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# 1 Results of informal discussions on the pending issues under agenda item 10 (Document 462)

1.1 The **Chairman of Committee 6**, introducing Document 462, said that the document represented the output of a small informal group of regional representatives that had been convened to report on the results of Committee 6 activities and pending issues under agenda item 10. Document 462 contained a brief report from the informal group, along with revisions to Document 445 and a new Annex 8 comprising the updated preliminary agenda for WRC-23, considered on first reading at the eleventh plenary meeting. The document represented a series of interdependent compromises on important issues concerning future studies to be conducted by ITU-R, and the content of the agendas of the next WRC and possibly the following one. Every region had made sacrifices and one or more regional organizations or administrations had expressed reservations on some aspects of almost every compromise. There had, however, been collective recognition of the need to move forward in the little time remaining. Some of the reservations expressed with regard to Annex 5 (draft new Resolution [COM6-IMT above 6 GHz] (WRC-15) – Studies on frequency-related matters for IMT identification including possible additional allocations to the mobile services on a primary basis in portion(s) of the frequency range between 24.25 and 86 GHz for the future development of IMT for 2020 and beyond) concerned the four frequency bands (7 075-8 500 MHz, 10-10.5 GHz, 14.8-15.35 GHz and 27.5-28.35 GHz) mentioned on the cover page of Document 462, which, as a result of a compromise, were no longer included in the draft resolution. There were also reservations about the frequency bands included in the resolution. She said that an error in reflecting the compromise agreement should be rectified: draft agenda item 1.6.1, which erroneously appeared on the agenda of WRC-19 (Annex 1) should be moved to the preliminary agenda for WRC-23 (Annex 8). There would be consequential editorial changes to Annex 3, replacing “WRC-19” by “WRC-23” in the related draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS ALLOC 52 GHz] (WRC-15) – Studies relating to the spectrum requirements and the possible allocation of frequency band 51.4-52.4 GHz to the fixed-satellite service (Earth-to-space). It had proved impossible to reach a compromise with regard to Annex 4 (draft new Resolution [COM6-SOS] (WRC-15) – Studies to accommodate requirements in the space operation service for non-GSO satellites with short duration missions); consultations were still ongoing and in fact all the frequency ranges in *invites ITU-R* were effectively in square brackets. Finally, regarding Annex 6, she was awaiting confirmation from RCC that in draft new Resolution [COM6-HAPS] (WRC-15) – Facilitating access to broadband applications delivered by High Altitude Platform Stations (HAPS), the brackets and the reference to regional organizations could be deleted from *resolves to invite ITU-R* 4.

1.2 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider each of the annexes in Document 462 in turn, beginning with Annex 2; Annex 1 (draft new Resolution [COM6-AGENDA 2019] (WRC-15) – Agenda for the 2019 World Radiocommunication Conference) would then be updated accordingly and proposed for adoption. He stressed that the document was the result of a difficult compromise and urged participants to reconsider their positions in order to be able to reach agreement.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-ESIM] (WRC-15) – Use of the frequency bands 17.7-19.7 GHz (space-to-Earth) and 27.5-29.5 GHz (Earth-to-space) by earth stations in motion communicating with geostationary space stations in the fixed-satellite service (Annex 2 to Document 462)

1.3 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that earth stations in motion were not part of the regulatory and interference environment, and there was no coordination procedure for them. They were a new development that fell within the scope of aeronautical or land mobile services and had nothing to do with FSS. His delegation had reluctantly made two concessions (with regard to draft agenda item 1.5 and earth stations on mobile platforms) and would make no more. Further discussion and study were needed in order to develop guidance on the matter. He had discussed his objections with the Chairman of the conference and the Chairman of Committee 6, but there seemed to be no understanding of his delegation’s position.

1.4 The **Chairman** asked the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran whether he saw any way forward with a view to the adoption of the draft resolution.

1.5 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, supported by the **delegate of Cuba** and the **delegate of the United Arab Emirates,** speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States,said that the only solution was to move the proposed agenda item from WRC-19 to WRC-23.

1.6 The **delegate of Switzerland** said that the technology was already in place and an appropriate regulatory framework was needed. ITU had to remain relevant and responsive to technological developments. It was urgent to conduct studies to assess the compatibility of the new technology with other services, and the item should be placed on the WRC-19 agenda. He urged delegations to approve the draft resolution which addressed the concerns that had been raised.

1.7 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** said that the technology was moving forward and could provide benefits to people all over the world. The technology should not be hindered by the absence of a clear regulatory framework, and it would be preferable for the item to be included in the agenda for WRC-19.

