



## Radiocommunication Bureau (BR)

Circular Letter  
CR/440

12 February 2019

To Administrations of Member States of the ITU

Subject: **Minutes of the 79<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 79<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Radio Regulations Board (26 – 30 November 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 that reads 'Mario Maniewicz'.

Mario Maniewicz  
Director

Annex: Minutes of the 79<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Radio Regulations Board

**Distribution:**

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



**Document RRB18-3/14-E**  
**19 December 2018**  
**Original: English**

MINUTES\*  
OF THE  
79TH MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD

26-30 November 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 A. PITT and Ms C. FERRIE-TENCONI

Also present:

Mr H. ZHAO, Secretary-General  
Mr M. MANIEWICZ, Deputy-Director, BR  
Mr A. VALLET, Chief, SSD  
Mr C. C. LOO, Head, SSD/SPR  
Mr M. SAKAMOTO, Head, SSD/SSC  
Mr J. WANG, Head, SSD/SNP  
Mr N. VASSILIEV, Chief, TSD  
Mr K. BOGENS, Head, TSD/FMD  
Ms I. GHAZI, Head, TSD/BCD  
Mr S. JALAYERIAN, 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 79th meeting of the Board. The official decisions of the 79th meeting of the Radio Regulations Board can be found in Document RRB18-3/13.

<b>Subjects discussed</b>	<b>Documents</b>
1 Opening of the meeting	-
2 Late submissions	-
3 Report by the Director of BR	RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) + Addenda 1 and 2(Rev.1)
4 Rules of procedure	RRB18-3/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.9))
5 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use frequency assignments to satellite networks: 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)	RRB18-3/2, RRB18-3/11; RRB18-3/DELAYED/5
6 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of Luxembourg requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the LXS-AIS satellite network	RRB18-3/4(Rev.1)
7 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of Egypt requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the EGYCOMM0A satellite network at 35.5°E	RRB18-3/7, RRB18-3/8, RRB18-3/10; RRB18-3/DELAYED/3
8 Submission by the Administration of Bangladesh regarding the processing of a filing for the frequency assignments to the BDSAT-119E-FSS satellite network under Article 6 of Appendix 30B	RRB18-3/6
9 Submission by the Administration of Norway regarding the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite network and the use of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution	RRB18-3/12; RRB18-3/DELAYED/4; RRB18-3/DELAYED/6
10 Submission by the Administration of the United Kingdom requesting consideration of interference issues affecting the reception of UK coordinated and agreed HF broadcasting stations	RRB18-3/9; RRB18-3/DELAYED/1; RRB18-3/DELAYED/2
11 Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19 on Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07)	RRB18-3/3
12 Discussion of chairmanship and vice-chairmanship of the Board for 2019	-
13 Confirmation of the dates of the next meeting and indicative dates for subsequent meetings	-
14 Oral report by RRB representatives on the Plenipotentiary Conference (Dubai, 2018)	-
15 Approval of the summary of decisions	RRB18-3/13
16 Closure of the meeting	-

## 1 Opening of the meeting

1.1 The **Chairman** opened the meeting at 1400 hours on Monday, 26 November 2018 and welcomed participants. He said that, regrettably, it would be the last Board meeting for the majority of members; he wished them success in all their future endeavours. He also welcomed the Secretary-General and congratulated him on having been unanimously re-elected at PP-18.

1.2 The **Secretary-General** said that it was indeed an honour to have been re-elected unanimously by ITU Member States. Their strong support was largely due to the achievements of ITU-R in recent years. He paid tribute to the outgoing Director of BR, Mr Rancy, for his leadership and for his contribution to the success of WRC-15 despite serious health problems. He was confident that Mr Rancy's successor, Mr Maniewicz, would continue the good work and preparations for the upcoming WRC. He expressed his appreciation to all outgoing Board members, not only for their important work in ensuring observance of the Radio Regulations, but also for the democratic manner in which they had conducted their proceedings. He expressed the hope that the next Board would continue in that spirit and welcomed the presence of more women members. In token of ITU's appreciation, it was his pleasure to award ITU silver medals to the outgoing Board members who had not attended PP-18: Mr Ito, Mr Magenta and Mr Terán. The other outgoing members had been presented with their medals at PP-18.

1.3 The **Director** also welcomed the participants and wished them a productive meeting.

## 2 Late submissions

2.1 **Mr Botha (SGD)** drew attention to six late submissions, which could be taken into consideration for information purposes under the agenda items to which they related.

2.2 **Mr Strelets** said that the Administrations of China and the United Arab Emirates specifically requested that the Board defer its consideration of their late submissions until the 80th Board meeting. The late submission from the United Arab Emirates concerned a submission from Norway which raised issues relating to Article 48 of the Constitution that were not covered by the Board's current rules of procedure; a new rule of procedure might therefore need to be drafted. He proposed that the Board address the requests from the Administrations of China and the United Arab Emirates when examining its agenda.

2.3 The **Director** noted that it was the responsibility of the Board and not administrations to propose changes to the agendas of the Board's meetings. When dealing with the various issues raised under the different agenda items the Board might well decide to defer their consideration, but it was not appropriate to do so at the present juncture.

2.4 The **Chairman** recalled that the Board's practice was to deal with issues under the relevant agenda items and defer their consideration only if it did not have all the necessary information to take a decision. Documents submitted within the deadline were placed on the agenda and taken up during the meeting; late submissions on related issues were considered for information purposes only.

2.5 **Mr Kibe** agreed with the Director, whose view was in accordance with §1.6 of Part C of the Rules of Procedure.

2.6 **Ms Wilson** agreed with the Director and Mr Kibe. All the late submissions received related to agenda items and should be considered under the relevant items.

2.7 **Mr Magenta** said that the Board had always followed the same procedure with regard to late submissions and should continue to do so.

2.8 **Ms Jeanty**, agreeing with Ms Wilson, stressed the importance of dealing with late submissions on a case-by-case basis. If the Board considered that it was not in a position to take a decision on a submission, it should defer its consideration; however, such a decision should not be taken merely at the request of an administration.

- 2.9 **Mr Ito** said that the Board should consider the late submissions before taking any decision on them.
- 2.10 **The Chairman** said that in line with the views expressed by the majority of members, all the late submissions would be considered under the agenda items to which they related.
- 2.11 It was so **agreed**.
- 2.12 The **Chairman** said that he assumed that Mr Strelets' comments regarding the Board's rules of procedure had a bearing on the proposal submitted by a group of administrations to PP-18 to revise that part of Resolution 119 (Rev. Antalya, 2006) dealing specifically with the Board's working methods.
- 2.13 **Ms Wilson** observed that no decision had been taken during PP-18 that obliged the Board to take any action with regard to its working methods. A recommendation had been issued not to modify Resolution 119 (Rev. Antalya, 2006), and it had been noted that the resolution instructed the Board to continue to review periodically its working methods and that Member States might wish to contribute in that regard. It was the Board's responsibility to reflect on its efficiency and revise its working methods or Rules of Procedure as and when it deemed necessary.
- 2.14 The **Chairman**, endorsing Ms Wilson's comments, suggested that the matter be further reflected on within the context of the Rules of Procedure and its working group (see §4 below).
- 2.15 It was so **agreed**.
- 2.16 **Mr Strelets** said that the very voluminous late submission from the Administration of China (Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/2) was available in English and Chinese only. He asked whether it could be translated into other languages before its presentation so that it could be considered carefully, as the Administration of China had requested.
- 2.17 The **Chairman** said that it would not be possible to translate the document into the other languages in time, but that the Bureau would present it in detail when it was taken up.

### **3 Report by the Director of BR (Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) and Addenda 1 and 2(Rev.1))**

3.1 The **Director** introduced his customary report in Document RRB18-3/5 (Rev.1), drawing attention to Annex 1 relating to the actions taken by the Bureau arising from the Board's 78th meeting. Good progress had been made on the recurrent matter of delays in processing times for filings, thanks to the Bureau's continued efforts, helped by a slight easing in the number of networks notified. Regarding cost recovery, the status of discussions in the Expert Group on Decision 482 set up by the Council was reported in §6.

#### **Processing of filings for terrestrial and space systems (§2 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.2 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, referring to filings for space systems, drew attention to Annex 3 to Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1), for which an update to include October 2018 was available. He noted that the average treatment time was now below three months for API (Table 1), and had been cut to 3.4 months for coordination requests (Table 2), thus meeting the regulatory deadline in both cases. The treatment time for submissions under §4.1.3/4.2.6 of Article 4 of Appendices 30/30A (Table 3) had also fallen again, thus remaining below the six-month performance indicator. The treatment time for submissions under Articles 6 and 7 of Appendix 30B (Table 4) had been further reduced, although it was still high at 10.5 months. The average treatment time for notifications pertaining to earth stations under Article 11 Part II-S/Part III-S (Table 6B) had stood at 13.4 months in September 2018. As previously reported, however, that parameter was adversely affected by notifications of earth stations located in, or having coordination contours overlapping, disputed territories (currently 28 cases, some of which had been open for over three years). Accordingly, the Bureau had also calculated the respective treatment time excluding such cases, which came to 5.3 months. As the latter figure provided a better measure of the Bureau's performance, BR proposed to present both figures in future

reports. As noted in §2.1 of the report, in line with the decision of the 78th meeting of RRB, use of the application “e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings”, developed in response to Resolution 908 (Rev.WRC-15), had become mandatory from 1 August 2018. In addition to Circular Letter CR/433 introducing the measure, the Bureau had also simultaneously issued Circular Letter CR/434, which provided more detail to facilitate the transition for administrations. The response had been good; indeed, all filings in November had been submitted electronically without any problems, and the Bureau remained available to assist any administration that might encounter any difficulty.

3.3 **Mr Strelets** stressed that the Bureau was to be congratulated on its well-coordinated and successful efforts to reduce satellite network filing processing times. With respect to Articles 6 and 7 of Appendix 30B, he suspected that further progress might in fact depend more on action upstream, including from the regulatory standpoint, rather than on providing additional resources to BR.

3.4 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** confirmed that, while extra resources would certainly help, they would indeed not eliminate the problem. Experience showed that, in submitting additional notifications, administrations often failed to take account of the particularities of Appendix 30B, which obliged the Bureau to seek clarifications or additional details, thus introducing delays not only for the Bureau’s action but also in terms of the statutory 30-day period for reply. If such filings could be better harmonized, treatment times could be shortened. It would be useful to raise the point at a radiocommunication seminar in order to make administrations aware of that aspect.

3.5 **Mr Strelets** wondered whether it might be time to address the underlying regulatory issues, and contemplate simplifying the coordination rules in order to reduce processing times and greatly facilitate the work of satellite operators, for example by extending application of No. 9.11 to additional use of the planned frequency bands and for such cases ceasing to calculate in respect of the reference situation. The Plan had been adopted 30 years ago, and in practice it was uneconomical for small countries to implement allotments, giving rise to frozen, unused resources. That had a big impact on processing times, and on efficient use of the spectrum. It might be beneficial to draw administrations’ attention to the matter and for the Board or WRC to discuss it. It would also be useful to have a document with statistics describing the degree of efficiency of implementation of the AP30B Plan.

3.6 The **Chairman** pointed out that the Board and Bureau could not act beyond their mandates. It was the prerogative of administrations to analyse such regulatory issues and raise them at a WRC. Having said that, the points discussed in relation to submissions under Appendix 30B merited reflection and could be brought to administrations’ attention at a radiocommunication seminar or a symposium and be referred to in the Director’s report to WRC.

3.7 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** drew attention to Annex 2 to Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1), which provided detailed information on the processing of notices for terrestrial services. As shown in Table 1, in spite of the large number of footnotes referring to No. 9.21, only a small number of notices (33) had been received so far in 2018 under No. 9.21. In respect of terrestrial assignments for recording in the Master Register under Article 11 (Table 3), some 178 assignments in disputed territories remained in abeyance.

