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# 1 Report of the Budget Control Committee (Committee 3)(Document 358(Rev.1))

1.1The **Chairman of Committee** **3**, introducing the committee’s report in Document 358(Rev.1), said that, as at 19 November 2015, no international organization or Sector Member that must share in defraying the expenses of the conference had registered for the event. The total budget for the conference, as approved in Council Resolution 1359 and including documentation, was CHF 6 953 000, whereas the actual cost was estimated at CHF 6 094 000. As an additional cost-cutting measure, Committee 3 was proposing a three-week deadline for submission of documents and proposals to WRCs. The committee had considered Resolutions 907 (Rev.WRC-15) and 908 (Rev.WRC-15) emanating from Committee 5, which would require an allocation of CHF 350 000 and 200 000, respectively. The plenary would be notified of any additional financial implications identified before the end of the conference.

1.2The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** pointed out that further resolutions with financial implications – for example, envisaging meetings of a joint task group, perhaps with interpretation – might be adopted during the conference. It might therefore be preferable to delay approval of the committee’s report in order to allow the committee to take account of any such resolutions.

1.3The **Chairman** congratulated the Chairman of Committee 3 on a job well done and suggested that Document 358(Rev.1) should be approved on the understanding that it would be revised as necessary to take account of any further resolutions with financial implications.

1.4 It was so **agreed**.

# 2 Reports by the chairmen of ad hoc groups (Documents 429, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436)

2.1The **Chairman of Ad Hoc Group 5-2 of Committee 5** related to agenda item 1.10, introducing Document 429,said that, having considered both a new and a further revised proposal from RCC, the regional groups had been unable to reach agreement. Consequently, the ad hoc group considered that no allocation should be made to the mobile-satellite service in the frequency bands 22 GHz to 26 GHz and that Resolution 234 (WRC-12) should be suppressed.

2.2 The **Chairman** notedthatAd Hoc Group 5-2 of Committee 5 had concluded its work. He suggested that the plenary endorse Document 429 and approve the suppression of Resolution 234 (WRC-12).

2.3 It was so **agreed**.

2.4The **Chairman of Ad Hoc Group 5-3 of Committee 5** related to agenda item 1.9.1, introducing Document 431, said that the ad hoc group had considered a proposal from CEPT for a new allocation to the fixed-satellite service in the frequency band 8 400-8 500 MHz in the Earth-to-space direction. As the regional groups had been unable to reach agreement, the ad hoc group considered that no allocation should be made and that Resolution 758 (WRC-12) should be suppressed.

2.5 The **Chairman** noted that Ad Hoc Group 5-3 of Committee 5 had concluded its work. He suggested that the plenary endorse Document 431 and approve the suppression of Resolution 758 (WRC-12).

2.6 It was so **agreed**.

2.7 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on Other Bands** related to agenda item 1.1, introducing Document 436, said that after extensive discussion during two meetings, the regional groups were still not ready to compromise. Consequently, the ad hoc group had failed to reduce the number of options and, in fact, had added a new one. A number of participants had expressed concern at the introduction of a new option at such a late stage of the proceedings. The output of the ad hoc group’s work would comprise six documents of which only one, Document 436, had been issued; Documents 440 to 444 were still being processed. Document 436 summarized the options for the frequency band 3 300-3 400 MHz. Option 1 would entail no change to the Radio Regulations under agenda item 1.1 for the frequency band 3 300-3 400 MHz. Option 2 would require an additional MS allocation using footnotes in the frequency band and its identification for IMT in some countries. Option 3 would involve an additional MS allocation using footnotes in the frequency band and its identification for IMT in some countries, with the application of RR 9.21 and pfd criteria. Option 4 would require an additional MS allocation using footnotes in the frequency band and its identification for IMT in some countries, along with the application of separation distance in order to protect radiolocation services.

2.8 The **Chairman** said that it was unfortunate that the ad hoc group had not only failed to reduce the number of options but had added an additional one. He was reluctant to transform the plenary session into a drafting group and called for suggestions on the way forward.

2.9 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** said that, owing to the importance of the issues, the meetings of the ad hoc group had drawn a large number of participants and had consequently been unable to reach consensus. It would be more productive for the experts and the heads of the regional groups, whose role should not be to defend their groups’ positions but to act as messengers, to meet in an effort to find a solution.

2.10 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** said that one of the ad hoc group’s problems had been that its chairman did not have sufficient decision-making power. The group had been close to agreement; indeed, in one case consensus had been blocked by a single administration. If it was decided to convene a new ad hoc group, its chairman must be empowered to take decisions.