1.8 The **delegates of Norway** and **Sweden** supported consideration of the item at WRC-19.

1.9 The **delegate of Egypt** opposed the frequency band allocations under the current version of the draft resolution and said that the item should be considered at WRC-23.

1.10 The **delegate of Germany**, speaking on behalf of CEPT, recalled that the draft agenda item had been proposed by his region and discussed with all concerned parties. It was important not to leave an existing technology that was already on the market without a regulatory framework. The topic could be placed under item 10 of the WRC-19 agenda; any issues that arose could be addressed during the ITU-R study period prior to the 2019 conference.

1.11 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that his delegation had no objection to either the topic or the draft resolution but was prepared to defer their consideration until WRC-23 in order to allow more time for preparation and study.

1.12 The **delegates of Viet Nam, Australia** and **Luxembourg** said that they would prefer the item to be placed on the WRC-19 agenda.

1.13 The **delegate of the United States** said that she supported the statements made by the delegate of Germany on behalf of CEPT and by Sweden, Switzerland, Australia and others. ITU must keep up with technology, particularly when it was already in the marketplace. The satellite industry, like many other industries, was “going mobile” and the topic should be studied so that it could be considered at WRC-19.

1.14 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said that the definition of fixed-satellite services was clear in the Radio Regulations but if the definition of those services was undermined, how would they be distinguished from mobile-satellite services? She stood ready to participate in a study of the topic during the forthcoming study period but had no objection to delaying its consideration until WRC-23.

1.15 The **delegate of France** said that the differing views on the topic were proof of the need to study and regulate it. He therefore suggested that delegations that had difficulties with the resolution should hold informal consultations and propose amendments that would meet their concerns so that the item could be placed on the agenda for WRC-19.

1.16 The **delegate of Spain** said that deferring the study of a technology that had proved viable and, indeed, was already in operation would be damaging to the image of ITU. The item should be placed on the agenda of WRC-19.

1.17 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the image of ITU would be damaged if it contradicted the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations. Earth stations in motion did not fall within the scope of the fixed-satellite service. At the urging of the delegations of Switzerland and the United Kingdom, the topic, which was not on the agenda of WRC-15, had been included in a draft resolution under agenda item 1.5 and that was quite sufficient. The item should either be placed on the agenda for WRC-23 or removed from the agendas for both WRC-19 and WRC-23.

1.18 The **delegate of Austria** said that it would be detrimental to the image of ITU as a modern organization, and ITU-R in particular, not to consider the topic during the WRC-19 preparatory period.

1.19 The **delegate of Ireland** supported the views expressed by the delegate of the United Kingdom and by the delegate of Germany on behalf of CEPT.

1.20 The **delegate of Nigeria** said that the proposed draft agenda item represented a compromise that had required considerable effort. The march of technology could not be halted and the item should be placed on the agenda of WRC-19.

1.21 The **delegate of the Netherlands** associated himself with the statements made by the delegates of Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Sweden and by the delegate of Germany on behalf of CEPT.

1.22 The **delegate of South Africa** said that there appeared to be general agreement on the need to study the topic. Perhaps a solution could be found through informal consultations.

1.23 The **Chairman of Committee 6** recalled that draft Resolution [COM6-ESOA] (WRC‑15) – Possible operation of earth stations on aircraft in the FSS in the frequency band 12.75-13.25 GHz (Earth-to-space), contained in Annex 2 to Document 445, had been withdrawn as part of a difficult compromise that had led to the issuance of Document 462.

1.24 The **Chairman** said that the draft resolution in Annex 2 to Document 462 would be left in abeyance, pending consideration of the remainder of the document.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS ALLOC 52 GHz] (WRC-15) – Studies relating to the spectrum requirements and the possible allocation of frequency band 51.4-52.4 GHz to the fixed-satellite service (Earth-to-space) (Annex 3 to Document 462)

1.25 The **Chairman** recalled that, as the Chairman of Committee 6 had indicated, the draft new resolution should refer to WRC-23 and the associated agenda item should be placed on the agenda for WRC-23.

1.26 The **delegate of France** said that ITU-R should begin studies on the frequency band as soon as possible with a view to making an initial report to WRC-19. Accordingly, the draft resolution should refer to WRC-19, even if no decision on allocation was taken at that conference, and the topic should be included on the agenda of WRC-19 under item 6. The **delegate of the Russian Federation** supported that suggestion, adding that he had some doubts about achieving compatibility, particularly in terms of regulatory aspects.

1.27 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** said that his Administration supported the studies and was in favour of retaining the item on the agenda for WRC-19.