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

“In relation to § 2 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1), the Board:

- Noted with appreciation the continued efforts from the Bureau resulting in further reductions in the treatment time of satellite network filings. The Board noted that although further reductions in the treatment time of filings under Appendix 30B would be welcomed, the allocation of more resources in the treatment process may not have a significant impact on the treatment time.
- Endorsed the decision of the Bureau to provide separate statistics for the treatment time of submissions under Article 11 of earth stations located in disputed and undisputed territories.

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;
- Continue 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 satellite network filings.”

3.9 It was so **agreed**.

**Reports of harmful interference and/or infringements of the Radio Regulations (Article 15) (§4.1 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.10 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)**, drawing attention to Tables 1 to 4 in the Director’s report, noted that a total of 274 communications concerning reports of harmful interference and/or infringements had been received by the Bureau between 1 October 2017 and 30 September 2018.

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

3.11 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that §4.2 of the Director’s report summarized the situation regarding interference caused by Italian stations to TV and sound broadcasting stations of neighbouring countries in the VHF/UHF bands. As requested at the 78th meeting of the Board, the Bureau had drawn up a document, contained in Addendum 2 (Rev.1) to the Director’s report, providing a consolidated summary of the situation, based on priority lists, contributions from the administrations and the roadmap from Italy. All the administrations involved had cooperated fully in the preparation of the document; but it only covered the priority cases. In addition, for the Administrations of Croatia and Slovenia the data in the document refer only to the Italian dominant interferers (operating co-channel or within  $\pm 200$  kHz of the central frequency), and thus did not represent the full picture. As could be seen, despite some progress the situation remained difficult. Addendum 1 to the Director’s report contained recent information received from the Administration of Croatia dated 2 November 2018. In October 2018, Croatia had submitted over 900 new Appendix 10 harmful interference reports in accordance with the Article 15 procedure. Croatia reported substantial improvement in regard to TV broadcasting, although Italy continued to operate on TV channels allotted to Croatia but not yet in use. Similar improvement had not been seen in relation to FM sound broadcasting. At the conclusion of multilateral meetings in October 2017 and June 2018, Italy had been requested to provide information on five action items, but no updates had been forthcoming. Finally, and adding a new dimension to the issue, Croatia stated that Italian broadcasting stations had started to use T-DAB channels (12A, 12B and 12C) allotted to Croatia in the GE06 Plan but not yet in use by Croatia.

3.12 In reply to a question from the **Chairman**, who wondered whether, following the good progress made in relation to digital terrestrial TV through cooperation among the countries concerned, Italy had communicated any plans to free channels allotted to Croatia below 700 MHz so as to allow Croatia to exploit the digital dividend by moving channels from above 700 MHz, **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that no information had been received. To facilitate future consideration, the Bureau could separate the two types of cases, namely interference to TV stations in use and emissions on frequencies allotted to Croatia but not yet in use.

3.13 The **Director** confirmed that the focus to date, and associated progress made, had been on eliminating interference. While the occupation by Italian stations of channels not allotted to Italy under the GE06 Plan was not yet causing interference, the issue would need to be addressed in order to avoid future problems and allow smooth GE06 planning for all parties.

3.14 The **Chairman**, noting also the existence of a European transition plan, suggested that the Bureau might be tasked with analysing those cases in detail with the Italian Administration to determine a time-frame for release of the channels in question.

3.15 **Mr Khairov**, pointing to some precedents where technical solutions had helped resolve such issues, said that, given the distance separating Italy and Croatia and the warm-sea propagation conditions prevailing in the Adriatic, some modifications to technical characteristics of the interfering stations (such as, for example, power, antenna pattern, elevation) might suffice. One course of action could thus be to establish a group of technical EMC experts from the countries concerned under the leadership of the Bureau to elaborate concrete proposals for technical solutions.

3.16 **Mr Strelets** underlined that, while much still remained to be done, the major efforts undertaken had clearly been successful to a degree, prompting Italy, for example, to enact a law that had exerted a very positive impact in terms of reducing interference in digital TV broadcasting. That aspect should be duly reflected in the Board's and Director's reports to the WRC, to indicate how the issue had been tackled by the Board and the Bureau and underline the progress made. Recognizing the positive outcome of the meetings held between the parties, he wondered whether the Bureau had received any response from Italy in respect of the five action items agreed at the multilateral meeting, and for when the next meeting was planned. Concurring, the **Chairman** said that the achievements should indeed be duly reflected in the Director's report. He also wondered whether Italy had indicated any possible approach to address the priority list.

3.17 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** replied that no information had yet been received from Italy on the five items, and the next multilateral meeting was scheduled for June 2019. At the June 2018 meeting, there had been some commitments on the part of the administrations to hold bilateral meetings, which could constitute an effective way forward. Regarding possible technical solutions, Italy had already implemented some measures to eliminate interference under the previous roadmap. The situation in the case at hand was, however, slightly different from similar past cases, insofar as broadcasting stations in some areas in Italy were not under the direct governance of the regulator. Without decisions by the regulator, for economic reasons the broadcasters might be averse to making the necessary investments to modify stations in operation. Also, neighbouring administrations had expressed a preference to have the issue dealt with at meetings at the regulator level rather than by contacts between local broadcasters.

3.18 Following a comment by **Ms Wilson** that it was imperative that administrations in adjacent countries adhere to the Plan, yet the instruments available to the Board and the Bureau to ensure compliance were limited, **Mr Ito** emphasized that the core of ITU's work was founded on respect for regulations and mutual cooperation in good faith. It was thus important to keep urging the administrations concerned to meet, discuss and establish a schedule for resolving the issue, and to inform the membership of such cases. **Mr Strelets** concurred, pointing out, moreover, that beyond goodwill and mutual respect, Member States had committed to the terms of the Constitution, Convention and Radio Regulations. The cooperation reported and important progress made so far provided a good foundation on which to pursue the matter in the same vein. **Ms Jeanty** agreed that the Board must continue to push for the parties to reach agreement through cooperation, and **Mr Koffi** underlined the importance of bilateral meetings, which the Board should strongly encourage.

3.19 The **Chairman** said that, in order to facilitate further work, the Bureau should publish the consolidated list of priority stations in Addendum 2 (Rev.1) to the Director's report, and any future updates, on the relevant ITU webpage.

3.20 In response to a question from the **Chairman** concerning the T-DAB channels, **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** confirmed that the Bureau's normal course of action upon receipt of information on measurements showing channels allotted to one administration under the GE06 Plan being used by another administration was to request the latter to refrain from such usage. **Ms Jeanty** pointed out that Italy's emissions on the T-DAB channels allotted to Croatia, while not yet causing harmful interference, constituted a case of non-conformity with the Plan that must be attended to. That view was shared by **Ms Wilson**, who said that the Board should request that the T-DAB channels be included in the roadmap.



3.21 The **Chairman** noted that, on the basis of the information communicated to the Bureau by Croatia, the Board was unanimously in favour of extending the scope of the issue to include the question of occupation of T-DAB channels. On the basis of the discussion, he suggested that the Board conclude as follows:

“In considering §4.2 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) and its Addenda 1 and 2(Rev.1), the Board noted with gratitude the efforts of the Bureau and the administrations concerned in establishing the consolidated list of priority sound broadcasting stations for which action would be required to eliminate harmful interference. The Board encouraged the Administration of Italy and its neighbouring administrations to continue to convene bilateral and multilateral coordination meetings. Furthermore, the Board requested the Administration of Italy to:

- Comply with the GE06 Regional Agreement for digital sound broadcasting and, given that the current use of some T-DAB frequency blocks by Italy is not in conformity with the GE06 Plan provide a roadmap for the release of these T-DAB frequency blocks;
- Bring the remaining Italian television broadcasting stations into conformity with the GE06 digital television broadcasting Plan and allow for the implementation of the second digital dividend in the relevant neighbouring administrations;
- Continue to provide the administrations of the relevant neighbouring countries and the Bureau with the information agreed at the multilateral meetings.

The Board decided to instruct the Bureau to publish the consolidated list of priority sound broadcasting stations of neighbouring countries of Italy for which harmful interference must be mitigated and any eventual updates to this list on the relevant ITU webpage, and encouraged the administrations concerned to provide the Bureau in a timely manner with any update to this document on a continuous basis.”

3.22 It was so **agreed**.

**Submission of interference reports for space services using the web-based application “Satellite Interference Reporting and Resolution System” (SIRRS) (§4.3 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.23 **Mr Vallet (Chef SSD)** said that §4.3 of the Director’s report provided the Board with information on implementation of the operational version of the SIRRS application, a web-based tool to facilitate the submission of interference reports concerning space services and the subsequent exchange of information and to assist in identifying and promptly eliminating sources of interference.

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

“The Board noted the actions of the Bureau reported under §4.3 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) and instructed the Bureau to continue to assist administrations in the exploitation of the SIRRS web application.”

**Implementation of No. 11.44.1, No. 11.47, No. 11.48, No. 11.49, No. 9.38.1, Resolution 49 and No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (§5 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.25 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that §5 of the Director’s report provided statistics on the suppression of satellite network special sections and submissions. It could be seen from Table 5 that the bulk of the suppressions resulted from expiry of the seven-year regulatory deadline under No. 11.48; and from the application of No. 13.6, which showed the impact of the Bureau’s action in implementation of that provision. Between 2012 and 2018, the ratio between total and partial suppressions under No. 13.6 had been reversed, indicating that the Bureau’s work and administrations’ submissions had become more precise, so that the MIFR provided a truer reflection of the real situation in terms of orbit operation.

**Council work on cost recovery for satellite network filings (§6 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.26 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Council Expert Group on Decision 482 set up by Council-18 had met on 27-28 September 2018 to consider Procedures B and C described in

Document C18/36. The group's detailed consideration of the procedures had given rise to five requests to BR, including to "report to the next meetings of the RRB on the progress achieved and consideration given by the Expert Group on Decision 482 on the course of action to be taken by the RRB and the BR regarding amendments to certain RoP, such as receivability, and RR No. 11.31 for the reduction and facilitation of the tasks performed by the BR". The Bureau would be submitting such a report to the 80th meeting of RRB. The next meeting of the Expert Group was scheduled for 28 February – 1 March 2019, immediately after the CPM.

3.27 In reply to a question from **Mr Strelets**, who asked to what extent consideration of Procedures B and C was still relevant given the perhaps diminishing trend in respect of non-GSO networks, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the situation was different for each procedure. The aim of Procedure B, rather than recovering more costs, was to incite administrations to remain within reasonable limits in the size of their submissions, insofar as there was no restriction to prevent them from submitting very large and complex non-GSO filings, which could create peaks in demand on Bureau resources and hence processing bottlenecks since filings had to be treated in order. Procedure C, on the other hand, focused on how best to cover specific software development costs incurred when applications had to be updated every so often to accommodate changed requirements. Such costs could be incorporated in the general cost-recovery framework, or the relevant amounts could be allocated directly by the Council as and when required. The Expert Group was currently leaning towards the second option.

3.28 **Mr Koffi** wished to ascertain the purpose of the consolidated documents relating to modifications to RR Appendix 4 which the Expert Group had requested the Bureau to provide to the CPM and WRC-19 (request 4 in §6 of the Director's report). In response, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** explained that since Annex 2 to Appendix 4 was the subject of several proposed amendments from Working Party 4A under WRC-19 agenda item 7, as well as other proposals under items 1.6 and 1.7, the Bureau had been asked to provide a consolidated synthesis of all proposals. An overview was necessary in order to assess the relevance of the proposals, identify any potential issues and in particular ensure that the whole set of proposals was altogether coherent. The Bureau was also asked to identify any items that might be superfluous or any modifications that could reduce its workload, for example by harmonizing input data. That point was also addressed in §7.2 of the Director's report to the present meeting.

