be 'FR', is positioned above the name of the Director.

François Randy  
Director

**Annex: Minutes of the 78<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Radio Regulations Board**

**Distribution:**

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



**Document RRB18-2/15-E**  
**6 August 2018**  
**Original: English**

MINUTES\*

OF THE

78th MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD

16-20 July 2018

Present:

Members, RRB

Mr M. BESSI, Chairman  
Ms J. C. WILSON, Vice-Chairman  
Mr N. AL HAMMADI, Mr D. Q. HOAN, Mr Y. ITO, Ms L. JEANTY,  
Mr I. KHAIROV, Mr S. K. KIBE, Mr S. KOFFI, Mr A. MAGENTA,  
Mr V. STRELETS, Mr R. L. TERÁN,

Executive Secretary, RRB

Mr F. RANCY, Director, BR

Précis-Writers

Mr T. ELDRIDGE and Ms C. RAMAGE

Also present:

Mr H. ZHAO, Secretary-General  
Mr A. VALLET, Chief, SSD  
Mr M. SAKAMOTO, Head, SSD/SSC  
Mr J. WANG, Head, SSD/SNP  
Mr C.C. LOO, Head, SSD/SPR  
Mr N. VASSILIEV, Chief, TSD  
Ms I. GHAZI, Head TSD/BCD  
Mr K. BOGENS, Head, TSD/FMD  
Mr S. JALAYERIAN, Acting Head, TSD/TPR  
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 77th meeting of the Board. The official decisions of the 77th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board can be found in Document RRB18-1/10.

Subjects discussed	Documents
1 Opening of the meeting	-
2 Report by the Director of BR	RRB18-2/2 + Addenda 1-5, RRB18-2/DELAYED/1
3 Rules of procedure	RRB18-2/1 (RRB16-2/3 (Rev.8)), RRB18-2/8(Rev.1); CCRR/60
4 Requests under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments in the bands 10 950-11 195 MHz and 11 197.98-11 198.03 MHz to the INTELSAT8 328.5E and INTELSAT9 328.5E satellite networks under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB18-2/5, RRB18-2/13
5 Requests under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the CTDRS-1-77E satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB18-2/6, RRB18-2/9, RRB18-2/DELAYED/2
6 Requests under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the COMS-116.2E and COMS-128.2E satellite networks under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB18-2/7
7 Status of the INSAT-2(48), INSAT-2M(48), INSAT-2T(48) and INSAT-EK48R satellite networks at 48°E	RRB18-2/10, RRB18-2/11, RRB18-2/DELAYED/3
8 Submission by the Administration of the Russian Federation requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the ENSAT-23E satellite network (23°E)	RRB18-2/12, RRB18-2/DELAYED/4, RRB18-2/DELAYED/5, RRB18-2/DELAYED/6
9 Consideration of issues related to Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07)	-
10 Confirmation of the dates of the next meeting in 2018 and indicative dates for subsequent meetings	-
11 Approval of the summary of decisions	RRB18-2/14
12 Closure of the meeting	-

## 1 Opening of the meeting

1.1 The **Chairman** opened the meeting at 1400 hours on Monday, 16 July 2018 and welcomed participants.

1.2 The **Secretary-General** also welcomed participants and, referring to the various items on the agenda of the meeting, stressed the importance of the Board's work to the Radiocommunication Sector, ITU and the international community as a whole. He urged Board members to do whatever they could to promote understanding and agreement both within their respective regions and between regions in preparation for the CPM meeting in February 2019 and WRC-19 subsequently. He wished the Board success in its deliberations.

1.3 At the outset and in the course of the meeting, the **Chairman** drew attention to six late submissions, all of which related to items on the Board's agenda. He suggested that they be taken into consideration for information purposes under the agenda items to which they related.

1.4 It was so **agreed**.

## 2 Report by the Director of BR (Document RRB18-2/2 and Addenda 1-5, RRB18-2/DELAYED/1)

2.1 The **Director** introduced his customary report in Document RRB18-2/2, drawing attention to § 1 and Annex 1 relating to the actions taken by the Bureau arising from the Board's 77th meeting. As agreed at that meeting, the report provided greater detail on the reasons for delays in treatment times.

### Processing of filings for terrestrial and space systems (§ 2 of Document RRB18-2/2)

2.2 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** drew attention to Annex 2 to Document RRB18-2/2, which provided detailed information on the processing of notices to terrestrial services.

2.3 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, referring to filings for space systems, drew attention to Annex 3 to Document RRB18-2/2, for which an update to include June 2018 was available. He noted that, since the Board's previous meeting, the treatment time for coordination requests published (Table 2) had steadily decreased, and that the four-month regulatory deadline was expected to be met in the coming weeks. The treatment time of submissions under § 4.1.3/4.2.6 of Article 4 of Appendices 30/30A (Table 3) had also decreased significantly and was now below the six-month performance indicator. However, the treatment time for submissions under Articles 6 and 7 of Appendix 30B (Table 4) remained around 13 months. It should be noted that the average examination and treatment times for notifications pertaining to earth stations under Article 11 Part II-S/Part III-S (Table 6B) were being adversely affected by notifications of earth stations located in disputed territories so that the average treatment times for notifications of earth stations including and excluding these pending cases stood at 15.4 and 7.7 months respectively. The Bureau was still considering the best way to treat the pending cases. Owing to the interest shown by administrations in the trial version of the application "e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings" developed in response to Resolution 908 (Rev.WRC-15), the trial period had been extended to 20 July 2018. Use of the application was expected to become mandatory from 1 August 2018, should the Board approve the relevant draft rule of procedure at the current meeting with that date of application.

2.4 In response to questions from **Mr Strelets** and **Ms Jeanty**, he said that the treatment time for the publication of coordination requests had decreased as the negative effects of various exceptionally complex networks, as discussed at the 77th meeting, were wearing off and coordination requests were being received for more conventional networks, which took less time to process. The significant knock-on effect of exceptionally complex cases on treatment times should not be underestimated. In addition, SSD staff had been working very hard to reduce treatment times in response to the frustration expressed by Board members, and progress would be further consolidated when new staff members joined the department. Furthermore, improvements to the algorithms of the examination

software had expedited the processing of submissions under § 4.1.3/4.2.6 of Article 4 of Appendices 30/30A, and, at all events, the number of new satellite networks submitted under those provisions was relatively low.

2.5 He went on to note that a decrease in the treatment time of submissions under Articles 6 and 7 of Appendix 30B was not to be expected in the short term since the continued large number of requests made it difficult to make up time. The April 2018 peak in treatment time was essentially an artificial one. As reflected in Table 4 of Annex 3 to Document RRB18-2/2, the date of receipt and treatment time changed only when new networks were published. No new networks had been published in February and March 2018, but a number, which had been pending for some time, had been published in April 2018, resulting in the peak observed. Treatment time for the notification of space stations had never been much less than 7.4 months. Publication under Part I-S took two months, and administrations were given 30 days to reply to communications. Furthermore, the increasingly complex use of the geostationary orbit was giving rise to a larger number of objections from administrations regarding coordination agreements, the investigation of which took time. He pointed out that the average treatment time for earth stations not located in disputed territories was 7.7 months.

2.6 **Mr Strelets** welcomed the efforts of the Bureau to reduce treatment times, which he trusted would continue to decrease once the new staff positions had been filled. The situation with respect to the treatment time of submissions under Appendix 30B, however, was particularly critical, compounding the difficulties already faced by satellite operators by obliging them to wait over a year for their filings to be processed. Every effort must be made to expedite those treatment times, possibly by encouraging the Bureau to make some sort of preliminary examination. He went on to say that a clear distinction must be drawn between the processing times for earth stations located in disputed territories and processing times for other earth stations. The situation with regard to such stations in disputed territories was highly complex and must not be allowed to have a negative impact on statistics.

2.7 The **Chairman** praised the Bureau for its work to decrease treatment times, but noted that the delays that persisted remained problematic, and that further improvements were likely to depend on the resources made available to the Bureau to recruit additional staff and purchase software. WRC-19 would provide an opportunity for the Bureau to highlight the difficulties it was encountering and work with administrations to reduce treatment times.

2.8 In response to questions from the **Chairman** and **Ms Wilson** regarding the introduction of the new e-submission application developed in response to Resolution 908 (Rev.WRC-15), **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that administrations had been informed of the proposed date of introduction of 1 August 2018 in March 2018 (Circular Letter CR/427) and again in May 2018 (Circular Letter CCRR/60) and none had raised any objection; in fact, some were eager for it to be introduced as they were experiencing difficulties with the existing e-mail and fax systems. It had been decided to make the system mandatory from the outset rather than offering a voluntary period of use in order to avoid the parallel use of two systems, which could lead to confusion, and to ensure that all administrations transitioned to the new system. The trial version had been very well received and tested by more than 150 users from 29 administrations. The Bureau would assist any administrations that experienced difficulties and would present the new interface at a number of forthcoming radiocommunication seminars.