1.28 The **delegate of China** said that “spectrum requirements” should be amended to read “spectrum needs”. If the topic was to remain on the agenda for WRC-19 under item 6, further editorial amendments would be required. The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** endorsed that comment.

1.29 The **delegate of the** **Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the topic should be included under agenda item 9.1 of WRC-19.

1.30 The **Chairman** said that he took it that the plenary could agree to include the topic on the agenda of WRC-19 and hence approve the draft new resolution as it stood. It would be left to the Chairman of Committee 6 to decide under which agenda item.

1.31 On that understanding, the text of draft new resolution [COM6-QV FSS ALLOC 52 GHz] (WRC-15) – Studies relating to the spectrum requirements and the possible allocation of frequency band 51.4-52.4 GHz to the fixed-satellite service (Earth-to-space) was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS REGU] (WRC-15)– Studies of technical, operational issues and regulatory provisions for non-GSO FSS satellite systems in the 37.5-39.5 GHz (space-to-Earth), 39.5-42.5 GHz (space-to-Earth), and 42.5-43.5 GHz, 47.2-50.2 GHz and 50.4-51.4 GHz (Earth-to-space) frequency bands (Annex 3 to Document 462)

1.32 The **delegate of France** said that the band 48.94-49.04 GHz should be added in *resolves to invite ITU-R* 5.

1.33 In response to a question from the **delegate of the** **United Arab Emirates**, the **Chairman of Committee 6** confirmed that the draft resolution would be considered as part of preparation for WRC-19, not WRC-23.

1.34 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** recalled that his Administration had reserved its position on the draft resolution. It had difficulties with inclusion of the band 42.5-43.5 GHz and would prefer the draft resolution to be considered as part of preparations for WRC-23. In response to a question from the **Chairman**, he said that the Russian Federation could, by way of compromise, agree to the draft resolution remaining under WRC-19 provided that the band 42.5-43.5 GHz was deleted.

1.35 The **delegate of the United States** said that the text had been discussed extensively, yet that was the first time a proposal had been made to delete the band 42.5-43.5 GHz from the draft resolution. She was curious as to why that band presented a problem. The **delegate of the United States** speaking on behalf of CITEL endorsed those comments; he emphasized that the draft resolution should relate to WRC-19.

1.36 The **delegate of China** said that reference to the band 42.5-43.5 GHz should be retained.

1.37 In response to a question from the **Chairman**, the **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that the Russian systems already operating in that band required adequate levels of protection. He called for further consultations, particularly as the draft resolution referred to studies of possible necessary revisions to regulatory texts.

1.38 Following a comment by the **delegate of France**, the **Chairman** suggested that interested parties should hold informal discussions with a view to developing an acceptable formulation.

1.39 It was so **agreed**.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-SOS] (WRC-15) – Studies to accommodate requirements in the space operation service for non-GSO satellites with short duration missions (Annex 4 to Document 462)

1.40 The **delegate of France**, supported by the **delegates of Denmark**, **Austria** and **Switzerland**, proposed the deletion of the square brackets around “420-450 MHz” in *invites ITU‑R* 3.

1.41 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that the draft resolution posed significant difficulties, not only for his Administration but for the entire Arab group. As many critical systems were deployed in each of the frequency ranges detailed in *invites ITU-R* 3, his Administration could not accept the draft resolution, with the reference to the frequency ranges, as part of the work of WRC-19.

1.42 The **delegate of Egypt** endorsed those comments, adding that the draft resolution might be acceptable if it referred to WRC-23.

1.43 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the square brackets and their content should be deleted from *invites ITU-R* 3.

1.44 The **delegate of the Netherlands**, having supported the proposal made by the delegate of France, said that the number of short duration missions was increasing rapidly and ITU had to come up with a proper response in the form of studies. If the studies showed that sharing and compatibility with existing services in a particular band could not be achieved, then an allocation in that band would not be considered.

1.45 The **delegate of Norway**, noting that his Administration also had a number of critical systems in the frequency bands, said that the possibility of an allocation would depend on the outcome of the studies, which should be reviewed by WRC-19.

1.46 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** endorsed the comments made by the delegates of the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and the Islamic Republic of Iran, as did the **delegate of Iraq,** who said that he had no objection to the studies themselves, but to the frequency ranges proposed, which were used by his Administration for very sensitive services.

1.47 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, supporting the views expressed by the delegates of the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and the Islamic Republic of Iran, recalled that his Administration had also reserved its position with regard to the frequency range 150.05-174 MHz.

1.48 The **delegate of Germany** said that the studies in the frequency ranges to which *invites ITU-R* 3 referred would be carried out only if studies of current allocations to the space operations service indicated that requirements could not be met. He supported the French proposal since inclusion of the frequency range 420-450 MHz would offer greater opportunity to reach a solution in the study cycle and ensure that ITU was responsive, including to the needs of the scientific community and academia.