2.11The **delegate of China** supported the proposal to continue the discussion in a smaller ad hoc group empowered to take decisions.

2.12 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said that a global or regional approach could not be taken in the absence of consensus. She therefore supported the convening of a new ad hoc or informal group to continue the discussion with a focus on country footnotes.

2.13 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that there was no point in establishing another group to discuss the pending issues, although it might be useful for the delegation of China, as the proponent of one position, to organize consultations with opposing delegations in an effort to find common ground. One solution would be to make no change to the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations; another would be for the footnotes to simply state “Stations in the mobile service operating in the frequency band 3 300-3 400 MHz shall not cause harmful interference to or claim protection from stations operating in the radiolocation service”.

2.14 The **delegate of Nigeria** said that, as the delegate of Zimbabwe had pointed out, the chairman of the ad hoc group had not been empowered to take decisions. While consensus had been reached in a few areas, some administrations had reserved their positions pending discussions in other ad hoc groups and a single administration had, in effect, held the entire group hostage. Perhaps the participants had hoped that drafting could be done in the plenary. Since the Chairman of the Conference would not allow that, the best way forward was to establish a new ad hoc group mandated to reduce the number of options to one or two.

2.15 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that agenda item 1.1 was sensitive and it was difficult to empower chairmen of ad hoc groups to take decisions since consensus was required. Many of the frequency bands proposed by the CPM and the study groups had been excluded from negotiation during the conference. The issue could not be addressed piecemeal; the solution was to look at the agenda item as a whole in an informal discussion group, led by the Chairman of the Conference, with participation limited to the heads of the regional groups and other interested parties. Once agreement on the options had been reached, it would be straightforward to draft and adopt a resolution.

2.16 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that, like the previous speaker, he favoured continued informal discussion of all the issues under agenda item 1.1, with the possible exception of the UHF band (which was being dealt with in its own ad hoc group), in a small inter-regional group led by the Chairman. He was not in favour of establishing a new ad hoc group.

2.17 The **delegate of Costa Rica** requested that his country’s name be added to proposed footnote 5.B11. He hoped that the Chairman of the Conference would participate in any new group that was established to continue discussion of the issues.

2.18 The **Chairman** pointed out that proposed footnote 5.B11 might not be approved by the conference.

2.19 The **delegate of Finland** recalled that the ad hoc group was only the latest in a series of efforts to reach consensus on the issues. The plenary should not become a drafting group; it would be preferable to convene an informal group with the participation of two or three representatives of each regional group to continue the discussion.

2.20 The **Chairman of Committee 4** said that although the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Committee 4 on Other Bands had made every effort to reduce the number of options, it appeared that some participants would be unwilling to compromise until the last possible moment and in plenary. He did not believe that a solution could be reached in that way; it would be preferable to look at all pending issues under agenda item 1.1 so that delegations could see the emerging package before taking a decision. He therefore favoured the convening of a small informal group to consider all pending issues, including the UHF band and bands being dealt with by other ad hoc groups.

2.21The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** said that, rather than considering the issues informally, he would prefer to continue the discussion in a formal group that could produce an outcome document for submission to the plenary.

2.22 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that if an informal group was to be established, it should not discuss the UHF frequency band since the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary on UHF had a good chance of reaching consensus based on the proposals put forward by CEPT and the Arab Spectrum Management Group.

2.23The **Chairman** said that a small group of regional representatives and interested administrations, which he would chair, was already in place and would meet in a few hours to seek a compromise solution; while nominally informal, it was empowered to produce an outcome document for consideration in plenary.

2.24 The **delegate of Egypt** said that if an informal group was established for a specific frequency band, similar groups would need to be established for the other bands as well. He would prefer the informal group to deal with all the frequency bands covered by the agenda item.

2.25 The **Chairman** said that no additional informal groups would be established; the informal group already in place would take up all pending issues as they arose but would not consider the frequency bands on which progress was being made.

2.26 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** again stressed that the UHF band should not be discussed by the informal group.

2.27 The **delegate of Egypt** reiterated his view that the informal group should give equal treatment to all the frequency bands concerned, including the UHF band, for which options were still pending.

2.28 The **Chairman** said that he saw no reason for the informal group to discuss the UHF frequency band since progress was already being made on that issue. He urged participants to waste no further time and to let the informal group examine all pending issues and decide which of them required its consideration.