3.29 The **Chairman** enquired whether the action requested of the Bureau in request 2 in §6 would call for revisions to rules of procedure. **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the general question had been raised in the Expert Group as to whether there were any possible changes to rules of procedure that might facilitate the Bureau's work or reduce its load. The Bureau's initial analysis had suggested no obvious candidates. Furthermore, experience had demonstrated the need to adopt a cautious approach, since the procedures at the heart of the Bureau's work were generally essential for applying the regulations, and some past attempts to find strong remedies had backfired. The measure taken by the Board, and endorsed by administrations, allowing BR to treat publications in several stages and proceed with publication while still completing the technical examination had been very beneficial, and solutions might lie more in pragmatic options of that nature than in revising rules of procedure. Lastly, it must be remembered that, as borne out by the statistics, a lot of progress had been made already, so there was less call for radical measures at the present stage.

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

"In relation to §6 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1), the Board noted the information reported by the Bureau on the Council work on cost recovery for satellite filings. The Board instructed the Bureau to continue to report to the Board on the progress of this work and to submit a report to the 80th Board meeting on the associated rules of procedure that might need to be modified."

3.31 It was so **agreed**.

**Review of findings for frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems under Resolution 85 (WRC-03) (§7 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.32 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau continued to publish the reviewed findings for non-GSO satellite networks subject to the Article 22 efd limits. Since the 78th RRB meeting, seven more systems had been reviewed, receiving the findings indicated in §7.1 of the Director's report. It should be noted that, since four of the seven systems contained multiple orbit configurations, in reality the volume of work accomplished by the Bureau was equivalent to 34 reviews.

3.33 The Board **agreed** to conclude on §7.1 of the Director's report as follows:

“The Board noted with appreciation the progress reported by the Bureau under §7.1 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) on the application of Resolution 85 (WRC-03) and instructed the Bureau to continue to follow this approach.”

3.34 Introducing §7.2 of the document, on harmonization of input data, a matter which had already been discussed at the Board's previous two meetings, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** reported that Working Party 4A had considered the necessary changes to Appendix 4 as issues I and L under WRC-19 Agenda Item 7 and had developed the corresponding CPM text in Sections 3/7/9 and 3/7/12 of Document CPM19-2/1. Regarding consequent updating of the efd validation software, the budgetary requirements were being assessed and a modular procurement approach was being considered to ensure sustainable availability of the necessary tools for the Bureau. Following a request from **Ms Wilson** for more explanation of the modular approach, he said that the first version of the efd validation software was proprietary, which meant that the Bureau did not possess the source code, and as the companies involved were often small there was a risk in terms of sustainability. The aim was thus to take the opportunity of version 3 to prepare a broader call for bids that went beyond a simple update, allowing several companies to tender proposals, and possibly to award contracts in batches, thus securing a system that could be evolved more easily without having to modify the core program every time the database structure is altered. The Bureau was in the process of formulating the call for bids in collaboration with the ITU Procurement Service.

3.35 The Board **agreed** to conclude on §7.2 of the Director's reports as follows:

“When considering §7.2 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) the Board noted the information reported on the harmonization of input data under Appendix 4, and instructed the Bureau to report to the 80th Board meeting on progress on the update to the efd validation software.”

**Class of station symbols for stations in the space operation service or providing space operation functions (§8 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.36 Introducing §8 of the Director's report, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** drew attention to a subtle distinction drawn in the Radio Regulations between the space operation service (SOS) (defined in No. 1.23, class of station ET) and the space operation functions (space telemetry, space telecommand and space tracking, defined in Nos. 1.133, 1.135 and 1.136, class of station ER, ED and EK, respectively). No. 1.23 stated that “These functions will normally be provided within the service in which the space station is operating”. The examination under No. 11.31 of notices with classes of emission related to the space operation functions was governed by the rule of procedure on No. 1.23. Until now, on that basis, the Bureau had processed many filings where the class of station symbols ET and ER/ED/EK could be used interchangeably, a practice which had not generated any serious difficulty, insofar as the frequency bands in the filings were either allocated to the main service or allocated to the SOS and the main service under the same regulatory conditions, resulting in the same finding irrespective of the class of station symbol. Cases had recently arisen, however, of filings for space operation functions performed in other services in a number of frequency bands, listed in §8 of the Director's report, which were allocated to the SOS and to other space services but under different regulatory provisions. In some bands, for example, the SOS was subject to coordination whereas the space operation functions in the other space service were not. In such instances, it was essential to distinguish between the SOS and the space operation function(s) provided under the other service,

since the regulatory finding would be different. First, as an immediate general measure, the Bureau had released a new version of the SpaceVal validation software which precluded use of the symbol ET in an inappropriate band, and it intended to issue a circular letter explaining the class of station symbols concerned and reminding administrations to use the correct symbol when submitting notices. Secondly, a detailed analysis of the situation in the listed bands would be provided to the Board's next meeting.

3.37 In response to concerns expressed by **Mr Strelets**, who wished to know whether the approach was applied only to new filings, and thought that the approach might first need to be coordinated with administrations as it could affect the manner in which filings were examined as well as the findings given, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** provided three detailed examples to illustrate situations in different bands, two where the notified class of station symbols did not affect the finding and were interchangeable, and the other – the case of the bands listed in §8 – where the class of station symbol would imply different regulatory treatment. In the latter instance, under the immediate measure taken by the Bureau, the administration would simply be asked to apply the appropriate class of symbol to be consistent with the Radio Regulations; and, in practice, no administration would object to doing so. Thus, there was no regulatory impact at that stage, and no need to consult administrations. The measure would indeed apply only to new filings, and not be retroactive.

3.38 **Mr Strelets** remained concerned. The Bureau was quite correct in stating that if the SOS was indicated (ET) in a given band, the function (ER/ED/EK) could not suddenly become primary if the SOS allocation was secondary in that band. However, it would be unwise to interpret the definition of the SOS for the sake of convenience. No. 1.23 stipulated that the SOS was “concerned exclusively with the operation of spacecraft, in particular space tracking, space telemetry and space telecommand.” The words “in particular” implied that the three functions were elements included in the service, and trying to separate the service and the functions was hazardous. Another factor was that the situation regarding the SOS and space operation functions might be the legacy of a bygone era, when the three functions were supported by separate stations, whereas today the division was somewhat artificial insofar as they were usually combined in a single control station. For all those reasons, there was a need to reflect on the matter in depth and ensure the administrations were involved in the consideration of issues pertaining to fundamental regulatory provisions.

3.39 Recognizing that the Bureau was in any event proposing to make a detailed analysis, particularly regarding the problematical bands, and to report back to the next RRB meeting, the **Chairman** suggested that Mr Strelets and Mr Vallet discuss the technical aspects offline, and that the Board conclude as follows:

“Regarding §8 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) dealing with the class of station symbols for stations in the space operation service or providing space operation functions, the Board instructed the Bureau to submit a detailed report on the application of RR No. 1.23 to the 80th Board meeting and to issue a circular letter to inform administrations of the issue.”

3.40 It was so **agreed**.

#### **Frequency assignments to the USABSS-8 satellite network not in conformity with Resolution 4 (Rev. WRC-03) of the Radio Regulations (§9 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.41 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that, as described in §9 of the Director's report, following exchanges with the United States Administration under Resolution 4 (Rev. WRC-03), concerning expiry of the period of validity of the USABSS-8 satellite network, and under No. 13.6, seeking evidence of its continuous operation and identification of the actual satellite currently in operation, the United States had identified EHOSTAR-15 as the current satellite operating under the USABSS-8 satellite network. That information had been reliably verified. However, in the absence of a response to the Bureau's reminder of the need to provide a new period of validity, a symbol had been inserted in the Master Register indicating that the assignments to USABSS-8 were not in conformity with Resolution 4, and the information had been published in a Resolution 4 special section in the BR

IFIC. The Board might wish to encourage the United States Administration to communicate the new period of validity for the assignments in question.

3.42 **Mr Strelets** said that the case was somewhat perplexing. First, he wondered why, in the course of a procedure under Resolution 4, the Bureau had embarked on a procedure under No. 13.6. The two procedures were entirely separate, and the latter was only applicable when the Bureau had reliable information available that a recorded assignment was not in use. Secondly, he was unsure whether the Board was in a position to intervene: the administration had been informed that the network was marked in the Master Register as not compliant with Resolution 4, and was at liberty to respond if it so wished.

3.43 The **Chairman** understood that the problem was that a satellite was known to be in orbit with frequency assignments in use, but other administrations might be misled by the Master Register to believe that they had expired. That said, it was indeed unclear what added value the Board could bring beyond asking the Bureau to continue communicating with the administration concerned. Perhaps the mere inclusion of the case in the Director's report and its discussion by the Board might prompt the administration to act. That view was supported by **Mr Koffi**.

3.44 Later in the meeting, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** informed the Board that the revised period of validity had been received from the United States Administration.

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

“The Board noted the problem reported by the Bureau under §9 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) regarding the non-conformity with Resolution 4 (Rev.WRC-03) of the frequency assignments to the USABSS-8 satellite network and the Board further noted that the revised period of validity for the frequency assignments was received during the course of the 79th meeting.”

**Bringing back into use of some frequency assignments to the ARTEMIS-21.5E-DR and DRN-P2B satellite networks (§10 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.46 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that §10 of the report informed the Board of the Bureau's actions in respect of two networks (ARTEMIS-21.5E-DR and DRN-P2B) for which confirmation of bringing back into use had been received later than the 30-day period allowed under No. 11.49.1. Taking into account the reasons provided by the administrations (administrative error and time for the administration to verify the correctness of the information, respectively) and the fact that the actual operations of both networks were compliant with the spirit of No. 11.49.1, and on the basis of past precedents, the Bureau had decided to accept confirmation of the bringing back into use. Such cases were reported to the Board for the sake of transparency.

3.47 **Mr Strelets** fully supported the Bureau's actions regarding the ARTEMIS-21.5E-DR and DRN-P2B networks, as well as the USGOVSAT-1R network reported in §11. For many reasons, such as the sheer volume of correspondence, staff changes, etc., communications did not always reach the right official or the executive level. Some flexibility was in order when the networks in question were operating in accordance with the regulations and agreed characteristics. Excessive rigidity would not be in the interests not only of the notifying administration but also of the other administrations.

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

“The Board noted the decision taken by the Bureau under §10 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) concerning the bringing back into use of some frequency assignments to the ARTEMIS-21.5E-DR and DRN-P2B satellite networks.”

**Resubmission of notified frequency assignments to the USGOVSAT-1R satellite network (§11 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.49 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that §11 of the report informed the Board of the Bureau's action in respect of a network (USGOVSAT-1R) for which resubmission of the notice for recording under No. 11.41 had been received slightly later than the six-month deadline stipulated in No. 11.46. Taking

into account the detailed description of the circumstances provided by the administration (two BR communications not received) and the fact that the actual operational status of the network was compliant with the relevant provisions of Article 11, and on the basis of past precedents, the Bureau had decided to accept the late resubmission. Such cases were reported to the Board for the sake of transparency.

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

“The Board noted the decision taken by the Bureau under §11 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) concerning the resubmission of notified frequency assignments to the USGOVSAT-1R satellite network.”

**Public information about small satellites embarking very broad frequency ranges (§12 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.51 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the technological development described in §12 of the Director’s report was brought to the Board’s attention for information only. The emergence of small, low-cost satellites capable of transmitting or receiving on a much broader range of frequency bands than today could lead to more GSO satellites being brought into use, and potentially increase the risk of spectrum warehousing.

3.52 **Ms Wilson, Mr Ito and Mr Strelets** having remarked that it would be premature to draw any conclusions regarding the new development, which might however be raised in due course at future radiocommunication seminars or symposia, the **Chairman** noted that there had as yet been no analysis of the technology in question, notably from the point of view of its conformity with the Radio Regulations or potential impact, and that members unanimously agreed that the Board had no basis on which to express any opinion at that stage.

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

“The Board noted the information provided by the Bureau under §12 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) on small satellites that are capable of operating across very broad frequency ranges. The Board instructed the Bureau to keep it informed of any future developments.”