1.49 The **delegate of Switzerland** said that, while he supported the comments made by the delegates of France and the Netherlands, he could go along with the deletion of the square brackets and the reference to “420-450 MHz” in *invites ITU-R* 3 if that would result in consideration of the draft resolution under WRC-19. The **delegate of Zimbabwe** endorsed that comment.

1.50 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** said that the need to protect incumbent services was clear. In order to take account of concerns expressed, administrations might wish to consider in informal discussions the possibility of indicating that the studies should concentrate on the first two frequency bands referred to in *invites ITU-R* 3 and then on the third only if a solution could not be found in the first two.

1.51 The **delegate of the United States** suggested that the most logical course of action would be to relate the draft resolution to the agenda for WRC-23. The **delegates of Sudan** and **Kazakhstan**, on behalf of RCC, supported that suggestion, as did the **delegates of Belarus** and **Armenia** who added that their administrations would have some difficulty with the inclusion of the frequency bands 150.05-174 MHz and 420-450 MHz.

1.52 The **Chairman** proposed two options: either to delete the square brackets and their content in *invites ITU-R* 3 and conduct studies for WRC-19; or to delete the square brackets, retaining the reference to “420-450 MHz”, and relate the draft resolution to the agenda for WRC‑23.

1.53 The **delegate of the Netherlands** expressed support for the first option.

1.54 The **Chairman** proposed that further discussion of Document 462 should be deferred pending informal consultations.

1.55 It was so **agreed**.

1.56 Several hours later, the **Chairman** proposed resuming the examination of Document 462 starting with Annex 5.

Draft new Resolution [COM6‑IMT ABOVE 6 GHZ] (WRC‑15) – Studies on frequency-related matters for IMT identification including possible additional allocations to the mobile services on a primary basis in portion(s) of the frequency range between 24.25 and 86 GHz for the future development of IMT for 2020 and beyond (Annex 5 to Document 462)

1.57 The **delegate of Cameroon**, speaking on behalf of the African group, said that the group had not seen any of its proposals on the current agenda item considered, and had not even had an opportunity to submit them. He therefore requested that the African proposals be taken into account in the compromise that would be worked out, in particular by ensuring that the extension of 5G below 20 GHz were studied. He added that the message from the Conference to the populations of African countries was “5G is not for you”. The **delegate of Finland** shared the view that studies on 5G in the 6-20 GHz band were of great importance for the development of that technology, and hoped that the next study cycle would allow the concerns of all the parties involved to be taken into account.

1.58 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said that ITU was a space for discussion and as such had to promote respect for the rights of the minority. The frequency bands which were the subject of the draft Resolution were used by a number of different services, and their use was thus based on sharing. That involved only sharing studies, not a dual identification of frequencies to facilitate access to broadband applications.

1.59 The **delegate of Argentina** said that the list of frequency bands adopted in the draft Resolution reflected a consensus that had been reached after nearly four weeks of discussions. Furthermore, sharing and capacity studies had already been carried out and revealed considerable variations, depending on the authors. He therefore recommended that the discussions should not be reopened.

1.60 Following deletion of the square brackets and text therein, the text of the draft new Resolution [COM6-IMT ABOVE 6 GHz] (WRC-15) – Studies on frequency-related matters for IMT identification including possible additional allocations to the mobile services on a primary basis in portion(s) of the frequency range between 24.25 and 86 GHz for the future development of IMT for 2020 and beyond, was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-HAPS] (WRC-15) – Facilitating access to broadband applications delivered by High Altitude Platform Stations (HAPS) (Annex 6 to Document 462)

1.61 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** said that the text had not yet been examined and could therefore not be approved by simple removal of square brackets and the text therein. The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** endorsed that view, noting that it was also supported by a number of other delegations.

1.62 The **delegate of Cameroon**, speaking on behalf of the African group, said that he supported the adoption of the text of Annex 6 with the square brackets removed. He was supported by the **delegate of Burkina Faso**. The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** considered that the allocation of new frequency bands for HAPS applications was not justified, given that those applications already had a number of bands that were still unused.

1.63 The **delegate of the United States** said that ITU stood at a crossroads. It could either choose to pursue technological progress and enjoy its benefits, or it could protect the status quo. Annex 6 had to be dealt with in accordance with the general procedure that had been agreed, whereby a text, once any square brackets and associated text had been deleted, became the compromise text which was no longer open to discussion.

