

Italy

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION ON SOME ITU-R PROCEDURES

During recent meetings of Study Group 6 some issues related to the interpretation of ITU-R procedures have emerged, on which we would like to seek guidance from the RAG.

1. Guidance related to old Questions and Recommendations

A statement was made during recent meetings, to the effect that current procedures require the Study Group to suppress all the old Questions assigned to it, basing on the age of those texts, and to develop new Questions as needed.

A statement was also made, to the effect that the same action should be performed on all the Recommendations assigned to the Study Group, that are more than eight years old.

We would like to ask the RAG to indicate whether such statements reflect the authentic interpretation of the RA Resolutions regarding Questions and Recommendations that are, e.g. more than eight years old.

2. Guidance related to the procedures to oppose adoption of Recommendations

We understand that, when an Administration opposes adoption of a draft new or revised Recommendation, it should provide a written justification for its opposition, and the justification should be attached to the Chairman's Report.

We would like to ask the RAG to indicate whether our understanding on this matter is correct.

3. Guidance related to the authentic interpretation of procedures

We understand that, when divergent opinions emerge on the interpretation of procedures at meetings of a Study Group or Working Party, the group's Counsellor should be asked to provide the authentic interpretation, and, in uncertain cases, the Director should be asked to do so.

We would like to ask the RAG to indicate whether our understanding on this matter is correct.

4 Guidance related to accreditation of delegates and “proxies”

We understand that proper accreditation is required for delegates to attend ITU-R meetings, and that such delegates are entitled to express not only their expert opinion but also the official opinion of the Administration or Sector Member that has provided their accreditation, which appears on the delegate list.

It sometimes happens that a delegate makes a statement on behalf of another Administration for which he declares to hold a proxy but is different from the Administration that has provided his accreditation.

Since attendance lists do not show proxies, we would like to ask the RAG to indicate which procedures should be applied in such cases.