**Application of the rule of procedure on No. 9.19 (§13 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1))**

3.54 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that the change of approach in the application of the rule of procedure on No. 9.19 described in §12 of the Director’s report was submitted to the Board for information. Initially, the notifying administrations of terrestrial transmitters had been required to obtain coordination agreement from the administrations/network organizations responsible for any affected BSS network (based on the criteria of frequency overlap and a distance to the BSS service area of less than 1 200km). In practice, however, the BSS typical earth stations were not always located on the territory of the administrations responsible for the BSS network, which thus had no authority to give coordination agreement. Under the new approach, therefore, coordination agreement would be obtained from the administrations responsible for the territory on which the BSS earth stations were located. The approach had been incorporated in the software and tested, and the Bureau was re-examining previous notices. It was planned to republish them and inform the administrations accordingly.

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

“The Board noted the information provided by the Bureau under §13 of Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) on the application of the rule of procedure on RR No. 9.19.”

3.56 The Board **noted** the report of the Director of BR (Document RRB18-3/5(Rev.1) and Addenda 1 and 2(Rev.1).

#### 4 Rules of procedure (Document RRB18-3/1(RRB16-2/3(Rev.9)))

4.1 **Ms Jeanty**, speaking as the Chairman of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, introduced Document RRB18-3/1(RRB16-2/3(Rev.9)), noting that the Board had approved all the rules of procedure contained in the document at previous meetings. Prior to the current meeting, however, she had received a proposal from the Bureau to revise the rule of procedure relating to the GE75 Plan. If the Board agreed to that proposal, it would be reflected in an updated version of Document RRB18-3/1(RRB16-2/3(Rev.9)), for consideration at the 80th Board meeting.

4.2 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said the intent of the proposal was that it should be mandatory for administrations notifying digital assignments under the GE75 Plan modification procedure to specify two additional items – the modulation and code rate. That data was required to apply the algorithm used for identifying the administrations affected. No notifications concerning digital assignments had yet been received by the Bureau. A query from an administration had prompted the Bureau to draft the proposal.

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

“The Board decided to update the List of proposed rules of procedure in Document RRB18-3/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.9)) taking into account the proposal by the Bureau for the revision of specified rules of procedure.”

4.4 **Mr Strelets** said that he wished to discuss how the Board should deal with cases when administrations affected by submissions from other administrations were unable to respond appropriately on time for reasons beyond its control and requested the deferral of the submissions in question to a future meeting. The Board essentially had three options: to ignore such requests; to consider the relevant submissions, but defer any decision until a future meeting; or to defer consideration of the submissions to the next meeting. The third option would give the administrations affected the opportunity to prepare the necessary documentation, since, in accordance with §1.6 of Part C of the Rules of Procedure concerning the Board’s working methods, late submissions could be considered for information only. Consequently, the Board’s consideration of the substance of the late submission from the Administration of China (Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/2) concerning interference to United Kingdom broadcasting stations was not in compliance with the relevant rules of procedure. At the very least, the Board should make it clear to administrations whether or not they were entitled to make such requests for deferral, with a view to dispelling the current ambiguity. Simply ignoring requests from administrations, as the Board had done at the present meeting, was not the appropriate approach.

4.5 The **Chairman** said that it was indeed an important matter that had been raised by delegations at PP-18. He invited members to state their views and consider the possibility of amending the Board’s working methods, as set out in Part C of the Rules of Procedure, if appropriate.

4.6 **Ms Wilson** said that although a group of administrations had submitted proposals to PP-18 on the matter, those proposals had not been discussed in substance during the conference. Administrations that submitted documents to the Board were entitled to have them considered in a fair and timely manner, and if the Board had all the information it needed to take a decision during a meeting, it should be able to do so. The existing working methods allowed the Board to defer consideration of an issue to a future meeting, which it had done on several occasions for different reasons. She would be concerned about adopting a rule of procedure that would, in effect, force the Board to take a predetermined course of action. She was therefore at a loss as to what a new rule of procedure would say other than that the Board should consider the information provided and take appropriate action.

4.7 **Mr Magenta** said that the Board should deal with such issues on a case-by-case basis, but should not defer any decision simply at the request of an administration. He recalled that late submissions relevant to items on the agenda could be considered for information only.

4.8 **Ms Jeanty** agreed that the Board should deal with such issues on a case-by-case basis and not decide a priori to opt for deferral. The Board should take a decision on a given item if it had sufficient information and otherwise defer its consideration. She was not in favour of drafting new rules of procedure, as the Board would have less scope to defer or not defer consideration of an item. At PP-18, it had been suggested that Resolution 119 (Rev. Antalya, 2006) be amended such that the Board could defer its consideration of an item once only, but that would be too restrictive. It might need to defer consideration several times.

4.9 The **Chairman** recalled that under the current procedure, submissions received three weeks or more before the opening of a given meeting were placed on the agenda. That allowed concerned administrations sufficient time to make submissions, perhaps not to provide detailed information, but at least to outline their position and help the Board reach a decision. If the Board acceded to requests from administrations to defer consideration of matters until subsequent meetings, it ran the risk of creating a backlog of submissions.

4.10 **Ms Wilson** said that it was important to remember that under the present rules of procedure, late submissions could be considered if they were relevant to the agenda, otherwise they could be deferred; yet, such submissions could be considered for information purposes only. On the other hand, a late submission containing a request to defer consideration of a given issue was in fact a proposal, which could not be taken up as such by the Board. If the late submission provided an argument as to why consideration of the issue should be deferred, it could be considered by the Board for information.

4.11 **Mr Strelets** said that it was clear from the discussion that under certain circumstances administrations did not have any rights: even if they were concerned by a submission, they were not entitled to make proposals to the Board. He pointed out that in accordance with the §1.6 of Part C of the Rules of Procedure, a late submission could be considered for information only, if Board members agreed: if one member disagreed, the late submission could not be considered. Moreover, no matter what arguments administrations put forward in their late submissions, they could not be considered because such submissions were exclusively for information purposes. The crux of the matter was that administrations in that situation did not have equal rights. In that connection, he recalled proposals made by administrations in the past for their representatives to attend Board meetings; those proposals had not been followed up. The Board's new membership might well hold different views, and administrations had every right to raise the matter at WRC-19. Board members should not place themselves above administrations: they were elected to the Board by administrations and should therefore take their requests into account.

4.12 **Mr Magenta** agreed with Ms Wilson and Ms Jeanty that the best approach was not to be too prescriptive, but to remain flexible and to consider submissions on a case-by-case basis. He questioned the advisability of allowing representatives of administrations to attend Board meetings, as it raised the complicated question of whether they could make statements or provide written input.

4.13 **Mr Ito** endorsed Ms Wilson's comments concerning late submissions and their deferral. Upon examination of a late submission, the Board could decide whether it should be deferred to a future meeting. That could not be described as disregarding the request of the administration concerned, and was in conformity with the current rules of procedure, which therefore did not need to be changed.

4.14 **Ms Wilson**, referring to the rights of administrations, emphasized that the Board members had been elected to a post of great responsibility requiring them to exercise their judgement and observe the rights of all administrations as well the regulations adopted by conferences. She concurred with Mr Ito that the Board's current approach to its decisions on late submissions was in keeping with the rules of procedure and ensured observance of the rights of all administrations. A case in point was the Board's decision at its 78th meeting to defer consideration of a submission by the Administration of the Russian Federation concerning the bringing into use of frequency assignments to the ENSAT-



23E satellite network (23°E) to allow potentially affected administrations an opportunity to state their views.

**5 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use frequency assignments to satellite networks: 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 RRB18-3/2, RRB18-3/11 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/5)**

5.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB18-3/2, which contained a request from the Administration of the Russian Federation to extend the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use the frequency assignments to the ENSAT-23E satellite network. He recalled the Board's decision to defer consideration of the matter from its 78th meeting owing to a late submission from the Russian Federation notifying a change in the orbital position of the network. The network was intended to operate the Angosat satellite for broadcasting in Angola and other African countries. However, following the successful launch of the satellite in December 2017, a problem with its electrical power system had been detected during initial orbit flight tests. Efforts to rectify the problem and resume the flight tests had continued, in vain, until mid-April 2018. Thereafter it had been decided to start work on building a new satellite (Angosat-2), whose launch was scheduled for 2020. The Administration of the Russian Federation requested an extension of the time-limit until 21 April 2021 on the grounds of *force majeure*, namely the malfunction of the Angosat satellite during flight tests. Document RRB18-3/2 explained in detail how the malfunction of the Angosat satellite fulfilled all four conditions for *force majeure*.

5.2 Document RRB18-3/11 set out the concerns of the Administrations of Luxembourg and Germany regarding the Russian Federation's request. Based on public, operational and coordination and public information available, including from Internet sources, those administrations had not expected that the Angosat satellite was planned to be operating at 23°E. Since they had been operating various frequency assignments and spacecraft at 23.5°E for some time, the proximity of the orbital position requested by the Russian Federation raised coordination issues. The only meeting held to discuss those issues had concluded that coordination at such close orbital separation was not feasible. Luxembourg and Germany therefore requested that there should be no transmissions from the Angosat-2 satellite until coordination procedures with their networks operating at 23.5°E had been duly completed.

5.3 In Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/5, taken up by the Board for information, the Administration of the Russian Federation emphasized that coordination and notification procedures relating to satellite networks were governed by the Radio Regulations and had no bearing on situations of *force majeure*. The Russian Federation would take all necessary measures to eliminate unacceptable interference between the Angosat-2 satellite when operating at 23°E and other planned or in-service satellites.

5.4 In response to a question from **Mr Kibe**, he informed that the Administration of the Russian Federation had notified the satellite network at 23°E under Article 11 of the Radio Regulations, submitted the information required under Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-15) and paid its cost recovery dues in accordance with Council Decision 482.

5.5 **Ms Wilson** said that, although the Administrations of Luxembourg and Germany made valid points in their submission, she concurred with the Russian Federation's statement that coordination and notification procedures relating to satellite networks had no bearing on situations of *force majeure*. The Board must therefore focus on determining whether the case constituted *force majeure*. That was no easy task. It was an unusual case where the Angosat satellite seemed to have been placed at one orbital position and, after flight tests, moved elsewhere. Her main concern, however, was whether failure to complete the tests constituted *force majeure*. Such failure was of course unfortunate

but perhaps not unforeseeable. She was therefore not certain that the case fulfilled all the criteria for *force majeure*.

5.6 **Mr Hoan** said that the information provided by the Administrations of Luxembourg and Germany to refute the Russian Federation's claim that it had fulfilled the fourth condition of *force majeure* (causal effective connection) was drawn mainly from public sources and could not be considered as reliable. On the other hand, the explanations provided in the Russian Federation's submissions seemed to meet all the criteria for *force majeure*; moreover, the Bureau had confirmed that the Russian Federation had complied with all the necessary regulatory requirements. He therefore suggested that the Board should consider the Russian Federation's request favourably.

5.7 **Ms Jeanty** expressed concern about the potential consequences for the Administrations of Luxembourg and Germany, clearly spelled out in their submission, if the Board acceded to the Russian Federation's request. She asked what the next steps would be if the Board agreed that it was a case of *force majeure*.

5.8 The **Chairman** said that cases of *force majeure* conferred all rights on the requesting administration and that in making its decision the Board need not weigh the possible effects on the networks of other administrations. If the Board decided that the request submitted by the Russian Federation was a case of *force majeure*, it would request the Bureau to take all the necessary steps to assist the administrations concerned with their coordination problems. Furthermore, in its late submission, the Administration of the Russian Federation indicated its willingness to deal with possible interference.

5.9 **Mr Ito** said that he was unclear regarding the information provided in Documents RRB18-3/2 and RRB18-3/11, which referred to the orbital position of the Angosat satellite as 23°E and 13°E or 14.5°E, respectively. He failed to understand why the Administration of the Russian Federation had suddenly changed the orbital position from 13°E to 23°E, particularly since it made no difference to the time-limit established. He sought clarification from the Bureau on whether the satellite was actually operating from the orbital position 23°E.

5.10 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** said that, since the Russian Federation had not submitted any information to the Bureau on the bringing into use of frequency assignments to the Angosat satellite, the Bureau had not conducted detailed study on the orbit/frequency occupancy. The only information publicly available on the Internet was that referred to in Document RRB18-3/11, which indicated orbital positions of 13°E or 14.5°E.