1.64 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the entire text of Annex 6 would be acceptable if the phrase “appropriate regulatory actions” at the end of the *resolves to invite WRC‑19* were replaced with: “the necessary regulatory actions, as appropriate, provided that the results of the studies referred to in *resolves to invite ITU-R* are complete and agreed to by the study groups.”

1.65 It was so **agreed**.

1.66 Following the deletion of the square brackets and associated text and incorporation of the modification proposed by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the text of the draft new Resolution [COM6-HAPS] (WRC-15) – Facilitating access to broadband applications delivered by High Altitude Platform Stations (HAPS) was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Draft new Resolution [COM6‑RLAN 5 GHz] (WRC‑15) – Studies concerning Wireless Access Systems including radio local area networks (WAS/RLAN) in the frequency bands between 5 150 MHz and 5 925 MHz (Annex 7 to Document 462)

1.67 The text of the draft new Resolution [COM6-RLAN-5GHz] (WRC-15) – Studies concerning Wireless Access Systems including radio local area networks (WAS/RLAN) in the frequency bands between 5 150 MHz and 5 925 MHz was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Resolution COM6/2 (WRC-15) – Preliminary agenda for the 2023 World Radiocommunication Conference (Annex 8 to Document 462)

1.68 The **Chairman of Committee 4** recalled that the morning plenary meeting had approved a document on UHF bands which had proposed studies for 2023 and that the decision in question had to be reflected in Annex 8.

1.69 On the understanding that the Editorial Committee would incorporate the decision referred to by the Chairman of Committee 4, the text of the Resolution COM6/2 (WRC-15) – Preliminary agenda for the 2023 World Radiocommunication Conference was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS ALLOC] (WRC-15) – Studies relating to the spectrum requirements and the possible allocation of frequency band 37.5‑39.5 GHz, to the fixed‑satellite service (Annex 9 to Document 462)

1.70 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said that the text had been examined under conditions that had not allowed her delegation to make its position clear. A further difficulty in accepting the text was that the entry into service of the fixed-satellite service in the frequency band 37.5‑39.5 GHz made sharing with the mobile service more difficult.

1.71 The **Chairman** said that no annex could be treated any differently from the others with regard to the agreed approval procedure.

1.72 The text of the draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS ALLOC] (WRC-15) – Studies relating to the spectrum requirements and the possible allocation of frequency band 37.5‑39.5 GHz, to the fixed‑satellite service was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

1.73 The **Chairman** invited participants to resume their examination of Annexes 2, 3 and 4 which had remained pending.

**Draft new Resolution [ESIM] (WRC-15) – Use of the frequency bands 17.7-19.7 GHz (space-to-Earth) and 27.5-29.5 GHz (Earth-to-space) by earth stations in motion communicating with geostationary space stations in the fixed-satellite service (continued)**

1.74The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said that the problem of sharing between the fixed service and the mobile service to which she had drawn attention in connection with the 37.5-39.5 GHz frequency band also applied to the 27.5-29.5 GHz frequency band in Annex 2.

1.75 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran,** supported by the **delegate of Egypt**, said that the results of the studies requested in the draft Resolution would have to be examined by WRC in 2023, rather than in 2019. The **delegate of the United Kingdom**, supported by the **delegates of Norway**, **France**,and **the Netherlands**, objected that the change in question would be tantamount to treating the annex differently from the others and a departure from the established procedure. The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the mention of WRC-19 would be acceptable if the amendment made to the *resolves to invite WRC‑19* in Annex 6 also applied to the relevant provision of Annex 2.

1.76 Taking that modification into account, the text of the draft new Resolution [ESIM] (WRC-15) – Use of the frequency bands 17.7-19.7 GHz (space-to-Earth) and 27.5-29.5 GHz (Earth-to-space) by earth stations in motion communicating with geostationary space stations in the fixed-satellite service was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS REGU] (WRC‑15) Studies of technical, operational issues and regulatory provisions for non-GSO FSS satellite systems in the 37.5-39.5 GHz (space-to-Earth), 39.5-42.5 GHz (space-to-Earth), and 42.5-43.5 GHz, 47.2-50.2 GHz and 50.4-51.4 GHz (Earth-to-space) frequency bands (Annex 3 to Document 462) (continued)

1.77 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that, following consultations with the delegate of France on the frequency band 42.5-43.5 GHz, it had been agreed that the band would be deleted.