2.9 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on § 2 of the Director's report as follows:

“In relation to § 2 of Document RRB18-2/2, the Board noted with appreciation the efforts from the Bureau resulting in reductions in the treatment time of filings for satellite networks in certain cases, but was concerned that further improvement would be required overall, particularly in the case of treatment of filings under Appendix 30B. The Board decided to instruct the Bureau to continue:

- efforts to reduce the delays and to observe the regulatory deadlines for the processing of filings for satellite networks;

- consulting administrations on the significant impact on the processing time for complex and extensive satellite network filings, and to invite them to comply with the provisions of No. 4.1 of the Radio Regulations when they notify the frequency requirements for their satellite networks;
- assisting administrations in the use of the new application “e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings” developed in response to Resolution 908 (Rev.WRC-15) for the submission of electronic filings for satellite networks.”

2.10 It was so **agreed**.

### **Implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings (§ 3 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.11 Regarding the implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings (late payments), **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** drew attention to Annex 4 to the Director’s report and noted that, while a number of networks had been paid late, payment had been received before the Bureau meeting that would have cancelled them. Thus, in accordance with the relevant rule of procedure, none had been cancelled. He noted that the Bangladesh network had been nominated as the annual free entitlement for that administration.

### **Reports of harmful interference and/or infringements of the Radio Regulations (Article 15) (§ 4.1 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.12 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, drawing attention to Table 3 in the Director’s report, noted that 46 cases of harmful interference concerning space services had been received by the Bureau between 1 June 2017 and 31 May 2018.

2.13 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** noted with respect to § 4.1 of Document RRB18-2/2 that a total of 380 communications concerning reports of harmful interference and/or infringements had been received by the Bureau between 1 June 2017 and 31 May 2018, and that such cases continued to be handled normally within 48 hours.

### **Harmful interference to broadcasting stations in the VHF/UHF bands between Italy and its neighbouring countries (§ 4.2 of Document RRB18-2/2 and Addenda 1, 3, 4 and 5)**

2.14 Regarding § 4.2 of Document RRB18-2/2, **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that Switzerland had submitted 23 reports of harmful interference caused by Italian stations to Switzerland’s sound broadcasting services. A multilateral frequency coordination meeting between the administrations of Croatia, France, Italy, Malta and Slovenia had been held on 20 June 2018, the report of which was contained in Addendum 1 to Document RRB18-2/2.

2.15 **Ms Ghazi (Head TSD/BCD)** introduced Addendum 1 to Document RRB18-2/2, containing the report on the meeting of the Bureau with the Italian Administration and neighbouring countries on harmful interference to sound broadcasting services caused by Italy to its neighbours. The Administration of Switzerland had not attended, but the Administrations of Croatia and Slovenia had been present and had mentioned that no bilateral meeting took place and that there was no real improvement of the reported cases of interference. They also indicated their readiness to hold further bilateral meetings with Italy. The situation with regard to France had improved, with three out of four cases of harmful interference having been reported as resolved, and resolution of the fourth awaiting confirmation. Concerns had been expressed about the current use by Italy of DAB frequency blocks not allocated to it in the GE-06 Plan. Italy had confirmed that it would contact its operators and investigate such cases. Furthermore, under its new law on digital audio broadcasting, Italy would be issuing licences only for those channels allocated to it under the Plan. The meeting decided that the countries concerned should hold at least 2 bilateral meetings before the next multilateral meeting in May-June 2019.

2.16 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that the Administration of Croatia had, in a letter dated 27 June 2018 presented in Addendum 3 to Document RRB18-2/2, reported that, despite some reduction in harmful interference to Croatian digital television services, certain harmful interference

cases persisted. Furthermore, Croatia noted that Italy continued to use channels allocated to Croatia under the GE-06 Plan that were not currently in operation in Croatia, and that there had been no improvements concerning FM broadcasting. Croatia also pointed out that the antenna modifications implemented by Italy did not relate to cases on the list of priorities, and that it had identified the uncoordinated operation of T-DAB stations used by Italy. Slovenia, for its part, in a letter dated 27 June 2018 reproduced in Addendum 4 to Document RRB18-2/2, reported that Italy continued to use channels assigned to Slovenia under the GE-06 Plan, and that there had been no progress with respect to FM broadcasting.

2.17 Turning to the road map of the actions taken by the Administration of Italy to solve cases of harmful interference with its neighbouring countries (Addendum 5 to Document RRB18-2/2), he said that Italy had informed the Bureau that progress had been achieved with the cooperation of France, Switzerland and Malta, but the situation was more complex in the Adriatic area. Although there had been no bilateral coordination meetings between Italy and Croatia and Slovenia respectively, some measures had been taken with respect to those countries. Furthermore, the switch-off of the 700 MHz band would begin in 2020 and was scheduled to end in 2022, and Italy was working on the establishment of a new DAB plan in the VHF band. The road map itself reported on the situation country by country. In the case of Slovenia, the table of radio stations and frequencies had been replaced with information pertaining to simulation studies for the Slovenian radio stations KUK and NANOS on various frequencies, which was expanded upon in Annexes 1 to 10 of the document. The Administration of Italy had found that the calculated power based on the notified characteristics of the Slovenian stations was considerably less than real power in several cases, a finding that should be taken into account in the calculation of interference. With regard to Croatia, the cases remained roughly the same. In the case of France, only one of the four cases still remained, and the Bureau therefore assumed that the other three had been resolved. Regarding Malta, some developments were reported in respect of stations “Radju Malta 2” and “M2O”. In the case of Switzerland, Italy had identified 41 cases requiring attention, although Switzerland estimated there to be 69 pending cases. While the Bureau appreciated the timely submission of the road map, a clearer indication by Italy of the progress made would facilitate analysis.

2.18 The **Chairman** said that the Administration of Italy should be requested to provide the necessary information to make it easier for the Bureau to identify cases and assist administrations in their cooperation. Italy might also provide further information on the possible use by neighbouring countries of the 700 MHz band for television broadcasting prior to its re-allocation. It would be useful for the administrations concerned to comment on the road map, including to clarify whether or not the stations identified in it were on their priority lists.

2.19 **Mr Strelets** said that, while he welcomed the progress made with respect to France, it was regrettable that further progress had not been made with the other administrations. All the affected administrations must continue their efforts on the issue and the road map should be discussed at future multilateral meetings. The Board would benefit from a document to serve as a basis for discussion at future meetings that included an evaluation of the road map by the administrations concerned.

2.20 The **Director** said that the lack of progress was not entirely surprising given that the options available to the Italian Government to resolve issues relating to sound broadcasting were far more limited than they had been for television broadcasting. Huge strides could not be expected from one Board meeting to the next. Each assignment had to be dealt with on an individual basis, with the Board encouraging progress, however small.

2.21 **Ms Ghazi (Head TSD/BCD)** agreed that it was very difficult for the Italian Administration, despite the goodwill it had demonstrated, to resolve the FM band situation owing to the domestic regulations in force. It had, however, promised a number of fairly major improvements after the release of the 700 MHz band, including the use of digital television in VHF and the reduction of congestion in the FM band through the establishment of the T-DAB transmission plan. Pending the implementation of those measures, it had been suggested at the multilateral meeting that Italy should focus on certain cases on the priority lists.

2.22 The **Chairman** agreed that Italy should focus on cases on the priority lists. The Board would benefit from a document drawn up on the basis of priority lists, contributions from administrations and the road map from Italy, which should be updated for each meeting to indicate the status of stations causing harmful interference, those being interfered with, and the progress achieved.

2.23 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that the Bureau would be pleased to produce such a document, but would require more transparent information from the Administration of Italy, including information by station name, to facilitate links to assignments in the Master Register and to the reports of other countries.

2.24 Following comments by **Mr Strelets** and the **Chairman** regarding the Slovenian Administration's decision not to invite broadcasters to participate in coordination meetings, the **Director** said that it would be difficult for the Board to advise administrations on the composition of their delegations to such meetings. **Mr Strelets**, noting that a conflict of interest might arise between broadcasters and regulators, agreed that each administration should decide for itself.

2.25 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

"In considering § 4.2 of Document RRB18-2/2 and Addenda 1, 3, 4 and 5, the Board noted with satisfaction the efforts made by the Administration of Italy to organize bilateral and multilateral meetings for the resolution of harmful interference cases of sound broadcasting stations and the improvement of the situation on harmful interference with France and Malta. However, the Board noted with concern that the situation with Croatia, Slovenia and Switzerland has not improved. The Board encouraged the Administration of Italy and its neighbouring administrations to continue to coordinate in bilateral and multilateral meetings, including the broadcasting operators in such meetings when appropriate, to resolve cases of continuing harmful interference to sound and television broadcasting stations, and to focus efforts on those stations identified in the priority lists. Furthermore, the Board requested the Administration of Italy to observe the digital sound broadcasting Plan of the GE06 Regional Agreement. The Board decided to instruct the Bureau to produce a document, coordinated with countries concerned, on the basis of priority lists, contributions from administrations and the road map from Italy, that would indicate the status of stations causing harmful interference, those being interfered with, and the progress achieved, and encouraged the administrations concerned to provide the Bureau with information in a timely manner to update this document on a continuous basis and to submit the updated document to future meetings of the Board."