5.11 **Ms Wilson**, echoing Mr Ito's concerns, said that according Document RRB18-3/11, no coordination on any initial orbit testing had taken place with the operators concerned; consequently, there could be no guarantee that the Angosat satellite had been at 23°E during testing. If it had been there, satellites operating in the vicinity would surely have been subjected to some interference. She recalled that the Administration of the Russian Federation had changed the orbital position of the satellite from 13°E to 23°E in its submission received shortly before the 78th meeting, possibly owing to a concern to comply with the time-limit. She was inclined to consider the request favourably as a case of *force majeure*, although she was still unsure whether the failure of initial orbit testing constituted grounds for *force majeure* and whether the satellite had actually been at 23°E for such testing.

5.12 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Angosat satellite project had commenced around 10 years previously and that in order to find a suitable orbital position, the Administration of the Russian Federation had submitted three separate coordination notifications, for 13°E, 14.5°E and 23°E, all of which had expired on 11 April 2018. Since the satellite had been launched in December 2017, there had been ample time for it to reach any of those orbital positions within the specified time-limit. Nonetheless, it was difficult to reconcile the Russian Federation's assertion in Document RRB18-3/2 – that once the Angosat satellite had been placed at the notified orbital position, the planned flight tests had begun – with media reports that telemetry tests had detected an electrical power problem with the satellite during its transfer to the geostationary orbit. It was thus unlikely that

the initial orbit tests had taken place at 13°E or 23°E. Furthermore, there was no question of the tests having failed: they had worked and showed a malfunction of the satellite. The Administration of the Russian Federation therefore claimed the unforeseeable malfunction of the satellite as grounds for *force majeure*. His understanding was that the Administration of the Russian Federation had intended to operate the satellite at only one of the three orbital positions notified and had initially considered 13°E, but had subsequently opted for 23°E, possibly owing to coordination problems. Following the Board's decision at its 78th meeting to defer consideration of the matter, the Bureau had suppressed the frequency assignments notified at 13°E and 14.5°E. He was confident that the Russian Federation's request would be acceptable to the Administrations of Luxembourg and Germany provided that coordination procedures were completed before the Angosat-2 satellite was brought into use at 23°E.

5.13 The **Director** said that in view of the fact that the components that had malfunctioned had not been recoverable, the question of where testing had taken place was irrelevant, as there was no longer a satellite to bring into use and the only network that remained was at 23°E.

5.14 **Mr Khairov** observed that administrations were entitled to choose an orbital position and that even if the Board granted the Administration of the Russian Federation an extension of the time-limit, in accordance with the Radio Regulations, the administration could not bring any satellite into use before completion of relevant coordination procedures. He suggested that the Board focus on determining whether the arguments put forward by the Russian Federation constituted *force majeure*.

5.15 **Mr Kibe** and **Mr Koffi** supported that suggestion.

5.16 The **Chairman** observed that in their submission, the Administrations of Luxembourg and Germany did not object to the Russian Federation's request for an extension on the grounds of *force majeure*, but merely drew attention to the need for coordination with their satellite networks operating at 23.5°E.

5.17 **Ms Wilson** said that, although there were inconsistencies in the information on when and where the malfunction of the Angosat satellite had occurred, the crux of the matter was that the satellite had malfunctioned, had not been useable for its intended purpose and no replacement satellite had been available. Since that situation had been unforeseeable, she suggested that the Board did have sufficient information to consider it as a case of *force majeure*. Nevertheless, the Board must make it clear that even if it agreed to extend the time-limit, steps must be taken to protect other satellite networks operating near the orbital position of 23°E.

5.18 **Mr Kibe**, **Ms Jeanty** and **Mr Koffi** agreed with Ms Wilson.

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

“The Board considered Documents RRB18-3/2 and RRB18-3/11, and Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/5 for information. The Board carefully considered the reasons provided by the Administration of the Russian Federation for the malfunction of the Angosat satellite to be considered as a case of *force majeure*. The Board concluded that all the conditions were fulfilled for the case to be considered as a case of *force majeure*. Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request from the Administration of the Russian Federation to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the ENSAT-23E satellite network (23°E) in the frequency bands 3 400-3 410 MHz, 3 500-4 200 MHz, 5 725-6 425 MHz, 10 950-11 200 MHz and 14 000-14 250 MHz to 30 April 2021 and instructed the Bureau to continue to take into account these frequency assignments. The Board further emphasised that the Administration of the Russian Federation would need to continue and complete the coordination process of the frequency assignments to the ENSAT-23E satellite network with the affected satellite networks of other administrations in compliance with the provisions of the Radio Regulations.”

5.20 It was so **agreed**.

**6 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of Luxembourg requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the LXS-AIS satellite network (Document RRB18-3/4(Rev.1))**

6.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB18-3/4(Rev.1) containing a request from the Administration of Luxembourg to extend the regulatory time-limit for bringing back into use the frequency assignments to the LXS-AIS satellite network. Use of the satellite network had been suspended and the final date for resumption of service under RR No. 11.49 had been 24 October 2018. As of June 2018, the Hiber-1 satellite intended to bring back into use the frequency assignments had experienced several co-passenger delays, none of which had been caused by the Administration of Luxembourg or its operating agency. Since there was a satellite launch window from November 2018 to February 2019, the Administration of Luxembourg requested that the Board grant an extension of four months. The attachment to the submission contained a confidential communication from the company responsible for the satellite launch that gave details of the reasons for the delays, published with the permission of the Administration of Luxembourg in compliance with §1.6 *bis* of Part C of the Rules of Procedure.

6.2 **Ms Wilson**, noting that the attachment mentioned a possible launch date of 26 November 2018, asked whether the launch had been successful.

6.3 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** said that the launch had been rescheduled for 29 November 2018.

6.4 **Mr Strelets** said that the document was clear: it was evidently a case of co-passenger delay. The request by the Administration of Luxembourg for an extension of the regulatory time-limit was fully justified. He therefore proposed that the Board accede to it.

6.5 **Ms Jeanty, Mr Khairov, Mr Koffi, Mr Hoan and Ms Wilson** supported that proposal.

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

“The Board considered the submission from the Administration of Luxembourg provided in Document RRB18-3/4(Rev.1) requesting a four-month extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the LXS-AIS satellite network. Based on the information provided the Board concluded that the situation qualified to be considered as a case of co-passenger delay and decided to accede to the request from the Administration of Luxembourg to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the LXS-AIS satellite network until 24 February 2019.”

6.7 It was so **agreed**.

**7 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of Egypt requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the EGYCOMM0A satellite network at 35.5°E (Documents RRB18-3/7, RRB18-3/8, RRB18-3/10 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/3)**

7.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** said that Document RRB18-3/7 contained a request from the Administration of Egypt to extend the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use the frequency assignments to the EGYCOMM0A satellite network by nine months, from 11 May 2019 to 11 February 2020. The satellite network was intended to develop telecommunication infrastructure throughout Africa; notification for the network and bringing-into-use information had been submitted to the Bureau on 8 May 2016. The reason for the request was a delay in the launch of the satellite by Arianespace due to co-passenger issues beyond the Egyptian Administration’s control. In support of its request, the administration drew attention to precedents concerning other administrations, the relevant decisions of WRC-12 and WRC-15 and confidential communications from the satellite manufacturer and launch service provider giving further details of the reasons for the delay, published

with the permission of the Administration of Egypt on behalf of Thales Alenia Space, Thales and Airbus Defence and Space in compliance with §1.6 *bis* of Part C of the Rules of Procedure.

7.2 In Document RRB18-3/10, the Administration of France expressed its support for the Egyptian Administration's request, noting that the satellite constructed by French companies and to be launched by Arianespace from French Guyana would play a crucial role in the development of Egypt's telecommunication networks. It also referred to relevant precedents and the decisions of WRC-12 and WRC-15.

7.3 In Document RRB18-3/8, the Administration of Papua New Guinea recalled that the advance publication information for the EGYCOMM0A satellite network had been submitted to the Bureau on 12 May 2009 and that, in 2016, at its 71st meeting, the Board had granted a three-year extension of the regulatory time-limit for the network on grounds of *force majeure*. The Administration of Papua New Guinea expressed concern that granting a further extension would establish a questionable precedent and that allowing an administration a period of almost 11 years for bringing into use frequency assignments was tantamount to aiding spectrum warehousing. A further concern was the potentially adverse impact of a further extension on planned satellite networks in the vicinity of the EGYCOMM0A satellite network, including those filed by the Administration of Papua New Guinea. It therefore submitted its reservation regarding the Egyptian Administration's request and urged the Board to defer consideration of the matter to a future meeting to allow other administrations concerned time to submit their views.

7.4 In Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/3, taken up by the Board for information, the Administration of Egypt provided further details to support its position that the current delay was beyond its control and listed numerous facts to refute the assertions concerning spectrum warehousing. It emphasized that the EGYCOMM0A satellite network would be the first telecommunication satellite launched into the geostationary orbit to provide essential telecommunication infrastructure for developing countries in Africa and the Middle East. If the Board deferred its decision on the request, the Egyptian Administration's satellite programme would be severely affected. Moreover, it would not be in keeping with the Radio Regulations or the Board's practice in similar cases.

7.5 **Mr Kibe** said that in its submission the Administration of Papua New Guinea asserted that, at the Board's 71st meeting, the Administration of Egypt had been granted a three-year extension for bringing into use the frequency assignments to the EGYCOMM0A satellite network, yet the minutes of the 71st meeting referred to the NAVISAT-12A satellite networks at the same orbital position.

7.6 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** said that the Egyptian Administration had changed the name of the satellite network from NAVISAT-12A to EGYCOMM0A, but that the orbital position remained the same.

7.7 **Ms Wilson** said that she would be very concerned if the Board affirmed that if an administration was granted one extension, it could not be granted a further one. It would not be in accordance with the Radio Regulations and was not a precedent the Board should set. The Egyptian Administration had done everything possible to bring into use the frequency assignments within the regulatory time-limit. The fact that it had been granted an extension previously was not relevant to the case. All the information provided by the Administration of Egypt indicated a co-passenger issue and that the delay experienced had been outside its control.

7.8 **Ms Strelets** said that, in the light of the information submitted, he saw no reason not to accede to the request of the Egyptian Administration, which had deployed great efforts to carry through its satellite network project. However, the submission from Papua New Guinea raised an important issue that the Board might wish to address in its report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07). According to §4.1.3 *bis* of Appendix 30/30A of the Radio Regulations, the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use an assignment could be extended once by not more than three years. Thus, while he was in favour of granting a further extension to the Egyptian Administration, it would amount to an extension of almost four years, which was in contradiction with the Radio Regulations. Another

matter of concern was that the documents prepared under that agenda item by the Administrations of Papua New Guinea and France appeared to run counter to No. 100 of the ITU Constitution, according to which Member States should refrain from attempting to influence Board members in the performance of their duties. In particular, he did not welcome the comment in the French submission concerning “the role assigned to the Board”. In future, it should be made clear that attempts to exert pressure on the Board were not acceptable and that the Board took its decisions independently and based on the facts before it.

7.9 The **Chairman** said that the question of whether a three-year extension was sufficient in all circumstances and the need to review certain provisions of the Radio Regulations in that connection should be addressed in the Board’s report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07). As to the concern of Mr Strelets regarding No. 100 of the Constitution, it might be a question of how one read the comments in question.

7.10 **Ms Jeanty** said that if the Board acceded to the Egyptian Administration’s request, it would not be granting a further extension as such, since previously it had granted an extension on the grounds of *force majeure* and the decision in the present case would be based on co-passenger issues. The provisions of Appendix 30/30A mentioned by Mr Strelets applied to cases of satellite launch failure. It seemed that many documents had been submitted to the current meeting in response to requests by administrations. If administrations were seriously affected by specific issues, then their contributions were warranted. She did not consider it necessary to defer consideration of the request by the Administration of Egypt, which had provided the information the Board required to take a decision. She agreed that the Board’s report to WRC-19 on Resolution 80 could address some of the matters raised during the discussion.