2.29 It was so **agreed**.

2.30 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on C-band** related to agenda item 1.1, introducing Documents 433, 434 and 435, said that the group had made some progress; it had reduced the number of options for Region 1 (Document 433) and Region 3 (Document 435), but further discussion was needed. Regarding Region 2, it had identified a single option for each of the three bands concerned (3 400-3 600 MHz, 3 600-3 700 MHz and 3 700-3 800 MHz), as detailed in Document 434.

2.31 The proposals for Region 2, as contained in Document 434, were **approved**.

2.32The **Chairman** suggested that Documents 433 and 435 be referred to the informal group, as had been done with Document 436. He encouraged the regional groups to continue to discuss the issues and agree on a way forward.

2.33 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that for Region 1, the situation was straightforward: in 2007, after extensive discussion, the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz had been allocated to mobile, and identified for IMT under certain conditions. His delegation was not prepared to revoke the agreement reached at WRC-07, leaving that band with no mobile service; there appeared to be broad, but not universal, agreement on that principle, although there might be room for negotiation on other matters. He would appreciate confirmation of that understanding from the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on C-band.

2.34 The **Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Committee 4 on C-band** said that the situation with regard to the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz was indeed clearer than was the case for the other bands. The ad hoc group had been close to agreement on option 3, which was his own preference, but had not reached consensus; the plenary might wish to take a decision on the matter. The other bands required further discussion.

2.35 The **Chairman** said that he foundDocument 433 rather confusing and suggested that the options should be clarified and re-submitted for consideration in plenary.

2.36 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that he would prefer Document 433 to be referred to the informal group in the hope that a single option could be agreed for each of the frequency bands. The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on C-band** agreed with the delegate of the United Arab Emirates.

2.37 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, speaking on behalf of RCC, said that since a compromise had now been reached on the basis of option 3 for the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz for Region 1, that issue should not be reconsidered by the informal group. Option 3 for the 3 400-3 600 MHz band was set out clearly in Document 433, and could be agreed by the plenary as it stood.

2.38 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that, because his country’s name had not been included in the relevant footnote, he could not agree to option 3 for the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz and said that the matter should be referred for discussion in the informal group and discussed together with other bands. Following informal consultations, however, he said that he was prepared to withdraw his objection but reserved the right to raise the issue in a future meeting if necessary.

2.39 The **Chairman** suggested that the texts for option 3 should be submitted to the Editorial Committee.

2.40 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on C-band** said that if option 3 was selected for the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz, there was still a need to consider ADD 5.BBB, which was intended to allow allocation of the band to the mobile service on a secondary basis. At present, no countries were mentioned in it; if the plenary considered that the footnote was required, administrations that wished to be listed therein should be requested to so indicate after the meeting and before the text was submitted to the Editorial Committee. Alternatively, the proposed footnote could be suppressed if no administrations wished to be listed.

2.41 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that proposed footnote 5.BBB should not be dropped; its inclusion would leave open the possibility of opting out of a primary allocation to the mobile service, even if no administration wished to do so at present.

2.42 **The Chairman** said he took it that the participants wished to submit the texts in Document 433 that concerned option 3 for the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz, including ADD 5.BBB, to the Editorial Committee.

2.43 It was so **agreed**.

2.44 Referring to Document 435 (summary of proposals for Region 3), the **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on C-band** explained that there was only one option for the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz namely, to add some country names to two existing footnotes, as shown in the document. For each of the frequency bands 3 600-3 700 MHz and 3 700-3 800 MHz, there were two options: either to make no change or to add a new footnote for some countries to identify the band for IMT subject to certain conditions.

2.45 Following informal consultations, the **Chairman** confirmed that there was general agreement on the option for the frequency band 3 400-3 600 MHz and the proposed changes to footnotes 5.432B and 5.433A and that they will be sent to Committee 7. The consideration of the other bands will be referred to the informal group.

2.46 It was so **agreed**.

2.47 The **Chairman** introduced Document 432, which provided the terms of reference and information on the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary on UHF established to treat issues regarding the frequency band 470-694/698 MHz in relation to agenda item 1.1.

2.48 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary** **on UHF** recalled that Committee 4 had been unable to conclude on a potential compromise solution involving no change in Region 1 at the present conference and the inclusion of an agenda item for WRC-23 on consideration of options concerning mobile allocation and identification, and country footnote solutions in the other two Regions. At its meeting that morning, the ad hoc group had received contributions from the Arab Spectrum Management Group and CEPT regarding the development of the text of a future agenda item and an accompanying resolution. Some participants had considered that no change should be retained across the entire band in all Regions, and various views had been expressed as to whether or not the proposal put forward by CEPT would constitute a good solution for Region 2. More time was required to enable interested parties to reach a compromise solution, and he asked whether the ad hoc group should continue its consultations, or whether the matter should be taken up by the informal group to be chaired by the Chairman of the Conference.