2.26 It was so agreed.

#### **Implementation of Nos. 11.44.1, 11.47, 11.49, 9.38.1 and 13.6 and Resolution 49 (§ 5 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.27 Commenting briefly on § 5 of Document RRB18-2/2, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** drew attention to Tables 5, 6 and 7, which provided statistics on the suppression of satellite networks and submissions. There were no particular difficulties to report.

2.28 **Mr Strelets** pointed out that the title of § 5 of the report contained no reference to No. 11.48, even though the text and graphical material contained information on that provision. Reference to No. 11.48 should therefore be included in the title of §5, since the title was included in the Director's report to the Board as a matter of tradition.

#### **Modification to Council Decision 482 and future work on cost recovery for satellite network filings (§ 6 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.29 Regarding § 6 of Document RRB18-2/2, the **Chairman** recalled that Council-18 had revised Council Decision 482 in order to implement Procedure A, as presented to the Board at its 77th meeting. It had also established a Council Expert Group on Decision 482, which would, *inter alia*, further examine Procedures B and C and consider whether Procedure B should also be applicable to cases of exceptionally complex GSO filings received.



2.30 In response to a question from **Mr Strelets, Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau had been requested to provide the Council Expert Group with statistical data on the number of exceptionally complex GSO satellite network filings received by the Bureau and their particular features. The **Chairman** added that the Expert Group would consider whether the Procedure B approach, which sought to limit the flat fee to a maximum number of units, should be applicable to exceptionally complex GSO satellite network filings only once the studies concerning complex non-GSO filings had been completed.

2.31 In response to a question from **Mr Koffi, Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Council Expert Group would be open to all Member States and Sector Members.

2.32 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

“When considering § 6 of Document RRB18-2/2, the Board noted Decision 482 of Council 2018 on cost recovery for satellite network filings and the decision to create a Council Expert Group which is to study the matter further. The Board decided to instruct the Bureau to report to the Board on progress on this matter.”

2.33 It was so **agreed**.

### **Review of findings for frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems under Resolution 85 (WRC-03) (§ 7 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.34 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, referring to § 7.1 of Document RRB18-2/2, said that since the Board’s 77th meeting, findings reviewed under Resolution 85 (WRC-03) had been published for five additional networks. The detailed results were available on the BR IFIC and BR website. Turning to § 7.2 of Document RRB18-2/2, he said that harmonisation of input data would be an important factor in reducing treatment times. Recommendation ITU-R S.1503, as approved (version 3) in January 2018, required additional parameters not currently available in Appendix 4 to the Radio Regulations, and Working Party 4A would be considering the necessary changes to Appendix 4 in the context of WRC-19 agenda item 7.

2.35 In response to a question from the **Chairman** regarding the necessary progress made in acquiring the relevant software, he said that the Bureau had begun the necessary work for acquiring the new software and the source code needed to ensure its sustainability. Although funding for the software had not been provided for in the budget for the current biennium, savings had already been made in certain budget lines and a wide-ranging call for tender would be launched. He pointed out that a number of examinations could still be made using version 2 of the software.

2.36 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

“The Board noted the items in § 7.1 on the publication of reviewed findings and § 7.2 on the harmonisation of input data of Document RRB18-2/2 and decided to instruct the Bureau to make all efforts to expedite the acquisition of new software for the processing of filings under Resolution 85 (WRC-03) and to report to the Board on progress on this matter.”

2.37 It was so **agreed**.

### **Extension of period of operation for certain assignments in the Regions 1 and 3 List of additional uses of Appendices 30 and 30A (§ 8 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.38 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau had received requests to extend the period of operation for two satellite networks some 7-8 months after the deadline indicated in § 4.1.24 of Appendices 30 and 30A (three years before the expiry of the first 15-year period of operation). Since § 4.1.24 provided no guidance on how to proceed should the deadline not be met, the Bureau had decided to accept the extension requests, in the knowledge that the assignments continued to be in use and that the notified characteristics remained unchanged, and in line with the procedure already followed for Resolution 4 (Rev.WRC-03) (Period of validity of frequency assignments to space stations using the geostationary-satellite and other satellite orbits). The Bureau had also started to

send reminders to notifying administrations one month before the deadline for receipt of such requests.

2.39 **Mr Magenta** and **Ms Jeanty** considered that the Bureau had acted appropriately and welcomed the decision to send reminders to notifying administrations. **Mr Strelets** and **Mr Koffi** agreed, adding that § 4.1.24 of Appendices 30 and 30A might usefully be revised to refer to the need to send a reminder.

**Confirmation of bringing into use of certain frequency assignments to the TDRS 89E satellite network (§ 8 of Document RRB18-2/2)**

2.40 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that confirmation of the bringing into use of certain frequency assignments to the TDRS 89E satellite network had been received by the Bureau more than 30 days after the end of the regulatory period provided for in RR No. 11.44. However, following explanations from the Administration of the United States that the delay had been due to a clerical error and noting that the actual operations of the TDRS 89E satellite network were compliant with No. 11.44, the Bureau had decided to accept the bringing-into-use confirmation.

2.41 **Mr Magenta** and **Ms Jeanty** welcomed the Bureau's pragmatic decision, as did **Mr Strelets** who noted that clerical errors might very well happen particularly when a satellite had been operating successfully in accordance with notified characteristics for a number of years.

2.42 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on § 8 and § 9 of Document RRB18-2/2 as follows:

“The Board noted the actions of the Bureau under § 8 and § 9 of Document RRB18-2/2 and considered that the Bureau had acted appropriately. The Board welcomed the decision of the Bureau to send reminders to administrations on the deadline for the submission of extension requests for satellite networks that would reach the expiry of the 15 year period of operation in accordance with § 4.1.24 of Appendices 30 and 30A. The Board decided to instruct the Bureau to continue with this practice and to report to WRC-19 on the possible need to revise § 4.1.24 of Appendices 30 and 30A accordingly.”

2.43 It was so agreed.

**Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the bringing into use of the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network (Documents RRB18-2/2(Add.2) and RRB18-2/DELAYED/1)**

2.44 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** introduced Addendum 2 to Document RRB18-2/2, in which the Bureau presented an overview of the history of the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network and requested guidance from the Board on the most appropriate way to process the request from the Administration of Cyprus for the bringing into use of the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network. He also drew attention, for information, to Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/1 containing a letter from the Administration of Cyprus, noting in particular the information contained in § 2e)-g) and the requests set out in § 2j) and k).

2.45 The **Chairman** noted the complexity of the case and invited the Board to consider whether it could accede to either of the requests of the Administration of Cyprus.

2.46 In response to a question from **Mr Strelets** as to whether § 1.6bis of Part C of the Rules of Procedure had been properly applied, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** confirmed that the Bureau had acted in accordance with that provision. At the request of Cyprus, the annexes containing information of a confidential or proprietary nature referred to in § 2f) of Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/1 had not been circulated to Board members, contrary to what was implied in the late submission. Paragraph 2f) itself had not been deleted, as the information contained therein was not confidential.

2.47 The **Chairman** said that it should be noted that the Board had not analysed any confidential documents.

2.48 **Ms Jeanty** said that she had some sympathy with the Administration of Cyprus. Referring to Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/1, she sought clarification as to why the Ukraine allotment (UKR00001) was no longer identified as affected (§ 2c)) and regarding the request set out in § 2j). She noted that the Bureau had taken some time to reply to the correspondence received from Cyprus in 2016 and was still processing the Part B resubmission for the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network received in September 2017. She wondered whether the Board could endorse the use of one satellite for bringing-into-use purposes at one orbital position and its subsequent move to another orbital position.

2.49 **Mr Strelets** noted that the submission from Cyprus that had received an unfavourable finding had been received before 1 January 2017, the date of entry into force of the Radio Regulations as adopted by WRC-15, and he sought clarification as to when the decision of WRC-15 to change the status of the Ukrainian network from an assignment to allotment had come into effect. The Administration of Cyprus had made every effort to comply with the Radio Regulations: it had notified bringing into use a long time before the regulatory deadline for the satellite network, placed a satellite in the orbital position for more than 90 days, and contracted for the manufacture and launch of a satellite to operate the notified orbital position long-term. The problem lay in the fact that Cyprus had had to wait so long for its submission to be processed by the Bureau. As the Board had already discussed, such protracted delays were challenging for administrations, and he reiterated his suggestion that some form of preliminary examination by the Bureau could be helpful. He was supportive of the requests submitted by Cyprus.

2.50 **Mr Ito**, having noted that the Administration of Cyprus had expended considerable time and resources on processing and modifying its submission in order to accommodate Ukraine's new allotment, asked whether the Bureau had tried to identify another location on the service arc suited to Ukraine, taking into account the flexibilities provided for in Appendix 30B.