7.11 **Mr Khairov**, referring to Ms Jeanty’s comments on documents received in response to requests from administrations, said that although the Board did not wish to be swamped with information, it could not prevent administrations from submitting documents. The submission from the Administration of Papua New Guinea did provide food for thought on multiple extensions of time-limits for satellite networks – a topic that should be taken up in the Board’s report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80. The Administration of Egypt had encountered many setbacks, deployed tremendous efforts and taken all the necessary steps to bring its satellite network into use. As for the assertions of spectrum warehousing, he recalled that, at the Board’s 71st meeting, the Administration of Egypt had renounced several of its notified orbital positions in favour of the current one. He therefore proposed that the Board accede to the Egyptian Administration’s request.

7.12 **Mr Ito, Mr Koffi, Mr Hoan and Mr Magenta** agreed that the Board had the necessary information to accede to the Egyptian Administration’s request.

7.13 **Ms Wilson** agreed that the Board had sufficient information to take a decision on the Egyptian Administration’s request at the present meeting. Nevertheless, its decision would not be based on the views of other administrations concerned, but be taken on the grounds of co-passenger delay. Her understanding of No. 100 of the Constitution was that Member States should refrain from attempting to influence individual Board members in the performance of their duties. That could not be equated with administrations submitting documents to meetings of the Board to encourage it to take decisions, which posed no problem provided that the documents were relevant to the agenda, submitted on time and posted on the website. She therefore saw no conflict between No. 100 of the Constitution and the submissions received from the Administrations of France and Papua New Guinea. Lastly, when the Board dealt with its report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80, it would see whether any further refinements could be made based on its consideration of the Egyptian Administration’s request.

7.14 **Mr Al Hammadi** said that, while he was in favour of acceding to the Egyptian Administration’s request at the present meeting, he had some sympathy for the concerns expressed by the Administration of Papua New Guinea. The Board must establish a way of handling repeat requests to extend the regulatory time-limit by the same administrations.

7.15 The **Chairman** said that, pursuant to the decision of WRC-12, upheld by WRC-15, and the Opinion of the ITU Legal Adviser, the Board had the authority to extend the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use the frequency assignments to a satellite network. However, the decision did not specify the number of times an extension could be granted; that came under the purview of the WRC. Nonetheless, the Board's current approach of handling requests on a case-by-case basis was in accord with the WRC-12 decision.

7.16 **Mr Kibe** said that the Administration of Papua New Guinea had not provided sufficient grounds for the Board not to accede to the Egyptian Administration's request. Furthermore, the Board should not accord any privileges to the Administration of Papua New Guinea in connection with the coordination procedures for the satellite network filings it mentioned in its submission. He suggested that the Board's decision on the unique case of the extensions granted to the Egyptian Administration be brought to the attention of WRC-19 through the Board's report under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07).

7.17 **Mr Strelets** said that the Board was supposed to handle extension requests on a case-by-case basis in regard to *force majeure* only. Where administrations provided sufficient information to justify co-passenger delays, the Board should decide on the case automatically. He wondered whether the different views expressed relating to No. 100 of Constitution might stem from the different language versions. In any event, Board members should refrain from being influenced by contributions, including some of those submitted to the current meeting. The Board should be guided in its work by the Radio Regulations and did not need any additional arguments other than those from the Egyptian Administration to take a decision on the case in hand.

7.18 The **Chairman** agreed with Mr Khairov that the Board could not prevent administrations from submitting contributions on relevant agenda items. In his view, the French Administration was concerned by the Egyptian Administration's request since French companies had been responsible for the manufacture and launch of the EGYCOMM0A satellite network and had corroborated information regarding the co-passenger delay in the Egyptian Administration's submissions. No. 100 of the Constitution must be upheld and administrations should not attempt to influence the Board, but confine themselves to furnishing information that would assist the Board in its decision-making.

7.19 **Ms Wilson** maintained her position with regard to No. 100 of the Constitution. Since the Director's report would include information on all the Board's activities, including its decisions on the extension of regulatory time-limits, she did not consider it appropriate to refer specifically to the case of the Egyptian Administration in the Board's report under Resolution 80. It had been agreed not to make reference in the report to specific cases or administrations, but instead to focus on issues and topics. Thus the issue of multiple extensions could be included as an issue or topic.

7.20 **Mr Magenta** agreed that the Director's report should cover all the Board's activities. If administrations were not satisfied with the Board's approach to aspects of its work, they could voice their concerns at a WRC. Regarding No. 100 of the Constitution, he agreed that the Board could not prevent administrations from submitting documents. It was the Board's responsibility to decide which documents were relevant to its work. The information they contained was not only for the Board's consideration but also for that of the membership of the Union as a whole.

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

"The Board considered Documents RRB18-3/7, RRB18-3/8 and RRB18-3/10, and Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/3 for information. The Board indicated that its decisions concerning cases of co-passenger delay and *force majeure* for the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use frequency assignments were in conformity with the decisions of WRC-12, as confirmed by WRC-15. After examination of the information provided, the Board concluded that:

- The information provided was sufficient to take a decision at this time;
- This case qualified as a situation of co-passenger delay and that the requested extension was for a defined and limited time period.

Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request by extending the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the EGYCOMM0A satellite network at 35.5°E to 11 February 2020.”

7.22 It was so **agreed**.

## **8 Submission by the Administration of Bangladesh regarding the processing of a filing for the frequency assignments to the BDSAT-119E-FSS satellite network under Article 6 of Appendix 30B (Document RRB18/3-6)**

8.1 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** said that Document RRB18/3-6 contained correspondence exchanged between the Administration of Bangladesh and the Bureau relating to the sequence of events that had led to the date of receipt for the BDSAT-119E-FSS satellite network being changed from 17 August 2017 to 10 July 2018. Essentially, Bangladesh had failed to receive two telefaxes sent by the Bureau. First, it had not received a request for clarifications, with the result that, reacting only to the reminder and given the time needed to compile the requested information owing to its lack of experience in the satellite communications field, it had submitted its response 17 days after the deadline, requesting however that the original date of receipt be maintained. Secondly, it had not received a subsequent telefax indicating that, pursuant to the regulations, the date of receipt had been changed to 10 July 2018. Bangladesh was asking the Board to reinstate the original date of receipt of 17 August 2017. In reply to a question from the **Chairman**, he said that, in the period between the two dates of receipt, filings had been received for two satellite networks of other administrations within the coordination arc of Bangladesh’s network.

8.2 The **Chairman** having pointed out that the Board had considered cases of failure to receive correspondence in the past, **Mr Strelets** and **Mr Khairov** agreed that there were precedents and remarked that no administration, even in the most advanced nations, was immune from administrative errors and particularly communication glitches. They were thus in favour of acceding to Bangladesh’s request, recognizing also that it was a developing country striving to grow its telecommunication sector.

8.3 **Mr Hoan, Ms Jeanty** and **Mr Koffi** emphasized that the Bureau had acted entirely correctly in application of the Radio Regulations For the reasons invoked by the previous speakers, however, they concurred that the Board should accede to Bangladesh’s request.

8.4 Replying to **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)**, the **Chairman** confirmed that in acceding to the request from Bangladesh, the Board would be instructing the Bureau to review the examination results of relevant networks received in the interim.

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

“The Board considered the submission by the Administration of Bangladesh provided in Document RRB18-3/6. The Board noted that the Bureau had acted correctly and that the Administration of Bangladesh had experienced difficulties in receiving correspondence from the Bureau. Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request of the Administration of Bangladesh to reinstate the original date of receipt, 17 August 2017, of the BDSAT-119E-FSS satellite network filing and instructed the Bureau to review the examination results of networks received after that date, as appropriate.”

## **9 Submission by the Administration of Norway regarding the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite network and the use of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution (Documents RRB18-3/12, RRB18-3/DELAYED/4 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/6)**

9.1 **Mr Sakamoto (Head SSD/SSC)** introduced Document RRB18-3/12 in which the Administration of Norway expressed its concerns regarding the status of the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite network filed by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates and the latter’s application of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution in that connection. The document provided detailed information



drawn from various publicly available sources which indicated that no satellite corresponding to the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite network filed with ITU had ever operated at 17.5°W, whereas the Resolution 49 information submitted by the United Arab Emirates in November 2017 stated that the launch window of the satellite was the period between 1 March 2011 and 2 March 2012. The document also explained that the Norwegian satellite operator, Global IP, was building a broadband satellite that would be launched in April 2019 and positioned at 18°W. That orbital position had been chosen on the assumption that the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite slot would expire before being brought into use. The Norwegian Administration considered that invoking Article 48 in a manner that obstructed the Bureau from investigating the status of the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite network under RR No. 13.6 was wholly incompatible with the ITU Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations and the Radio Regulations. It recommended that the Board restrict the application of Article 48 of the Constitution to legitimate military installations and allow affected administrations to conduct inquiries into the legitimacy of invocations of the article. Specifically, the Norwegian Administration requested the Bureau, under RR No. 14.1, to reconsider its position regarding the status of the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W network as set out in its letter of 8 March 2018, namely that the Bureau did not continue to inquire under No. 13.6 when the notifying administration invoked CS Article 48; and, if the Bureau maintained that position, to bring the matter to the Board's attention with a view to a decision under Nos. 14.5 and 14.6.

9.2 In Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/4, taken up by the Board for information, the United Arab Emirates Administration responded to the Norwegian Administration's submission with various explanations and information, concluding that the requests made in the Norwegian Administration's submission were groundless and should be dismissed. It reiterated the importance of continued coordination between the administrations and operators under the Radio Regulations, noting that there had been no communication with the Norwegian Administration in that regard since June 2018.

9.3 In Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/6, also taken up by the Board for information, the Administration of France expressed its support for the submission from the Administration of Norway. It requested that the Bureau prepare for each Board meeting an updated list of the networks and satellite systems in respect of which Article 48 had been invoked and had subsequently resulted in submissions to the Board from administrations contesting the validity of invoking the article.

9.4 **Mr Strelets** said that while he understood the concerns of the United Arab Emirates, he was baffled by the late submission from the French Administration in support of the Norwegian submission and was certainly not in favour of the request for the regular publication of information relating to Article 48, most of which was confidential. The submission from Norway raised several important questions, such as how the Norwegian satellite network could have been commissioned on the assumption that the United Arab Emirates Administration's frequency assignments would not be brought into use before the end of the regulatory period. That meant that Norway had not held discussions to coordinate the frequency assignments with the United Arab Emirates network published previously, and thus had infringed its obligation to coordinate with the United Arab Emirates. It was a complex issue that warranted careful reflection. Perhaps the best solution would be to defer consideration of the three submissions until the Board's 80th meeting so as to allow other administrations time to submit their views on the application of Article 48.

9.5 **Ms Wilson** said that the two late submissions from the United Arab Emirates and France were for information purposes only, thus there was no reason to take account of the French Administration's request. The Board should focus on the Norwegian submission and try to reach a decision thereon at the current meeting. The problem was that Norway's submission did not put forward real arguments to question the application of Article 48 in respect of the YAHSAT-G6-17.5W satellite network, it merely questioned its existence.

9.6 **Mr Ito** agreed that it was a complex issue for which there was no easy solution. It would not be appropriate simply to defer its consideration given that two administrations had voiced their concern. He recalled that the Board had dealt with a similar case at its 77th and 78th meetings, where the Administration of Germany had sought clarification regarding INSAT networks for which the

Administration of India had invoked Article 48. He proposed that the Board follow a similar course of action by seeking confirmation from the United Arab Emirates that the network in question was used for military purposes.

9.7 **Ms Wilson** said that the two cases were not comparable because, at its 77th meeting, the Board had requested India to respond to the issues raised by Germany, whereas the United Arab Emirates had already responded to issues raised in Norway's submission. She would not be in favour of the Board seeking any further information from an administration that had invoked Article 48. It was not in keeping with the Board's practice.