1.78 After deletion of the band 42.5-43.5 GHz, the text of the draft new Resolution [COM6-QV FSS REGU] (CMR-15) – Studies of technical, operational issues and regulatory provisions for non-GSO FSS satellite systems in the 37.5-39.5 GHz (space-to-Earth), 39.5-42.5 GHz (space-to-Earth), and 42.5-43.5 GHz, 47.2-50.2 GHz and 50.4-51.4 GHz (Earth-to-space) frequency bands was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

Draft new Resolution [COM6-SOS] (WRC-15) – Studies to accommodate requirements in the space operation service for non-GSO satellites with short duration missions (Annex 4 to Document 462) (continued)

1.79 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that informal consultations on the text in question had identified two options for examining the results of the studies that had been advocated, namely at WRC-19 or at WRC-23, and the latter was in his view preferable. He was supported by the **delegate of Belarus** speaking on behalf of the RCC, the **delegate of Egypt**, the **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** speaking on behalf of the Arab group, and the **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, who noted that many delegations had made concessions on that point and it was time for the advocates of the WRC-19 option to do the same in their turn.

1.80 The **delegate of the United Kingdom**, speaking on behalf of the CEPT, said that both options had been discussed and that by 2023 it would in any case be too late for the technology concerned. Annex 4 to Document 462 therefore needed to be dealt with by the same procedure as all the others. He was supported by the **delegates of France**, **the Netherlands, Norway** and **Germany**.

1.81 The **Director of BR** proposed a compromise between the two positions, by retaining the reference to WRC-19 and introducing in the clause *resolves to invite WRC-19* the modification approved for Annexes 2 and 6.

1.82 Taking that modification into account and following deletion of the square brackets and the text therein, the text of the draft new Resolution [COM6-SOS] (WRC-15) – Studies to accommodate requirements in the space operation service for non-GSO satellites with short duration missions was **approved** for submission to the Editorial Committee.

1.83 Document 462 as a whole, as amended, was **approved**.

1.84 The **delegate of the United States** submitted the following statement on 5G spectrum, for inclusion in the minutes:

“The United States, supported by Colombia, Finland, Japan, Korea, Singapore, Sweden and Slovenia express concerns with the discussions and disposition of the future conference agenda item to study spectrum for next generation mobile services (5G) using bands above 6 GHz. Mobile broadband is the highest growth sector in the telecommunications industry worldwide and it is crucial that the ITU address the needs of countries worldwide. Certain bands proposed by regional groups and individual countries for study under this agenda item were removed from consideration despite this support.

The ITU must continue to be a place that promotes and enables new technologies. Opposition even to studies in the band range 27.5-29.5 GHz is inconsistent with the ITU's role as an organization for international consultation and indicates a loss of faith in the study process and a preference for the status quo. The evaluation of innovative sharing techniques to create new opportunities is paramount to accommodate technological advances that will benefit the global economy. Given the pace of technological innovation and the demand for mobile broadband services, the ITU could lose its relevance if it does not join in a meaningful way in the search for globally harmonized spectrum for IMT-2020.”

# 2 Options for the frequency band 470-694/698 GHz under agenda item 1.1 (Document 446)

2.1 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary on UHF** related to agenda item 1.1 introduced his report contained in Document 446, which set out options for the frequency band 470-694/698 MHz. The proposal for Region 1, contained in Annex 1, was for no change at the current conference for the frequency band 470-694 MHz in relation to agenda item 1.1. A future conference agenda item for WRC-23 was proposed, and the accompanying draft resolution was also set out in Annex 1. The proposals for Regions 2 and 3 were set out in Annex 2. For Region 2, some modifications to existing country footnotes and some new footnotes were proposed for both the addition of a mobile allocation and an IMT identification. For Region 3, the proposal was for the addition of a country footnote for IMT identification. An amended version of Resolution 224 (Rev.WRC-12) was set out in Annex 2, taking into account the compromises reached for Regions 2 and 3, including changes agreed in Working Group 4C that had not been considered by Committee 4 owing to a lack of time.

2.2 The **delegate of Brazil** made the following statement:

“The Administrations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela consider that,

Taking into account the contribution number 101 [Document 101] to the WRC-15,

Also considering the great number of administrations in different regions, supporting no change for agenda item 1.1, related to the UHF band 470-698 MHz,

We reaffirm the importance of the continuous development of the broadcasting service in our nations;

We also note the existence of different levels of development and the need to guarantee full access to new ICT technologies for developing countries.

Additionally, the compromise solution presented today under this agenda item attempts to merge the different positions of countries in this Region.

In doing so, it is our understanding that the additional footnotes incorporated in Article 5 of the Radio Regulations will guarantee that stations of the mobile service for IMT applications shall not cause harmful interference to, nor claim protection, from the broadcasting service.

Therefore, we look forward to considering this situation in the application of the provisions of the Radio Regulations.”