2.51 **Mr Hoan** said that he had some sympathy with the difficulties faced by the Administration of Cyprus, but the Bureau and Board must base their treatment of requests from administrations on the provisions of the Radio Regulations in force. No. 11.44B.2 would be applicable, but its date of entry into force should be clarified. A solution should be found to the difficulties experienced by Cyprus in identifying the Ukrainian allotment using the Bureau's software.

2.52 The **Chairman** noted that according to the information in Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/1, the Ukrainian allotment was no longer identified as affected as a result of the revised characteristics of the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network submitted by Cyprus.

2.53 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)**, responding to questions, said that when Cyprus had made its initial Part B submission in June 2016, it had not realized that WRC-15 had taken the decision to change the status of the Ukrainian network (UKR00001) from an assignment to an allotment. The Bureau had understood that decision to be have been applicable with immediate effect. Accordingly, when the Bureau had undertaken its examination of Cyprus' submission, it had applied the provisions in force at the time, taking into account the WRC-15 decision on the status of the Ukrainian network, and Cyprus's submission had received an unfavourable finding. In § 2j) of its letter in Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/1, Cyprus was requesting that its resubmission of the Part B notification be processed maintaining the date of receipt of the first submission, i.e. 3 June 2016. If that was not possible, § 2k) requested that bringing into use be associated with the 22 September 2017 resubmission of the Part B notification, in which case the network would be processed based on a later date. The Bureau had remained in continuous communication with Cyprus, and was currently awaiting a response from Cyprus to questions relating to the resubmission of the Part B submission. It had decided to refer the matter to the Board for guidance after Cyprus had indicated that it would not be in a position to launch a new satellite before the expiry of the 8-year regulatory deadline for the satellite network. Further processing of the resubmission would therefore depend on the Board's decision.

2.54 The **Chairman** asked whether Cyprus had had the information required in order to coordinate with the Ukrainian network following its change of status.

2.55 **Ms Wilson** said that when Cyprus had made its initial Part B submission, the 2012 edition of the Radio Regulations would have been in force, in which case No. 11.44B.2 presumably would not have been applicable. She sought clarification as to whether No. 11.44B.2 had come into force with the rest of the new Radio Regulations on 1 January 2017 or immediately after WRC-15.

2.56 **Mr Khairov** sought the Chairman's confirmation that he could intervene as Ukraine was implicated in the case.

2.57 The **Chairman** confirmed that Mr Khairov could intervene as the matter related directly to the interests of Cyprus, not to those of Ukraine.

2.58 **Mr Khairov** said that he too had sympathy with the Administration of Cyprus and would like to accede to its request, but the Radio Regulations and other normative provisions must be complied with. For example, according to the provisions in force and as discussed at WRC-15, a satellite that had brought an assignment into use on a continuous basis at a given orbital position for a period of no fewer than 120 days could not be moved to another orbital position before the date of receipt of the notification information for the assignment. He also noted – as also discussed at WRC-15 – the various provisions (No. 11.41, § 6.25 of Appendix 30B) that allowed an assignment that had received an unfavourable finding to be entered in the Master Register/List provisionally, with an indication of those administrations whose assignments were the basis of the unfavourable finding. In the light of those provisions, the Bureau had been correct in concluding that Cyprus had not satisfied the compatibility requirements. He further noted that Cyprus had made the submission for its network once the satellite had been moved to another orbital position, and therefore the time taken by the Bureau to process submissions had no bearing on whether or not the Board could accept 7 March 2016 as the date of bringing into use. He concluded that the Board would be in infringement of the Radio Regulations if it accepted the requested date of bringing into use for the network. In order to meet the Administration of Cyprus halfway, a possible solution could be to instruct the Bureau to continue to take the assignment into account until WRC-19 and submit the case to WRC-19 for consideration along with a full explanation of its circumstances. He further suggested that consideration be given to seeking the amendment of § 6.25 of Appendix 30B in order to allow the resubmission of assignments following an unfavourable finding with respect to allotments in the Plan, with the change from provisional to definitive entry if no objections were received.

2.59 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** briefly outlined the process leading to the decision by WRC-15 to change the status of Ukraine's assignment to that of an allotment. Technically speaking, it would be very difficult to find a new slot meeting Ukraine's requirements for a new allotment, and any change to allotment UKR00001 would require a WRC decision. Moreover, Ukraine was unlikely to want to move its allotment after having coordinated with other administrations over several years. The Bureau had understood the Ukrainian network to have the status of an allotment immediately after WRC-15, as had been reflected in all BR IFICs published after WRC-15. Although the Bureau had not sent a reminder immediately after WRC-15 to those administrations whose submissions affected the Ukrainian network, it had since done so; the same problem was therefore unlikely to occur in the future. Prior to the adoption of No. 11.44B.2 at WRC-15, the Bureau's practice had been to establish the date of bringing into use as 120 days before notification was received, so it did not recognize an earlier date of bringing into use.

2.60 The **Chairman** said that it was his understanding that No. 11.44B.2 had entered into force only on 1 January 2017, and had not in been force when Cyprus' submission was processed. The Administration of Cyprus had, however, sought to apply that provision by notifying the network 120 days after bringing into use.

2.61 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the situation before the adoption of No. 11.44B.2 at WRC-15 was even more restrictive, since it had not been admissible for a satellite to have been in position for over 120 days prior to bringing into use. WRC-15 had accepted the principle that a satellite could

be in position for longer. However, the possibility of putting a satellite in position, moving it to another location and notifying the network's bringing into use at a later date had not been provided for either before or after WRC-15.

2.62 The **Chairman** said that the majority of Board members appeared to agree that the Administration of Cyprus had made every effort to comply with the Radio Regulations. However, the unfortunate situation had meant that it had been unable to apply or had misconstrued certain provisions of the Radio Regulations. From the explanations given by the Bureau, it appeared that the revised characteristics of the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network were now compatible with the Ukrainian allotment. The Board did not have the mandate to extend the date of bringing into use since it was not a case of *force majeure* or co-passenger delay, and the request by Cyprus to maintain the original date of receipt of the first submission would give rise to regulatory difficulties. The Board might, however, instruct the Bureau to continue to take into account the satellite network with its revised characteristics and report the case to WRC-19 for decision. The position of Cyprus would be strengthened if the HS-4 satellite, which was expected to be launched in the fourth quarter of 2018, was operating long-term at the orbital position by the time of WRC-19.

2.63 **Mr Strelets** agreed that there were no grounds for the Board to recognize the network's bringing into use as requested by Cyprus; it was important, however, that the Board was requesting that the network be taken into account until WRC-19, by which time HS-4 would have been launched. Also, the conference would be made aware of the problems faced by administrations as a result of processing delays. Regarding the amendment proposed by Mr Khairov, he said that § 6.25 of Article 6 of Appendix 30B was highly sensitive, and further consideration within the framework of Working Party 4A would be required. Referring to Cyprus' letter of 10 June 2016 in Addendum 2 to Document RRB18-2/2, he pointed out that the Administration of Cyprus should be made aware that Circular Letter CR/343 did not contain any regulatory provisions and was only an information document.

2.64 **Mr Koffi** agreed that the Administration of Cyprus had made every effort to comply with the Radio Regulations.

2.65 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

“The Board considered Addendum 2 to Document RRB18-2/2 in detail and also considered Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/1 for information. The Board noted that the Administration of Cyprus had made all efforts to comply with the provisions of the Radio Regulations and further noted that the national allotment of Ukraine (UKR00001) may not be identified as affected by the resubmitted KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network. After thorough examination of all the information provided, the Board concluded that it was not able to accede to the requests from the Administration of Cyprus. However, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to continue to process the filings for the KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite network, and take into account its frequency assignments, until the last day of WRC-19 and to report the case to WRC-19 for a decision.”

2.66 It was so **agreed**.

2.67 The Director's report in Document RRB18-2/2, together with its various addenda, was **noted**.

### **3 Rules of procedure (Documents RRB18-2/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.8)) and RRB18-2/8(Rev.1); Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.1 **Ms Jeanty**, speaking as the Chairman of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, introduced Document RRB18-2/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.8)) and drew attention to the rules of procedure that had yet to be addressed by the Board, at the present meeting: the rules relating to Resolutions 907 (WRC-15) and 908 (Rev.WRC-15) as identified in Attachment 2; and the eight rules identified in Attachment 3, as agreed at the Board's 77th meeting. The list of rules in the document would be updated subsequently to reflect the action taken by the Board on the rules before the present meeting.

3.2 The Board **agreed** to conclude on the document as follows:

“The Board decided to update the list of proposed rules of procedure in Document RRB18-2/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.8)) taking into account the approval of new or revised rules of procedure.”

3.3 The **Chairman** invited the Board to take up the draft revised rules of procedure and suppressions of rules in Circular Letter CCR/60, along with the comments received from five administrations reproduced in Document RRB18-2/8(Rev.1).