9.8 **Mr Magenta** said that the Board should not ask an administration to confirm the veracity of information provided in a submission or question the existence of a network an administration had registered.

9.9 **Mr Khairov** said that it was important for the Board to take action on the matter in view of the concerns expressed by administrations in regard to the application of Article 48. He emphasized that the article did not release administrations from their regulatory obligations towards other administrations. He did not consider it necessary to seek clarification from the United Arab Emirates regarding the use of its satellite network. The hoarding of frequency assignments was not an acceptable practice, but was likely to become increasingly widespread as greater demands were placed on the spectrum. He proposed that the Board address issues relating to the application of Article 48 in its report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07) and also consider the possibility of drawing up a relevant rule of procedure.

9.10 **Ms Jeanty** said that she agreed on the need to address issues relating to the application of Article 48 that were brought to the Board's attention increasingly. There was no reason why the Board should not submit proposals to WRC-19 through its Resolution 80 report, with a possible view to confirmation of the guidance provided by WRC-15. She observed that the Board had invited India to provide information regarding its application of Article 48.

9.11 The **Chairman** said that the case involving India and Germany was different from the case at hand, as Germany had indicated that India's frequency assignments were not being used for military or national defence purposes.

9.12 **Mr Strelets** reiterated his concerns regarding the submission from Norway, in particular the grounds for assuming that the United Arab Emirates would not bring its satellite network into use. He questioned the need to draft a new rule of procedure concerning the application of Article 48 when WRC-15 had provided clear guidance on the matter. Clear rules were needed in order to prevent any improper use of the article. For example, it was not clear at what point in time administrations must declare that they were invoking Article 48 in respect of frequency assignments; it was his understanding that it should be when assignments were notified under Article 11 and not when the Bureau requested clarification under No. 13.6.

9.13 The **Chairman** noted that if there was to be any modification to Article 11, it would have to be by a WRC. Clearly if administrations invoked Article 48 in respect of assignments at the stage of an inquiry under No. 13.6, it would pose problems, particularly for administrations with assignments nearby. The Board might wish to address the question of the retroactive application of Article 48 in its report under Resolution 80.

9.14 **Ms Wilson** said that the part of the draft Resolution 80 report concerning issues arising under Article 48 had not yet been finalized. No agreement had been reached on whether such issues should be included in the report, since they had been dealt with at previous conferences. Member States might also wish to submit proposals on the application of Article 48 to a future conference. She was not sure what form a rule of procedure on Article 48 might take. As it stood, Article 11 did not impose any obligation on administrations to notify that a particular assignment would be used for military purposes; however, she thought it unlikely that the WRC would decide to amend Article 11 along those lines.

9.15 **Mr Strelets** said that the Bureau usually held consultations with administrations when they notified frequency assignments under Article 11, and that could provide an opportunity to ascertain whether the assignments were intended for military or commercial purposes. The crucial question, however, was how to prevent cases of abuse of Article 48. That required careful reflection, particularly on issues relating to retroactive application of Article 48. He had no ready answers, the only certainty was that the article should be invoked exclusively for military purposes. In that connection, the late submission from the United Arab Emirates made no reference to “military” purposes, but used the term “governmental”, which was not at all the same. Moreover, there was only one reference to Article 48 and that was in the title of the document.

9.16 The **Chairman**, summing up the discussion, said that although the United Arab Emirates’ submission did not specifically refer to military purposes, it was the Board’s practice not to ask further questions regarding assignments when an administration invoked Article 48. The Board also seemed to be in favour of not deferring consideration of the issue. He therefore suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

“The Board considered in detail the submission from the Administration of Norway in Document RRB18-3/12 and Documents RRB18-3/DELAYED/4 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/6 for information. The Board noted that the information provided was sufficient to consider the matter at this time. The Board noted that the administration had invoked the application of CS Article 48 in relation to this satellite network. The Board recognised that it was not within its mandate to make decisions with reference to CS Article 48”.

9.17 It was so **agreed**.

## **10 Submission by the Administration of the United Kingdom requesting consideration of interference issues affecting the reception of UK coordinated and agreed HF broadcasting stations (Documents RRB18-3/9, RRB18-3/DELAYED/1 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/2)**

10.1 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** introduced Document RRB18-3/9, in which the United Kingdom sought to bring the Board’s attention to a longstanding problem of harmful interference suffered by HF broadcasting stations that were duly coordinated through the recognized regional coordination groups, notified and recorded in the HF broadcasting schedules, in accordance with RR Article 12. Examples of the interference were provided in Annex A to the document, and four audio recordings thereof in Annex B. The United Kingdom reported that, with the assistance of other administrations, it had identified the sources of interference as all emanating from the territory of China. According to the United Kingdom, China’s response to the United Kingdom’s Appendix 10 harmful interference reports submitted to China since 2013 had on the whole been limited to acknowledgement of receipt without addressing the substance of the interference, although in January 2017 China had identified some frequencies used by its broadcasting service and some which might relate to experimental emissions. Bilateral meetings had been held between the two administrations on two occasions, following which China had however not wished to sign a proposed summary record/agreement, the text of which was provided in Annex C to the document. At the United Kingdom’s request, the Bureau had sought to organize a meeting between the two administrations with BR participation, but China had declined, citing good existing cooperation with the United Kingdom and its consequent preference to pursue the matter on a direct bilateral basis. In the apparent absence of HF allotment conflict for either broadcasting stations or stations in the stage of experiment, the United Kingdom had concluded that the longstanding and unresolved interference exceeded the scope of Article 12, and should be brought to the Board’s attention. In reply to a question from the **Chairman** as to China’s reasons for not wishing to sign a summary record of the bilateral meetings, he said that the two countries appeared to have different interpretations of the purpose of the meetings: the United Kingdom saw them as a mechanism for resolving the interference, while China saw them as a means of exchanging information and general reporting.

10.2 **Mr Strelets** pointed out that the United Kingdom had not drawn any conclusions in its document or requested any action from the Board. Moreover, it should be noted that the Bureau had not carried out any in-depth examination nor had any draft recommendations been presented to the Board under No. 173 of the ITU Convention. In those circumstances, it was unclear what was being asked of the Board and indeed what action it could take at that stage.

10.3 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** explained that the Bureau had not carried out any investigations on the case, that having not so far been requested, but had confined itself to strict application of Article 15. The harmful interference reports received had thus been considered and transmitted to China with a request to take appropriate action, also drawing attention to No. 15.1.

10.4 **Ms Jeanty** said that she equated the United Kingdom's submission to the Board to a plea for help, in the face of a situation of longstanding and persistent harmful interference that had proven intractable and had still not been resolved despite multiple efforts (e.g. harmful interference reports, communications, bilateral meetings, proposal to hold bilateral meetings with BR participation).

10.5 **Mr Ito** noted that the administrations had been in contact and bilateral meetings had been held, leading to slight progress. The issue was a clear case of harmful interference, so the Bureau's involvement was entirely appropriate. The United Kingdom was no doubt looking to the Board to urge the administrations to move forward on the issue, with the Bureau's assistance, as it had done, for example, in the case involving Italy and neighbouring countries. **Mr Kibe** concurred with that approach. Citing Nos. 7.5 and 7.7 of the Radio Regulations, he said that the United Kingdom was exercising its right to address the Board on an unresolved case of longstanding and persistent interference, and the Board must consider the matter. **Mr Magenta** agreed with the previous two speakers.

10.6 The **Chairman** concluded, in the light of the discussion, that it was incumbent on the Board to respond to the content of the United Kingdom's submission. He therefore requested the Bureau to introduce, for information, Documents RRB18-3/DELAYED/1 and 2 from China, the latter in detail as it was not yet available in all six official languages.

10.7 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that in Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/1 China stated that it had consistently acknowledged and dealt with the United Kingdom's interference complaints, including through monitoring and localization of interference sources and on-site investigations, which had shown that on three frequencies the interference did not originate from the territory of China; that on another five frequencies, no interfering signal was present nor any interference found at the locations specified by the United Kingdom; and that interference had been eliminated on a further five frequencies. It confirmed that bilateral meetings had been held, as well as the differences in understanding of the objectives of the meetings. It also confirmed its response to the Bureau to the effect that it preferred to pursue direct bilateral consultations, based on the stable working-level contact already established, and that, in view of the ongoing interference investigations, further meetings would be premature at that stage. In conclusion, China emphasized that enormous efforts had been deployed to resolve the situation, positive results had been achieved, and it would continue fulfilling its obligations in regard to the interference complaints in the HF band. He then went in detail through Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/2, in which China supplied monitoring information on the three groups of frequencies referred to above and the exchanges of correspondence between the two administrations. The documents revealed one of the main differences between the two administrations' reports: the United Kingdom stated that it detected emissions of a non-broadcasting nature (noise/music) from the territory of China, while China stated that the emissions were other countries' broadcasting transmissions originating outside Chinese territory.

10.8 **Ms Wilson** said that the challenging aspect of the case was that, unlike in previous cases dealt with by the Board, where it was a question of how to eliminate harmful interference on which the parties agreed, in the case at hand it was first necessary to establish the source location and type of the interference, which were disputed.

10.9 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that the only provisions available to the Bureau to that end were Nos. 15.43 and 15.44, which provided for the possibility of engaging the cooperation of appropriate administrations or specially designated stations of the international monitoring system.

10.10 **Mr Koffi** said that while the Board could encourage the administrations to continue bilateral meetings, progress was hampered by the fundamental difference of opinion regarding the interference itself. To advance towards a resolution of the interference, the Bureau needed accurate information, and might thus seek the assistance of third-party monitoring.

10.11 **Mr Strelets** emphasized that Documents RRB18-3/DELAYED/1 and 2, containing significant detail compiled within a very short time-frame, testified very clearly to China's goodwill and serious commitment to addressing the complaints of interference. China was visibly deploying enormous efforts on detailed investigations. Importantly, that work was still ongoing in some cases, requiring a great deal of resources and time. China had expressed its willingness to hold bilateral meetings to deal with the interference as and when the results of investigations were known. Recognizing therefore that China was reacting to the interference complaints, carrying out investigations, identifying the sources of interference and eliminating sources located on its territory, and that both administrations were displaying goodwill, recourse to external monitoring stations, as well as being very costly, would not be appropriate at that juncture. As it had done in previous cases, the Board should urge both administrations to press on with efforts to resolve the problem.

10.12 **Ms Wilson** supported the idea of using third-party monitoring, through the relevant MoUs that ITU had established for that purpose. Both administrations were doubtless acting in good faith and thought their position to be technically well-founded, and Nos. 15.43 and 15.44 were clearly designed precisely for cases in which the parties disagreed on the nature of the interference (e.g. location and type).

10.13 **Mr Ito** agreed that it was important to identify the interference sources. However, the Board must not lose sight of the fact that the interference on some frequencies had been identified and eliminated through cooperation between the administrations, so the Bureau should broker further bilateral meetings as soon as possible, recognizing that the interference had lasted several years, which was obviously unacceptable.

10.14 **Ms Jeanty** said she was in favour both of third-party monitoring under No. 15.44 and of bilateral meetings involving the Bureau, whose presence could be salutary in a situation where there were substantive divergences between the parties. Such a meeting could be organized, for example, during the CPM.

10.15 **Mr Khairov** said he respected the fact that the United Kingdom had addressed the Board with great delicacy, and although its submission contained no specific request, it was patently a plea for help, and it was incumbent on the Board to take some action, recognizing, too, that the interference covered a large number of channels. Similarly, China had shown goodwill. It had carried out monitoring over a period of at least three years and had eliminated some cases of interference; and it had provided evidence of a new round of measurements and investigations following the United Kingdom's submission. It might thus be judicious, rather than moving directly to third-party monitoring, to allow the two countries room to continue work and convene further meetings. As others had indicated, those meetings should be held under the aegis of the Bureau, not only to broker an agreement, but also because of the suggestion that some of the interference might emanate from outside China.

10.16 The **Chairman** pointed out that, under the terms of No. 15.44, the Bureau was empowered to request the assistance of the international monitoring system itself, without any need for a green light from the Board.