2.49 In response to a question from the **delegate of Canada** regarding the terms of reference of the ad hoc group, the **Chairman** said that the ad hoc group would, ideally, reach an acceptable solution rather than simply collect and collate options. It should therefore continue its informal consultations and inform the Chairman of Committee 4 of the outcome, which should be reported to the informal group. If the ad hoc group did not manage to reach an agreement, the matter would be taken up by the informal group.

2.50 The **delegate of India** said that his country’s name should be added to footnote 5.idR3 in Annex 4 to Document 419.

2.51 The **Chairman** invited the delegate of India to raise the matter with the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary on UHF.

2.52 The **delegates of Germany** and **Spain** said that the ad hoc group should be given more time for informal discussions. The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** agreed, adding that WRC-23 must be able to review the situation with respect to allocation and identification.

2.53 The **Chairman** said that, at the current stage of proceedings, the conference simply did not have the luxury of time. The ad hoc group chairman should conclude its informal consultations before the start of the discussions in the informal group.

# 3 Thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B13) (Document 428)

3.1 The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee** said that Document 428 comprised a series of texts presented by Committee 5 in Documents 395, 396 and 420.

Article 5 (MOD 5.388); Article 9 (MOD title, MOD A.9.4, MOD 9.1, ADD 9.1A, MOD 9.2, ADD 9.2C, SUP Sub-Section IB, SUP 9.5B, SUP 9.5B.1, SUP 9.5C, SUP 9.5D, MOD 9.47, MOD 9.50, ADD 9.50.3, MOD 9.52, ADD 9.52.1, MOD 9.62); Article 11 (MOD title, MOD A.11.2, MOD 11.32A, ADD 11.32A.2, MOD 11.44, MOD 11.44.1, ADD 11.44.3 and 11.44B.1, MOD 11.44B, ADD 11.44B.2, MOD 11.48)

3.2 **Approved**.

Article 11 (MOD 11.49)

3.3 The **delegate of Argentina**, speaking on behalf of CITEL and recalling that it had not been possible to reach consensus on certain provisions relating to suspension of the use of a recorded frequency assignment, said that approval of MOD 11.49 should be deferred pending further consultations with a view to reaching a compromise.

3.4 The **delegate of Egypt**, speaking on behalf of African administrations, stressed that the Radio Regulations must be transparent and fair to all administrations. Although he did not object to the holding of further consultations, he sought clarification of the basis on which they would be held, particularly as it had not been possible to reach agreement during the informal consultations held over the previous three weeks and in view of the lack of time for further modification of texts on which agreement had already been achieved.

3.5 The **delegate of Argentina**, speaking on behalf of CITEL, agreed that the Radio Regulations should be transparent and fair to all administrations. Every effort would be made to achieve an acceptable solution by the following day.

3.6 On that understanding, the **Chairman** said that he took it that the plenary could agree to defer approval of MOD 11.49.

3.7 It was so **agreed**.

Article 11 (MOD 11.49.1)

Article 21 (MOD 21.16.3A); Appendix 4 (Annex 2 – MOD Table A (B13/428/32-34), MOD Table B (B13/428/35-37), MOD Table C (B13/428/38-41)); Appendix 8 (MOD 2.4); Appendix 30 (Article 2A – MOD 2A; Article 4 – MOD title, MOD 4.1.3*bis*, MOD 4.1.9, MOD 4.1.10, SUP 4.1.10*ter*, ADD 4.1.10a, ADD 4.1.10b, ADD 4.1.10c, ADD 4.1.10d, MOD 4.1.11, MOD 4.1.12, MOD 4.1.25, MOD 4.2.6*bis*)

3.8 **Approved**.

**Appendix 30 (Article 5** – **MOD 5.2.10)**

3.9 The **delegate of Argentina**, speaking on behalf of CITEL, reiterated his earlier comment and requested that approval of MOD 5.2.10 be deferred pending further consultations.

3.10 It was so **agreed**.

Appendix 30 (Article 5 – MOD 20*bis*, MOD 5.2.11, MOD 5.3.1; Article 11 – MOD 11.2, SUP Table 2, ADD Table 2, SUP Table 3, ADD Table 3, SUP Table 6A, ADD Table 6A; Annex 1 – MOD 1, MOD 6; MOD Annex 4); Appendix 30A (Article 2A – MOD 2A.2; Article 4 – MOD 4.1.3*bis*, MOD 4.1.9, MOD 4.1.10, SUP 4.1.10*ter*, ADD 4.1.10a, ADD 4.1.10b, ADD 4.1.10c, ADD 4.1.10d, MOD 4.1.11, MOD 4.1.12, MOD 4.1.25, MOD 4.2.6*bis*)

3.11 **Approved**.