**Draft revised rule on RR No. 4.4 (Annex 1 to Circular Letter CCR/60)**

3.4 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, having recalled that the Board had discussed the matter at its previous two meetings, introduced the draft revised rule on No. 4.4 and drew attention to the comments submitted by administrations as contained in Annexes 1-5 to Document RRB18-2/8(Rev.1). The Administration of Australia opposed the draft revised rule, observing that it was over-restrictive in particular in its application to non-space services, for which it was not required, and that No. 4.4 had been implemented successfully to date. Canada appeared to support the draft revised rule, while proposing modifications to §§ 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6. The United States questioned whether the draft revised rule was justified in the light of the existing Radio Regulations, while proposing modifications to §§ 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6 should the draft rule be approved. France supported the draft revised rule, while suggesting modifications for the sake of clarity. The Russian Federation proposed various modifications for the sake of clarity along with the use of the terminology used in the Radio Regulations, as well as corrections affecting only the Russian language version of the rule.

3.5 **Mr Strelets** noted that two administrations – the United States and Canada – pointed out that the modifications proposed in the draft revised rule would entail regulatory changes that only a WRC could address. If the Board were to agree with those administrations and retain only editorial changes to the rule, thus renouncing on its basic reasons for revising the rule, were those editorial changes in fact necessary and justified? Moreover, if approved, the revised rule must avoid placing additional and unnecessary burden on administrations, and in turn on operators when international regulations were transformed into national legislation. For example, it was meaningless to impose conditions relating to the implementation of No. 4.4 in regard to terrestrial services in a country like Australia which had no borders with other countries.

3.6 The **Director** said that the administrations had raised concerns which could be accommodated by making appropriate changes to the draft revised rule – for example, the particular concerns of large countries where stations could be located at considerable distances from borders, the need to address high altitude platform stations (HAPS) and keep matters simple for terrestrial services, etc. Depending on the stations concerned, the “compatibility studies” referred to in § 1.6 and results thereof could take the form of a very brief and simple statement and need not be over-complicated.

3.7 The **Chairman** invited the Board to consider the draft revised rule on No. 4.4 section by section, bearing in mind the comments submitted by administrations.

3.8 Section 1.1 was **approved**.

3.9 Regarding § 1.2, **Ms Jeanty** noted that the terms of No. 4.4 were very general, and she therefore questioned whether it was legally correct to state that “the scope of the terms ‘in derogation of either the Table of Frequency Allocations in this Chapter or the other provisions of these Regulations’ is specified in No. 8.4...”.

3.10 **Ms Wilson, Mr Strelets** and the **Director** considered that § 1.2 neither expanded nor limited the application of No. 4.4, but clarified which were the “other provisions” referred to in No. 4.4.

3.11 Section 1.2 was **approved**.

3.12 Section 1.3 was **approved** subject to the amendments proposed by the United States, but without the reference “(including its footnotes)” which was considered superfluous. The amendments were deemed to cover the concerns raised by the other administrations.

3.13 Section 1.4 was **approved**.

3.14 Regarding § 1.5, it was **agreed** that the modifications proposed by France and the Russian Federation should be incorporated where relevant as they clarified the text.

3.15 Regarding the modifications to § 1.5 proposed by Canada, it was **agreed** that the reference “(see also § 1.3 above)” should be retained and that the additional sentence proposed should be incorporated as a footnote to § 1.5, subject to appropriate editorial amendment.

3.16 Regarding the modifications to § 1.5 proposed by the United States, it was **agreed** that a reference to “Article 11” rather than to “Nos. 11.2 and 11.3” should be retained in the final sentence, thus covering all services (including receiving HAPS).

3.17 Subject to the main amendments above and to other minor amendments, § 1.5 was **approved**.

3.18 Regarding § 1.6, the minor modifications proposed by the Russian Federation, including amendments affecting the Russian language version only, were **approved**.

3.19 In the ensuing discussion of the modifications proposed by Canada and the United States, it was **agreed** that, rather than indicating that administrations “should conduct the relevant compatibility studies” etc., the rule should make it mandatory (“shall”) for administrations to “determine a) that the intended use of the frequency assignment to the station under No. 4.4 will not cause harmful interference into the stations of other administrations operating in conformity with the Radio Regulations” (thus allowing for far simpler studies and statements regarding compatibility) and “b) what measures it would need to take in order to comply with the requirement to immediately eliminate harmful interference pursuant to No. 8.5.”

3.20 Regarding the remaining text proposed by the Bureau for § 1.6 (two sentences, commencing “Administrations should provide the results of the above studies and the measures to the Bureau...””) and the alternative text proposed by Canada (according to which the “notifying administration shall provide a confirmation that it has performed the relevant compatibility studies...”), the following main points were made:

3.21 **Ms Wilson** said that administrations could be required to confirm that studies had been carried out, leaving them free to send the results to the Bureau for possible publication if they so wished.

3.22 **Mr Strelets** said the most important point was that administrations must demonstrate that studies had been carried out, that there would be no interference, and that measures had been identified to eliminate any interference caused. If those obligations were not imposed, the revised rule would be substantively the same as the existing rule, making its revision pointless. No coordination or any other obligations could be placed on administrations.

3.23 **Mr Ito** said that the matter should also be considered from the perspective of the role of an administration issuing licences to operators: that role should include the provision of information on potential interference if such information was requested and ensuring that the issuing of licences would cause no problems to other users who might be ignorant of potential interference problems. It was important for countries to be aware of their situation regarding potential interference before it was caused, when notification under No. 4.4 occurred, rather than when it was too late. Verbal assurances could be worthless.

3.24 **Ms Wilson** said that to make it mandatory for administrations to submit the results of studies appeared to go beyond the requirements of the existing Radio Regulations, and thus beyond the Board’s mandate. Moreover, regardless of whether studies had been carried out and made available, administrations operating stations under No. 4.4 had no rights; if they caused interference, they had to eliminate it immediately.

3.25 **Mr Strelets** agreed with Ms Wilson, noting that both Canada and the United States had warned that placing certain obligations on administrations in relation to No. 4.4 might require decisions by the WRC. The text of the revised rule already placed sufficient obligations on

administrations in their application of No.4.4 over time; it would therefore suffice to retain the text proposed by Canada rather than the two sentences proposed by the Bureau.

3.26 **Mr Khairov** endorsed Ms Wilson’s comments, noting that the key element of No. 4.4 was that administrations must guarantee to eliminate interference if it was caused, regardless of whether studies had been carried out and made available. Rather than calling for studies to be made available publicly, it would suffice to instruct administrations to conduct internal examinations allowing them to provide assurance, prior to submitting their filings under No. 4.4, that they would not cause interference.

3.27 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** noted that the two sentences proposed by the Bureau did not seek to place any mandatory obligations on administrations. The text proposed by Canada did (“shall provide confirmation”), but it was unclear what action should be taken by the Bureau if the notifying administration failed to provide the confirmation.

3.28 The **Chairman** assumed that failure to fulfil any obligation under the rule of procedure would result in non-publication of the assignment.

3.29 **Ms Wilson** said that administrations making assignments under No. 4.4 had no rights vis-à-vis other assignments, and provision of the results of studies should in no way be interpreted as suggesting that any form of coordination should follow. She therefore surmised that provision of the results of studies could not be made mandatory.

3.30 **Mr Hoan** supported Mr Strelets: it should be mandatory for administrations to provide confirmation of studies, as proposed by Canada. The two sentences proposed by the Bureau could nevertheless be retained as they placed no mandatory obligations on administrations and appeared for the most part to have met with the approval of administrations.

3.31 **Mr Ito** considered that the two sentences proposed by the Bureau could be deleted. If an operator using an assignment under No. 4.4 received complaints of interference from an administration, it would have to eliminate the interference. Its notifying administration was simply an intermediary, but was nevertheless responsible as it had issued the relevant licence.

3.32 **Ms Wilson** said that it might be useful to retain the text proposed by the Bureau in some form, even if it involved voluntary action.

3.33 **Mr Khairov** agreed with Ms Wilson. It was unclear what action the WRC would take on No. 4.4, and the discussions held and doubts raised on it should be passed on to the WRC to inform its decisions.

3.34 **Mr Strelets** said that the texts proposed by the Bureau and Canada appeared to contradict each other. He would prefer not to retain the Bureau’s text, as it was unclear what sort of studies and measures were intended and they were to be published for information purposes and served no practical purpose. In fact, the Bureau’s text could be seen as calling into question the notifying administration’s confirmation that it had carried out the required studies and identified measures to eliminate interference.

3.35 The **Chairman** commented that non-mandatory elements had no place in a rule of procedure. He therefore suggested that, on the understanding that the entire question of No. 4.4 would be discussed at the WRC, the Board might agree to retain the text proposed by Canada subject to some editorial amendment and not to retain the two sentences proposed by the Bureau, which administrations were unlikely to implement anyway as they were non-mandatory.

3.36 It was so **agreed**.

3.37 Section 1.6, as amended, was **approved**.

3.38 Section 1.7 was **approved**.



3.39 Subject to a number of editorial amendments, the draft revised rule on No. 4.4, as amended in the course of the discussion, was **approved**, with effective date of application immediately upon approval.