10.17 **Mr Hoan** said that HF interference was a complex and difficult area, and appreciated the efforts deployed on both sides. Both of the suggested courses of action, namely identifying the interference through the international monitoring system and bilateral cooperation between the two

administrations, were important, the latter perhaps more so. Thus, the Bureau should be instructed to encourage the administrations to pursue bilateral meetings, with the support and participation of the Director, to resolve the matter.

10.18 **Mr Magenta** also drew attention to the complexity of HFBC matters. He felt that, should the Board decide to instruct the Bureau to call upon third-party monitoring, it should perhaps obtain the agreement of the United Kingdom and China. In his opinion, a better alternative approach would be for the Bureau to convene a meeting with the two administrations with a specific agenda, namely to find solutions to clearly identify the source, location and type of the interference, to which end international monitoring would be one option on the table.

10.19 **Mr Strelets** drew attention to China's specific request in Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/2 to allow adequate time for both parties to study the other's contributions and initiate possible offline discussions. To his mind, that offered the best approach. There was goodwill on both sides, which could be undermined by the involvement of third parties. Neither party was asking for arbitration, but one party was asking for more time.

10.20 **Ms Wilson** said that both administrations, in good faith, had different views of reality, and no progress could be made without establishing a common set of facts. It would therefore be extremely difficult to resolve the issue without pinning down the existence, nature and source of the interference itself, which in the HF band was beyond the Bureau's means and would require recourse to third-party monitoring.

10.21 **Ms Jeanty** said that the two administrations diverged on the basic facts, and the international monitoring system was the mechanism in place to address such a situation. She was thus in favour of the Bureau applying No. 15.44. It was important to remember that application of No. 15.44 did not imply outsourcing the case itself to a third party, but rather empowering the Bureau to tackle the matter using available options and third-party facilities.

10.22 **Mr Koffi**, supporting previous speakers, underlined that, recognizing the two administrations' diverging views on the basic facts, establishing the source or sources of the interference was a key element for resolution of the case. Therefore, the Bureau should seek the involvement of the international monitoring system.

10.23 **Mr Ito** pointed out that, given the spontaneous, non-continuous nature of such interference in HFBC, identifying the source was a task that could take a very long time. To avoid potential waste of time and effort, therefore, he advocated talks between the administrations and the Bureau with a view to exploring ideas and an agreement on the way forward.

10.24 Taking into account the different views expressed, the **Chairman** offered a compromise proposal. Document RRB18-3/DELAYED/2 contained a lot of technical data which the Bureau needed time to examine. Proceeding directly to international monitoring might thus be premature. Rather than going beyond what the administrations had asked for up to now, the Board might wish give the Bureau time to analyse the data provided by China and compare it with the information submitted by the United Kingdom. The Bureau had the authority to trigger international monitoring under No. 15.44 if necessary, and particularly if so requested by an administration. The mere fact that the Board had mooted that option could in itself elicit some progress. In parallel, the administrations would be encouraged to continue cooperating fully to resolve the interference situation through further contacts and meetings, with BR assistance and participation, as appropriate. The Bureau would carry out the requisite analyses and report back as and when required according to progress or lack thereof.

10.25 **Mr Magenta** and **Mr Strelets** supported the Chairman's proposal.

10.26 Regarding whether the Board's decision should make reference to Nos. 15.43 and/or 15.44 and, if so, on what basis. **Mr Strelets** said that the two provisions were a matter for the Bureau and the administrations concerned. The two provisions were sequentially linked, such that the Bureau would initiate international monitoring only if requested by an administration. Without an explicit

request from the administration(s) concerned, and recognizing that no such request had been formulated, the Board could not take the initiative to draw particular attention to them and *a fortiori* to instruct the Bureau in that regard.

10.27 **Ms Wilson**, supported by **Ms Jeanty**, said that the basis for the Board's consideration of the case at hand was not No. 15.43, but rather §4 of Part C of the Rules of Procedure dealing with harmful interference, following the United Kingdom's request to the Board, and pursuant to which the Board "will decide on appropriate action" (§4.2). Given that the source location and nature of the interference were disputed, it was logical and legitimate for the Board to refer to Nos. 15.43 and 15.44 as relevant provisions available to the Bureau and administrations. The Board was not taking any initiative to propose the use of the provisions in question, but was merely noting the possibility of using them, if necessary, following the Bureau's study of the latest information.

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

"The Board considered Document RRB18-3/9, and Documents RRB18-3/DELAYED/1 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/2 for information. The Board expressed its appreciation for the considerable efforts of the Administrations of China and the United Kingdom to identify and eliminate harmful interference, and encouraged them to continue the coordination efforts of their HF schedules and experimental emissions. The Board noted under RR Nos. 15.43 and 15.44 regarding the possibility of using third-party international monitoring systems. The Board instructed the Bureau to further study the information provided in Documents RRB18-3/DELAYED/1 and RRB18-3/DELAYED/2. If necessary following this study, the Bureau may implement the provisions of RR No. 15.44 relating to the international monitoring system, if requested by the concerned administration in accordance with RR No. 15.43. The Board instructed the Bureau to report any progress on this matter to the next Board meetings."

## **11 Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19 on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) (Document RRB18-3/3)**

11.1 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, 28 November and the morning of Thursday, 29 November 2018, following which the Board **agreed** to adopt the following conclusions on the item:

"The Working Group on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) continued to review the preliminary draft report of the RRB to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) and the Board decided to submit the revised draft report to the 80th meeting for further study and review. The Board instructed the Bureau to take the necessary actions to make the preliminary draft report available as a contribution to the 80th meeting. The Board thanked Ms J. Wilson for the outstanding work done and her leading role in this matter."

## **12 Discussion of chairmanship and vice-chairmanship of the Board for 2019**

12.1 Following a discussion that highlighted the need to elect an interim chairman for the purpose of preparations for the Board's 80th meeting, **Mr Hoan**, supported by **Mr Magenta** and **Mr Koffi**, proposed that Ms Jeanty be elected as interim chairman of the 2019 Board, in conformity with No. 144 of the Convention.

12.2 It was so **agreed**.

12.3 **Ms Jeanty** thanked Board members for the trust thus placed in her.

### 13 Confirmation of the dates of the next meeting and indicative dates for subsequent meetings

13.1 The Board **agreed** to confirm the dates of its next, 80th meeting as 18-22 March 2019, and to tentatively confirm the dates of its subsequent meetings in 2019 as follows:

81st meeting 5-12 July 2019

82nd meeting 7-11 October 2019

### 14 Oral report by RRB representatives on the Plenipotentiary Conference (Dubai, 2018)

14.1 The **Chairman** said that he and Mr Strelets had been formally designated by the Board to represent it at PP-18, although most other RRB members had also attended.

14.2 The conference had elected the five ITU elected officials, the members of RRB and the Council Member States. In line with the desire to keep the basic instruments stable, PP-18 had not made any amendments to the ITU Constitution or Convention, so he would confine his report to the main resolutions and recommendations of interest to RRB.

14.3 The primary text for the Board was no doubt Resolution 119 (Rev. Antalya, 2006), on methods to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of RRB. Suggested amendments had been put forward in the RCC common proposals, seeking to make the recordings of RRB meetings available online and. The other regional groups had also submitted proposals, all advocating that the resolution be left unchanged, recognizing that the Board had always updated its working methods on an ongoing basis as necessary. The conference had ultimately decided not to modify Resolution 119, but to place on record that RRB should continue to review periodically its working methods and internal processes and revise them as it deemed necessary, and that administrations might wish to make inputs into that process.

14.4 Replying to a question from **Mr Magenta**, he said that PP-18 had not formulated any specific request to the Board to modify its working methods or internal processes, but had simply noted that *resolves* 1 of Resolution 119 (Rev. Antalya, 2006) allowed RRB to keep its methods and processes under review on an ongoing basis, which the Board did indeed do. As and when the Board saw fit to envisage any modification, it followed the existing procedure of proposing corresponding amendments to Part C of the Rules of Procedure, inviting administrations' comments through a circular letter, and making the adjustments as necessary. Fully agreeing, **Ms Wilson** emphasized that the key decision had been to maintain Resolution 119 (Rev. Antalya, 2006) unchanged. The existing process had been recognized and confirmed by PP-18, and there had been no request for particular action nor any particular recommendation to the Board to modify its working methods in any way.

14.5 Continuing his oral report, the **Chairman** said that in Resolution 186 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), on strengthening the role of ITU with regard to transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities, the conference had added an instruction to the Director of BR "to continue the efforts to disseminate information and assist ITU Member States in the application of coordination and notification provisions through ITU world and regional radiocommunication seminars, workshops, ITU-R publications, software and databases" and an invitation to Member States and Sector Members to participate actively in "ITU radiocommunication seminars, sharing of best practices, and cooperation agreements on the use of satellite monitoring facilities in order to address cases of harmful interference in accordance with Article 15 of the Radio Regulations".

14.6 After discussion on ITU's role as supervisory authority of the international registration system for space assets under the Space Protocol, PP-18 had adopted new Resolution COM5/4 (Dubai, 2018). The Member States had considered that the question was not yet fully mature, such that the issue would be kept under study by the Council and ITU's role as supervisory authority could be approved at a future plenipotentiary conference.



14.7 Following discussion of a proposed new resolution designed to protect some frequency bands allocated to space services, giving them something of a specific status, which had generated a lot of discussion, PP-18 had agreed as a compromise to instead amend Resolution 203, on broadband connectivity, to ensure a certain balance by inviting Member States to facilitate connectivity to both space and terrestrial broadband networks.

14.8 In respect of the ITRs, several contributions had called for the convening of a WCIT; others had suggested that a WCIT be held every four years. In conclusion, PP-18 had decided that the existing Expert Group on the ITRs would continue its work, with refined terms of reference, and report to the next plenipotentiary conference. That decision was reflected in Resolution 146 (Rev. Dubai, 2018). On the regional presence, proposals to transfer some responsibilities from BDT to the Deputy Secretary-General had not been adopted, and Resolution 25 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) maintained the regional offices under the responsibility of BDT.

14.9 Other areas of indirect interest to the Board included Resolution 197 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), calling for more intense study of IoT and smart cities and communities and for raising awareness of their importance; new Resolution WGPL/3, framing ITU studies and Member States' cooperation on OTTs; and revisions to several resolutions to facilitate Internet access and Internet governance, notably Resolutions 101, 102, 130 and 180 (Rev. Dubai, 2018).

14.10 The **Director** added that PP-18 had been successful overall, achieving consensus and avoiding any recourse to a vote. One text on which the conference had failed to reach agreement was a proposed new resolution on artificial intelligence (AI). Some Member States had wished to impose a strict framework on ITU's work in that area, while others had advocated addressing it within the Union's overall mandate. However, the lack of PP Resolution on this issue did not preclude ITU from studying aspects of AI, which would no doubt be of growing importance for ITU-R insofar as AI could offer solutions to some of the problems facing radiocommunications. **Mr Khairov** said he was pleased to see attitudes to AI evolving positively.

14.11 The Board **noted** the Chairman's oral report with appreciation.

## **15 Approval of the summary of decisions (Document RRB18-3/13)**

15.1 The Board **approved** the summary of decisions as contained in Document RRB18-3/13.

## **16 Closure of the meeting**

16.1 **Mr Strelets, Mr Magenta, Ms Wilson, Ms Jeanty, Mr Ito, Mr Hoan, Mr Kibe, Mr Khairov** and **Mr. Koffi** expressed their appreciation to all Board members and other staff who had made their experience on the Board so memorable.

16.2 The **Director** said that it had been a privilege for him to work with the Board, which had achieved outstanding results through its exemplary cooperation.

16.3 The **Chairman** thanked the Director, Board members, Bureau and all other staff for their advice, support and cooperation which had ensured the success of the Board's meetings. He closed the meeting at 1230 hours on Friday, 30 November 2018.

The Executive Secretary:  
F.RANCY

The Chairman:  
M. BESSI