Appendix 30A (Article 5 – MOD 5.2.10)

3.12 The **delegate of Argentina**, speaking on behalf of CITEL and reiterating his earlier comment, requested that approval of MOD 5.2.10be deferred pending further consultations.

3.13 It was so **agreed**.

Appendix 30A (Article 5 – MOD 24*bis*, MOD 5.2.11, MOD 5.3.1; Article 9A – MOD 9A.1, SUP Table 1B, ADD Table 1B, SUP Table 3A2, ADD Table 3A2); Appendix 30B (Article 6 – MOD title, MOD 6.14, MOD 6.17, MOD 6.31, MOD 6.31*bis*, MOD 6.33; Article 7 – MOD 7.1)

3.14 **Approved**.

Appendix 30B (Article 8 – MOD 8.17)

3.15 The **delegate of Argentina**, speaking on behalf of CITEL and reiterating his earlier comment, requested that approval of MOD 8.17 be deferred pending further consultations.

3.16 It was so **agreed**.

Appendix 30B (Article 8, ADD 14*bis*, MOD Article 10)

3.17 **Approved**.

3.18 The **delegate of the** **Islamic Republic of Iran** made the following statement:

“The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran noted that Appendices 30 and 30A to the Radio Regulations, applicable to Regions 1 and 3 and certain countries of Region 2, as well as Appendix 30B to the Radio Regulations, as agreed at previous WARCs/WRCs, have treaty status and provide an agreement and associated Plan aimed to guarantee equitable access for all countries, in particular developing countries, to spectrum and orbital resources.

In the course of several WRCs, these Appendices have undergone and continue to undergo modifications in regard to their technical and procedural aspects. In certain cases, such modifications are substantial, and may adversely affect the rights of Member States enshrined in these Appendices and have unintended consequences which could compromise the principles and criteria based on which these Appendices and associated Agreements and Plans were established.

This Administration intends to apply the relevant provisions of the Appendices in the near future in order to establish fixed-satellite and broadcasting-satellite services complementing its telecommunication/ICT infrastructure and satellite broadcasting service in the near future. The amendments contained in the document under consideration may compromise the smooth and reliable application of these Appendices.”

3.19 With the exception of MOD 11.49 (Article 11), MOD 5.2.10 (Appendix 30), MOD 5.2.10(Appendix 30A) and MOD 8.17(Appendix 30B), the thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B13) (Document 428) was **approved**.

# 4 Thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B13) – second reading (Document 428)

4.1 With the exception of MOD 11.49 (Article 11), MOD 5.2.10(Appendix 30), MOD 5.2.10 (Appendix 30A) and MOD 8.17 (Appendix 30B), the thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B13) (Document 428) was **approved** on second reading.

# 5 Approval of minutes – sixth plenary meeting (Document 430)

5.1 The minutes of the sixth plenary meeting (Document 430) were **approved** on the understanding that delegates could submit written corrections to their statements subsequently.

# 6 Statement by the delegate of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic

6.1 The **delegate of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic** made the following statement:

“Mr Chairman, Mr Secretary-General, Excellencies, Distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

First of all, I am very pleased to inform the Conference that LAOSAT-1 satellite has been successfully launched at midnight 7 minutes (local time) on 21 November 2015 at the Xi Chang satellite launching station, in China. On behalf of the Government of the People’s Democratic Republic of Lao, it is my great honour and pleasure to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General of the ITU, the Director of the BR and his team; our special thanks go to the Chairman and all members of the RRB for their support and understanding with their positive consideration of our request for the extension of the LAOSAT-1 assignments. I would also like to thank all administrations for their sympathy and support to the Lao Administration.

Mr Chairman,

The decision and endorsement for our request taken in this conference is meaningful and has a great implication for the socio-economic development of my country. With LAOSAT-1, as a newcomer for the satellite communication community, we are looking forward to closely working, cooperating and learning experiences from the ITU and administrations concerned in the near future. May I congratulate you, Mr Chairman for your very competent chairmanship and I wish you every success for our conference, WRC-15.”

6.2 The **Chairman**, speaking on behalf of all delegations, congratulated the Government and citizens of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic on the successful launch of their satellite.

**The meeting rose at 1215 hours.**

The Secretary-General: The Chairman:
H. ZHAO F.Y.N. DAUDU