2.3 The **delegate of China**, recalling that Region 3 countries had not managed to reach a consensus, noted that a number of APT countries had signed a joint proposal for no change while other countries had advocated the use of country footnotes. It was his Administration’s view that, for UHF frequency bands, the focus should be on regional and global coordination and allocation. Countries of Regions 2 and 3 should demonstrate the same spirit of compromise that had prevailed among Region 1 countries.

2.4 The **delegate of Colombia**, noting that the agreements reached in Region 2 regarding the use of the UHF frequency band were the product of a very delicate compromise, made the following statement:

“The Administration of Colombia will not implement IMT systems in the frequency range 614-698 MHz in the border zones between Colombia and Brazil until such time as a coordination agreement is reached on the use of spectrum in that frequency range. Similarly, the Administration of Colombia will not implement IMT systems in the frequency range 614-698 MHz in the border zones between Colombia and Ecuador until such time as a coordination agreement is reached on the use of spectrum in that frequency range.”

2.5 The **delegate of Germany**, welcoming the compromise reached, said that it would be useful, for the purposes of future harmonization, to indicate in *invites ITU-R* 1 of Resolution 224 that the studies should take into account the criteria used in the GE-06 Agreement.

2.6 The **Chairman** invited participants to consider Document 446 in detail.

2.7 The proposal for Region 1 “For the frequency band 470-694 MHz: no change is required in the Radio Regulations in Region 1 at WRC-15 in relation to agenda item 1.1” was **approved**.

2.8 The future conference agenda item for WRC-23 “1.X to review the spectrum use and spectrum requirements of existing services in the band 470-960 MHz in Region 1 and consider possible regulatory actions in the frequency band 470-694 MHz in Region 1 on the basis of the review in accordance with Resolution [YYY] (WRC-15) was **approved**.

Draft new Resolution [YYY] (WRC-15) – Review of the spectrum use of the band 470-960 MHz in Region 1

2.9 The **delegate of Nigeria** emphasized that Region 1 had achieved a delicate compromise on the issues covered in the draft new resolution, in the context of other matters, and appealed to all concerned to maintain that balance.

2.10 The **delegate of Rwanda**, speaking on behalf of the East African Community, added that the conference must keep in mind the links between the band being discussed and other bands covered by agenda item 1.1 on which agreement was still pending.

2.11 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** pointed out that his country was bordered by Region 1 countries on three sides and was party to the GE-06 Agreement, meaning that Region 1 could not be considered in isolation. The rights of countries in other regions must also be respected. He proposed that, in *resolves to invite WRC-23*, the words “provided that these studies are completed and approved by ITU-R” be added after “based on the results of studies above”, in order to avoid a situation similar to that which had arisen at the present conference under agenda item 1.5.

2.12 There being no objections to that proposal, the **Chairman** took it that the conference agreed to approve the text of the draft new resolution, as amended by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran, for submission to the Editorial Committee.

2.13 It was so **agreed**.

Article 5 (MOD Table 460-890 MHz, MOD 5.293, MOD 5.297, ADD 5.allocateR2, ADD 5.idR2a, ADD 5.idR2b)

2.14 **Approved**.

**Article 5 (ADD 5.idR3)**

2.15 The **delegate of Indonesia** said that his Administration had difficulties with the inclusion of Papua New Guinea in footnote No. 5.idR3. Discussions between the two countries had not yet resulted in agreement being reached.

2.16 The **Chairman** requested the countries concerned to continue their efforts to find a solution; in the meantime, Papua New Guinea’s name would be placed in square brackets.

2.17 The **delegate of Papua New Guinea** confirmed that discussions would continue.

2.18 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that his country had requested Pakistan not to include its name in footnote No. 5.idR3 and he asked for it to be deleted.

2.19 The **Chairman** encouraged the two countries to discuss the matter. Pakistan’s name would be placed in square brackets until the outcome was known.

2.20 The **delegate of Pakistan**, agreeing to that course of action, said that many broadcasting services in his country operated in the band 470-610 MHz. As use of those frequencies for IMT by neighbouring countries would affect such services, he requested that India’s name be removed from the section of the footnote relating to the entire band 470-698 MHz. Using the band 610-698 MHz for IMT would avoid interference.

2.21 The **Director of BR** suggested that India’s name should be placed in square brackets where it appeared in the current version of the text and inserted, also in square brackets, in relation to the band 610-698 MHz.

2.22 The **delegate of India** explained that his Administration wished to encourage the development of IMT by offering the widest frequency band possible pending the results of technical studies, rather than constraining the available frequencies to 610-698 MHz. India also made extensive use of the 470-610 MHz band for broadcasting; moreover, it had already been established that IMT should not cause interference to or claim protection from the broadcasting services of neighbouring administrations. Giving assurances that India would avoid causing interference to its neighbours’ broadcasting services in developing IMT, he requested that his country’s name remain in the footnote as it stood.