**Draft revised rules on the receivability of forms of notice (Annex 2 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.40 **Approved**, with effective date of application 1 August 2018.

**Draft revised rules on RR No. 9.11A (Annex 3 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.41 **Approved**, with effective date of application 1 January 2017.

**Draft revised rule on RR No. 9.27 (Annex 4 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.42 **Approved**, subject to the incorporation of the amendments (editorial) proposed by Canada and other minor editorial amendments, with effective date of application immediately upon approval.

**Draft revised rule on RR No. 11.48 (Annex 5 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.43 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the draft revised rule on RR No. 11.48 had been produced further to the Board's discussions at its 77th meeting, and comments had been received on it from the Administrations of the United States and the Russian Federation as contained in Annexes 3 and 5 to Document RRB18-2/8(Rev.1), respectively. Without suggesting specific revisions to the text proposed by the Bureau, the United States raised various concerns, including the fact that extensions of regulatory deadlines due to *force majeure* or co-passenger delay should not require revisions to Resolution 49 information when the launch delay amounted to an extension of only a few months or less; and that any revisions referring to Resolution 49 should be deferred subject to the conclusions reached by Working Party 4A on the topic. The Russian Federation proposed specific modifications to the draft put forward by the Bureau, in order to clarify matters relating to Resolution 49 by removing the two references to Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-15) in, and deleting the last sentence of, the second paragraph proposed by the Bureau and adding a new paragraph based on the wording of § 4.1.3*bis* of Appendix 30/30A and § 6.31*bis* of Appendix 30B; the Bureau deemed those proposals acceptable, noting that they appeared to cater for the concerns raised by the United States.

3.44 **Mr Strelets** said that the text put forward by the Bureau in Circular Letter CCRR/60 as amended by the Russian Federation did not cover cases involving extensions of, say, two to three months granted for co-passenger delay. **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** agreed.

3.45 The **Chairman** requested Mr Strelets and the Bureau to prepare text for incorporation in the draft revised rule to cater for the concern raised by Mr Strelets, taking into account the modifications proposed by the Russian Federation where appropriate.

3.46 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** subsequently proposed the following with regard to the text of the rule initially proposed by the Bureau in Circular Letter CCRR/60: the first paragraph should be retained unchanged; in the second paragraph, the references to Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-15) should be retained, as to delete them would be inconsistent with the first of the two stages provided for in § 4.1.3*bis* of Appendix 30/30A and § 6.31*bis* of Appendix 30B; and, in order to take into account the Russian Federation's proposals and the concerns raised by Mr Strelets, the last sentence of the second paragraph should be deleted and a new, third paragraph added, to read as follows:

"If, before the end of the period of extension or within one year following the Board's decision to grant an extension, whichever is earlier, the notifying administration has not provided to the Bureau updated Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-15) information for the new satellite under procurement, the related frequency assignments shall lapse. If, one month before the above-mentioned deadline, the notifying administration has not provided to the Bureau updated Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-15) information, the Bureau shall promptly send a reminder to the notifying administration."

3.47 Subject to those amendments, the draft revised rule of procedure on No. 11.48 was **approved**, with effective date of application immediately upon approval.

**Suppression of the rule on § 5.2.2.2 of Appendices 30 and 30A (Annex 6 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.48 Approved.

**Draft revised rule on Part A10 (GE-06 Regional Agreement) (Annex 7 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.49 **Approved**, with effective date of application immediately upon approval.

**Draft revised rule on Part B, Section B3 (Annex 8 to Circular Letter CCRR/60)**

3.50 **Approved**, subject to the incorporation of the amendments (editorial) proposed by Canada and other minor editorial amendments, with effective date of application immediately upon approval.

3.51 The **Chairman** said that the list of rules of procedure in Document RRB18-2/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.8)) would be updated to reflect the Board's approval of new or revised rules at the present meeting. (The final texts of the rules approved at the present meeting may be found in the annex to the summary of decisions of the meeting (Document RRB18-2/14)).

**4 Requests under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments in the bands 10 950-11 195 MHz and 11 197.98-11 198.03 MHz to the INTELSAT8 328.5E and INTELSAT9 328.5E satellite networks under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Documents RRB18-2/5 and RRB18-2/13)**

4.1 **Mr Strelets**, making general comments with regard to the application of RR No. 13.6, suggested that the Board might wish to develop a common approach and recommendations to the Bureau for addressing the variety of different cases that might arise in connection with No. 13.6, noting that retroactive investigation was particularly challenging for the administration concerned and the Bureau. A common approach would facilitate the work of the Bureau and Board and help administrations to understand actions taken by the Bureau.

4.2 The **Chairman** said that it was his understanding that Mr Strelets' general comments concerned the circumstances that for the Bureau triggered the examination procedure under No. 13.6. However, as that procedure had already been applied with respect to the cases now before the Board, the Board should follow the same procedure as it had at previous meetings.

4.3 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that, currently, when an administration informed the Bureau of a regulatory change concerning its satellite network, such changes were verified by the Bureau under No. 13.6 with a view to ensuring that the assignments were still being used in accordance with the notified characteristics. As far as retroactive examination was concerned, the current practice was to go back around three years (the length of the suspension period); it was difficult to be sure of all the facts when going back any further. The Bureau would be pleased to listen to any suggestions from the Board on possible improvements to the methodology used, but was under an obligation to implement the procedures set out in No. 13.6, the regular and consistent application of that provision having been requested by WRC-12 and WRC-15.

4.4 **Ms Wilson** recalled that the application of No. 13.6 had been addressed in the Board's report to WRC-15 under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07). The Board might wish to include a section on the issue in its Resolution 80 report to WRC-19.

4.5 **Mr Khairov** said that consideration might be given to developing a rule of procedure on No. 13.6, which was an extremely important provision for many administrations.

4.6 **Ms Jeanty** said that the Bureau's current approach appeared to be reasonable, but agreed that the Board might wish to address the issue in its report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80.

4.7 The **Chairman** said that the matter might be taken up further in the context of issues related to Resolution 80. As Mr Strelets' general comment did not concern the cases currently before the Board, those cases should be dealt with using the approach adopted for similar cases in the past.

4.8 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB18-2/5, containing a request from the Bureau for a decision by the Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments in the bands 10 950-11 195 MHz and 11 197.98-11 198.03 MHz to the INTELSAT8 328.5E and INTELSAT9 328.5E satellite networks under RR No. 13.6. He briefly outlined the history of the case, as set out in the document, noting in particular that the frequency assignments were among those referenced as "Common Heritage" in the Agreement relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization. Document RRB18-2/13 contained a submission from the Administration of the United States that provided additional information concerning its operations in the bands concerned and the negative implications of cancelling the frequency assignments. He noted that the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization had been informed of the request to cancel the frequency assignments.

4.9 **Mr Ito** said that, in his opinion, the Bureau had acted correctly in the present case. It was not acceptable for an administration, after receiving an inquiry under No. 13.6 and while not responding to it, to move another satellite to the orbital position concerned and change the status of the registered position before responding to the inquiry under No. 13.6. It would set an awkward precedent and could undermine the Radio Regulations if the extension request were approved at the present juncture. He would therefore support cancellation of the assignments.

4.10 The **Chairman** requested the Bureau to confirm whether or not a satellite was currently in operation at 31.5°W, and the risk of interference with other satellite networks. He also suggested the Board consider whether or not the launch delays of the replacement satellite could be deemed to involve *force majeure* or co-passenger issues.

4.11 **Mr Strelets** agreed that the Bureau had acted completely correctly under No. 13.6. The Administration of the United States had responded to the Bureau's reminder several months after it had been sent and only after INTELSAT had moved another satellite to the orbital position. That was not the first time that INTELSAT had behaved in such a manner; indeed, with around 55 satellites in its satellite grouping, it was not difficult for INTELSAT to move a satellite from one position to another. The Board had every reason to agree with the Bureau and to accede to the Bureau's request.

4.12 **Mr Al Hammadi** agreed that the Bureau had applied No.13.6 correctly.

4.13 **Ms Jeanty** supported the cancellation of the frequency assignments, pointing out that the Bureau had no evidence of bringing into use before September 2017 and that Document RRB18-2/13 contained no answers to the regulatory questions posed by the Bureau.

4.14 **Mr Koffi** agreed that the Bureau had applied No.13.6 correctly. However, the frequency assignments were among those referenced as "Common Heritage" and, although there had been a time when they had not been in continuous use, they were now being used for the provision of critical services and had no impact on other networks. Accordingly, he would prefer the assignments to be maintained in the Master Register and that the matter be referred to WRC-19 for decision.

4.15 **Mr Khairov** said that it was clear that the Bureau had acted correctly under No.13.6. However, as the Administration of the United States had indicated, the frequency assignments had been in use since late 2017, and any decision to cancel them could now appear to have an element of retroactivity. He would therefore prefer the assignments to be retained and the matter referred to WRC-19 for decision.

4.16 **Mr Hoan** agreed that the Bureau had acted in accordance with No.13.6. Although the frequency assignments were considered to be important and were referenced as "Common Heritage", the Administration of the United States had provided no information to demonstrate that they had continued to be in use in compliance with the provisions of the Radio Regulations for the three-year period prior to 26 September 2017. While the negative implications of cancellation

would be regrettable, it was difficult to disagree with the Bureau's request. It was not for the Board to refer the matter to WRC-19. The Board should take its decision, which the Administration of the United States was free to appeal against at WRC-19.

4.17 **Mr Magenta** noted that the frequency assignments provided critical maritime services and that WRC-19 might well overturn the Board's decision to cancel them; the Board should therefore refer the issue to WRC-19 for decision.

4.18 **Mr Strelets** reiterated that the Bureau had acted in accordance with No. 13.6; the facts of the case were clear and retroactivity did not come into play. The Board had no grounds to refer the matter to WRC-19, even if the assignments were referenced as so-called "Common Heritage", and should take the decision to cancel them. The administration could always challenge the Board's decision.

4.19 **Mr Ito** said that the Board should take the decision to cancel the assignments. However, in view of their status as "Common Heritage", the Bureau might wish to continue to take them into account to allow for the possibility that the United States or INTELSAT might appeal against the decision at WRC-19.

4.20 The **Director** said that, while there appeared to be agreement in the Board to cancel the assignments, members also recognized the importance of preserving the frequency assignments referenced as "Common Heritage". As a compromise, the Bureau might be instructed to postpone the cancellation until the last day of WRC-19, thus allowing for the possibility that the administration might raise the matter at WRC-19 if so wished, and avoiding any period of uncertainty for administrations concerned.

4.21 Responding to a comment from **Mr Strelets**, the **Chairman** said that there was clear agreement in the Board that the frequency assignments should be cancelled. A decision to postpone the cancellation until the last day of WRC-19 could only be interpreted as a wise course of action that would prevent unnecessary confusion and extra work for the Bureau should WRC-19 decide to reverse the Board's decision. He suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

"The Board considered in detail Documents RRB18-2/5 and RRB18-2/13 and concluded that the Bureau had applied No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations correctly. The Board noted that the Administration of the United States provided no information to demonstrate that the frequency assignments continued to be in use in compliance with the provisions of the Radio Regulations for the three year period prior to 26 September 2017.

However, the Board further noted that the frequency assignments are among those referenced as "Common Heritage" in the Agreement Relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organisation.

Based on the information provided, the Board considered that the Administration of the United States did not comply with the Radio Regulations and decided to cancel all assignments to the INTELSAT8 328.5E and INTELSAT9 328.5E satellite networks in the frequency bands 10 950-11 195 MHz and 11 197.98-11 198.03 MHz, and instructed the Bureau to postpone this cancellation until the last day of WRC-19."

4.22 It was so **agreed**.

## **5 Requests under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the CTDRS-1-77E satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Documents RRB18-2/6, RRB18-2/9 and RRB18-2/DELAYED/2)**

5.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB18-2/6, containing a request by the Bureau for the Board to cancel the frequency assignments to the CTDRS-1-77E satellite network on the grounds that no evidence could be found of their use in the period 3 July 2013-1 December 2016

(i.e. over three years). He also introduced Document RRB18-2/9, containing the Administration of China's reaction to the proposed cancellation: China stressed *inter alia* the importance of the network to China's manned spaceflight project, the fact that all coordination had been completed for the network, and the fact that no interference had been caused to other networks when satellite TL1-01 had been drifted between 77°E and 80°E; China also provided snapshot evidence of the satellite at 77°E in 2014 and 2015. He drew attention, for information, to Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/2, in which China provided the in-orbit operational plan of satellite TL1-01.

5.2 Responding to a question by **Mr Strelets**, he confirmed that China's letter RG/123/2018 of 13 March 2018 in Document RRB18-2/6 had included a two-page annex of confidential material which, in accordance with the Board's working methods, the Bureau was not making available to the Board.

5.3 **Ms Jeanty** said that it appeared from the information provided that satellite network CTDRS-1-77E had never been out of use for a period exceeding six months. Suspension had therefore not been required, and cancellation of the network would be inappropriate.

5.4 **Mr Strelets** recalled his earlier, general comments on the application of No. 13.6. In the case now under consideration, it would appear that at the time of application of No.13.6 a satellite had been using all the notified assignments to the network; there had therefore been no grounds for carrying out a study under No. 13.6. Such application had been retroactive, and had caused the administration concerned considerable difficulty by obliging it to provide evidence of the satellite's use some three years previously. The Bureau's request for cancellation should therefore be rejected. In general, when the Bureau received requests from administrations to investigate networks under No. 13.6, it should not do so if all appeared to be in order when the request was received. Assignments qualified for investigation under the provision only if they had not been brought into use, were no longer in use, or continued to be in use but not in accordance with the notified required characteristics as specified in Appendix 4. To investigate whether assignments had been in use at a point in time prior to the investigation constituted retroactive application of the Radio Regulations and was inadmissible. Consideration should be given to ensuring that those basic considerations guided the Bureau in its approach to the application of No. 13.6, particularly since the Bureau and administrations were already overburdened by work.

5.5 The **Chairman** said that Mr Strelets' general comments would be borne in mind when the Board discussed the application of No. 13.6 in general terms.

5.6 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** noted that China had been using one satellite to keep two orbital positions in use.

5.7 **Ms Wilson** said that the question of satellite hopping had been addressed under the Board's report under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) to WRC-15, and there was nothing in the Radio Regulations to prevent a satellite from operating at different orbital positions provided that interruptions to the use of the assignments remained below six months, following which suspension of use was required under No. 11.49. She recalled that the Board's prime concern in its past discussion of satellite hopping had been the use of one satellite for multiple orbital positions, which was not the case regarding China's use of satellite TL1-01.

5.8 **Mr Ito** asked how often the Chinese satellite had been moved between orbital positions 77°E and 80°E, and for confirmation that the satellite had not been transmitting in between the two positions. For the satellite to have been drifted once between the two positions was certainly admissible, whereas for it to have been drifted several times might be questionable.

5.9 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the satellite in question appeared to have been moved between the two orbital positions eight times in three years.

5.10 **Mr Strelets** said that Mr Ito's questions had no direct bearing on the case of the Chinese assignments under discussion, regarding which the main point was that the assignments should not have been investigated under No. 13.6 in the first place. He agreed with Ms Wilson that for satellites

to be used at different orbital positions was not prohibited under the present Radio Regulations; if WRC-15 had instructed the Bureau to track bringing into use and satellite location, it was for the purpose of collating statistics for submission to the WRC and not with a view to placing restrictions on administrations.

5.11 **Ms Jeanty** agreed with Ms Wilson's comments, and noted that the Board's decision on the case under consideration was to be based on the fact that interruption of use of the assignments had not exceeded six months, and the operations had been in compliance with the Radio Regulations in force.

5.12 **Mr Khairov** agreed with the previous speakers that the assignments to the Chinese network should not be cancelled. He nevertheless thanked the Bureau for its vigilance, which served the purpose of ensuring the rational and efficient use of the spectrum/orbital resources.

5.13 The Board **agreed** to conclude on the matter as follows:

"The Board considered Document RRB18-2/6 in detail. Based on the information provided in Document RRB18-2/9 and Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/2 for information, the Board concluded that the frequency assignments to the CTDRS-1-77E satellite network were in use in compliance with the Radio Regulations, and that the Administration of China has provided information to confirm this status. Consequently, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to maintain the frequency assignments to the CTDRS-1-77E satellite network in the MIFR."

## **6 Requests under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the COMS-116.2E and COMS-128.2E satellite networks under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Document RRB18-2/7)**

6.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced the Bureau's request in Document RRB18-2/7 for the Board to cancel the frequency assignments to the COMS-116.2E and COMS-128.2E satellite networks under No. 13.6.

6.2 **Mr Al Hammadi** said that the Bureau's request appeared to fully justified, and the Administration of the Republic of Korea had seen fit not to respond to the Bureau's inquiries and reminders. The Board should therefore take the decision to cancel the assignments as requested.

6.3 **Mr Strelets** agreed with Mr Al Hammadi.

6.4 The Board **agreed** to conclude on the matter as follows:

"The Board considered the information provided in Document RRB18-2/7. The Board noted that the Bureau had sent requests in accordance with No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations to the Administration of the Republic of Korea to provide information demonstrating that the frequency assignments to the COMS-116.2E satellite network and the frequency assignments to the COMS-128.2E satellite network in the bands 1 675.5-1 676.5 MHz, 1 677-1 683 MHz, 2 048.612-2 049.612 MHz, 2 059-2 064.2 MHz, 2 065.84-2 066.84 MHz, 2 224.78-2 225.78 MHz had been brought into use and continued to be in use, followed by two reminder letters, to which no response had been received. Consequently, the Board instructed the Bureau to cancel the frequency assignments to the COMS-116.2E satellite network and the corresponding frequency assignments in the above-specified frequency bands to the COMS-128.2E satellite network."

## **7 Status of the INSAT-2(48), INSAT-2M(48), INSAT-2T(48) and INSAT-EK48R satellite networks at 48°E (Documents RRB18-2/10, RRB18-2/11 and RRB18-2/DELAYED/3)**

7.1 **Mr Sakamoto (Head SSD/SSC)** introduced Document RRB18-2/10, containing the Indian Administration's response to the points for clarification raised by the Administration of Germany to the Board's 77th meeting and the Board's discussion thereof at that meeting. He also introduced Document RRB18-2/11 containing a letter from the Administration of Germany requesting the Board

to pursue its efforts to obtain a response from India; Germany's letter had been sent before it had become aware of India's submission in Document RRB18-2/10. Subsequently, when it had become aware of Document RRB18-2/10, Germany had submitted the letter provided to the Board for information in Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/3.

7.2 **Mr Strelets** said that the two administrations did not appear to be asking for any specific action on the matter at present. They should be thanked for their contributions and explanations, noting Germany's suggestion that the application of CS Article 48 could usefully be discussed at PP-18 or WRC-19.

7.3 **Ms Wilson** agreed with Mr Strelets, noting that Germany's suggestion that application of CS Article 48 be discussed at PP-18 or WRC-19 was catered for by the fact that the subject would be covered in the Board's report to the WRC under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07). **Mr Magenta** and **Mr Koffi** agreed.

7.4 **Ms Jeanty** expressed frustration at the fact that the sensitivity of matters relating to CS Article 48 appeared to be preventing the Board from dealing with the subject satisfactorily, as she was not fully convinced that invocation of the article in the present case was justified in all respects. The only response open to the Board appeared to be that it would address the matter of CS Article 48 under Resolution 80.

7.5 **Mr Hoan** said that India should be thanked for its response to the points raised by Germany. However, it remained unclear whether all the recorded assignments in question were used for military purposes, or whether in fact some were used for purposes to which CS Article 48 was not applicable, as maintained by Germany. While the matter should be addressed under Resolution 80, the Board might consider instructing the Bureau to assist in organizing a bilateral meeting between the Indian and German Administrations in a bid to resolve the issue.

7.6 The **Chairman**, responding to Ms Jeanty, considered that the decision taken by the Board at its 77th meeting remained valid, and he questioned whether it fell within the Board's mandate to intervene when an administration had invoked CS Article 48. Responding to Mr Hoan, he doubted whether bilateral meetings would serve much purpose, given the sensitivity of the matter and India's insistence on the application of CS Article 48.

7.7 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** noted that in its letter contained in Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/3 the Administration of Germany stressed the importance for the Bureau and Board to provide clarity on the manner and ease with which CS Article 48 could be applied and clearly identify those satellite networks for which the article had been invoked. In that regard, it was the Bureau's practice to keep an internal database of networks for which CS Article 48 had been invoked, and the Bureau divulged whatever information might be relevant if another administration raised questions regarding a network for which the article had been invoked. That practice could be maintained, or the Board might see fit to instruct the Bureau to publish all the notifications it received under CS Article 48.

7.8 **Mr Strelets** stressed the sensitivity of matters relating to CS Article 48, and considered that it was not the prerogative of the Board to decide to disclose all cases of its application. Regarding the need for clarity in the application of CS Article 48, the latter was part of the ITU Constitution, and thus fell under the responsibility of the plenipotentiary conference. If any administration had problems with its application, it could take the matter to that conference. Moreover, both WRC-12 and WRC-15 had discussed the application of the article and issued clear explanations regarding the action to be taken by the Bureau. Nothing had been requested of the Board, and administrations could also submit their concerns to the WRC if they so wished. Lastly, the application of CS Article 48 had no direct bearing on the rational and efficient use of the spectrum and orbit, and he therefore questioned the relevance of addressing it under the Board's Resolution 80 report. He concluded that the Board was not authorized to do anything further on the matter raised by Germany.

7.9 **Mr Ito** said that the present case and response received from India pointed to the fact that CS Article 48 appeared to transcend all other texts of the Union and action by the Bureau and Board. The Board could do little more than flag the issue, calling for the need for control regarding the invocation of CS Article 48 in order to avoid contaminating the entire Radio Regulations environment.

7.10 **Ms Wilson** saw no need for the Board to respond to requests made in a late submission to a Board meeting. She further noted that CS Article 48 had been addressed in a previous Board report under Resolution 80, and there was no reason why it should not be flagged again in the Board's Resolution 80 report to WRC-19, drawing attention to the need to avoid abuse in its application. **Mr Magenta** agreed.

7.11 **Mr Khairov** supported Ms Wilson and Mr Magenta. Responding to the points made by Mr Hoan, he noted that the Indian Administration had stated clearly in its submission that all the assignments to its four networks under consideration were used for military purposes, and all administrations were now duly informed accordingly for future purposes.

7.12 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

“The Board carefully noted Documents RRB18-2/10 and RRB18-2/11 and also considered Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/3 for information. The Board thanked the Administrations of India and Germany for the information provided and noted that the Administration of India has reconfirmed the application of CS Article 48 to the recorded frequency assignments to the INSAT-2(48), INSAT-2M(48), INSAT-2T(48) and INSAT-EK48R satellite networks at 48°E. Furthermore, the Board recognized that it was not within its mandate to make decisions with reference to CS Article 48. However, the Board draws the attention of administrations when applying CS Article 48 on the need to observe provision 3 of CS Article 48.”

7.13 It was so **agreed**.

## **8 Submission by the Administration of the Russian Federation requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the ENSAT-23E satellite network (23°E) (Documents RRB18-2/12, RRB18-2/DELAYED/4, RRB18-2/DELAYED/5, RRB18-2/DELAYED/6)**

8.1 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** drew attention to Document RRB18-2/12, which contained a request from the Administration of the Russian Federation for an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the “ENSAT-13E satellite network (13°E)”. Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/4 contained a further submission from the Russian Federation correcting the initial request to read “ENSAT-23E satellite network (23°E)”. He drew attention to Documents RRB18-2/DELAYED/5 and 6 from the Administrations of Germany and Luxembourg, respectively, urging the Board to postpone any discussions on the subject to its next meeting due to the very late submission of the corrigendum by the Russian Federation.

8.2 **Ms Wilson**, supported by **Mr Ito**, said that the late submission by the Russian Federation correcting the orbital position changed significantly the substance of the request. Administrations should have a proper opportunity to submit their comments, and the item should therefore be deferred to the Board's next meeting.

8.3 **Mr Koffi** agreed and took it that the Bureau would maintain the present status of the Russian network pending the Board's decision at its next meeting.

8.4 In response to a comment by **Mr Magenta**, the **Chairman** pointed out that the Board would require an analysis from the Bureau on the impact on other satellite networks before it could decide whether or not *force majeure* had arisen.

8.5 **Ms Wilson** said that Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/4 constituted a revision to Document RRB18-2/12, and should therefore be considered by the Board as a contribution at its next meeting.

8.6 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude as follows:



“The Board considered the information provided in Document RRB18-2/12 and also considered Documents RRB18-2/DELAYED/4, RRB18-2/DELAYED/5 and RRB18-2/DELAYED/6 for information. Taking due note of the major change introduced by delayed Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/4 and the need for the Bureau and the administrations concerned to analyse the impact of this modification on other satellite networks, the Board decided to defer the consideration of this matter to its 79th meeting in order to allow potentially affected administrations an opportunity to investigate and respond on this matter. The Board instructed the Bureau to publish Document RRB18-2/DELAYED/4 as a contribution to its 79th meeting.”

8.7 It was so **agreed**.

## **9 Consideration of issues related to Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07)**

9.1 A meeting of the Board’s Working Group on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) under the chairmanship of Ms Wilson was held on the afternoon of Wednesday, 18 July 2018, and the Board **agreed** to adopt the following conclusions on the item:

“The Board decided that the Working Group on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) would produce a preliminary draft of the report of the RRB to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07), which will be studied at the 79th meeting. The Board instructed the Bureau to take the necessary actions to make the draft report available as a contribution to the 79th meeting. The Board thanked Ms J. Wilson for the outstanding work done on this matter.”

## **10 Confirmation of the dates of the next meeting in 2018 and indicative dates for subsequent meetings**

10.1 The Board **agreed** to confirm the dates of its next, 79th meeting as 26-30 November 2018, and to tentatively confirm the dates of its subsequent, 2019 meetings as follows:

80th meeting	18-22 March 2019
81st meeting	5-12 July 2019
82nd meeting	7-11 October 2019

## **11 Approval of the summary of decisions (Document RRB18-2/14)**

11.1 The Board **approved** the summary of decisions as contained in Document RRB18-2/14.

## **12 Closure of the meeting**

12.1 **Mr Magenta** commended the Chairman for his skilled and efficient handling of the meeting.

12.2 The **Chairman** thanked everyone for their contributions to the meeting. He closed the meeting at 1630 hours on Thursday, 19 July 2018.

The Executive Secretary:  
F. RANCY

The Chairman:  
M. BESSI