2.23 The **Chairman** said that, as an objection had been raised, India’s name would be placed in square brackets, but encouraged the two delegations concerned to discuss the matter with a view to reaching agreement.

2.24 The **delegate of China** suggested that the last sentence of the footnote should be altered to read: “…under No. 9.21 and shall not cause harmful interference to or claim protection from the broadcasting service of neighbouring countries. Nos. 5.43 and 5.43A apply.”

2.25 It was so **agreed**.

2.26 The **delegate of Thailand** made the following statement:

“Thailand wishes to emphasize that Thailand has stood by the position of NOC, as already reflected in the APT position. Thailand can go along with the compromise proposals for Region 3 as indicated in Document 446 in the new footnote No. 5.idR3 as long as our neighbouring countries are not including their names in this footnote. Thailand continues to use the frequency band 470-698 MHz for the broadcasting service and, as such, Thailand wishes to reflect this statement in the minutes of the Plenary.”

2.27 There being no other comments, the **Chairman** took it that the conference agreed to approve the text of new footnote No. 5.idR3, as amended, for submission to the Editorial Committee.

2.28 It was so **agreed**.

**MOD Resolution 224 (Rev.WRC-12) – Frequency bands for the terrestrial component of International Mobile Telecommunications below 1 GHz**

2.29 The **delegate of France** proposed that *considering* *e)* of Resolution 224 should be amended to read “that some administrations of Regions 2 and 3 are planning to use the frequency band 470-694/698 MHz, or part of that band, for IMT” and that the words “of Regions 2 and 3” should be added after “some countries” in *resolves* 1, so as to make it clear that the band 470-694/698 MHz was not to be used for IMT in Region 1.

2.30 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, emphasizing that the issues covered in Document 446 had not been fully coordinated for Region 3,expressed concern at the way in which the amendments to Resolution 224, particularly that proposed by Germany earlier in the present meeting, had been handled. The amendments to the resolution had not been discussed at the APT coordination meeting. He expressed specific concern with regard to *invites ITU-R*.

2.31 The **Chairman** recalled that no objections had been raised to the statement made by the delegate of Germany at the time.

2.32 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** pointed out that there was a difference between including a unilateral statement in the minutes of the meeting and agreeing to a proposal contained therein. Regarding *invites ITU-R*, he stressed that ITU-R was international and should not develop specific criteria that were applicable to some regions but not others. The unity and universality of ITU should be preserved. As such, *invites ITU-R* was incorrect. If it were to be retained, the reference to “in No. 5.idR3” should be deleted.

2.33 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** said that *considering* *e)* no longer reflected the regional basis on which the band under discussion had been dealt with by the conference. He proposed the following alternative wording: “that some administrations of Regions 2 and 3 are planning to use the band 470-862 MHz or parts thereof for IMT, while for Region 1 administrations are considering using the band 694-862 MHz for IMT”.

2.34 The **delegate of France** supported the proposal by the delegate of Zimbabwe.

2.35 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the resolution should deal only with the band 470-694/698 MHz.

2.36 The **delegate of France** said that, on reflection, it seemed more appropriate to revert to his original proposal for *considering e)*. The fact that frequencies above 694/698 MHz might be used for IMT by some administrations in Region 1 was covered by the fairly general wording of *considering* *d)*. The **delegate of Zimbabwe** concurred with that suggestion.

2.37 It was so **agreed**.

2.38 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that he reserved the right to comment on the proposal made by the delegate of France once it had been incorporated into the text in writing and resubmitted to the plenary for first reading.

2.39 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** said that, in the light of the discussion, *considering* *f)* appeared to be redundant and could be deleted.

2.40 It was so **agreed**.

2.41 The **delegate of Brazil** sought clarification as to whether the *invites ITU-R* section applied to all regions or only Region 3.

2.42 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that, if criteria required for the application of No. 9.21 were developed by ITU-R, they would be included in Recommendations that would need to be approved by ITU as a whole. As such, they could not apply to a single region. Once adopted, countries could decide individually whether to use such criteria or not, but that was a separate issue. There were a number of ways to proceed. A request to BR could be included in the minutes of the plenary to the effect that, if any existing criteria could be adapted for the purpose, they should be submitted to a study group for further development. Alternatively, the usual ITU-R procedure could be followed: based on Resolution 224, administrations could submit contributions to ITU-R study groups, which were contribution-driven. The latter might be the simplest approach. In either case, *invites ITU-R* should be deleted.

2.43 The **Director of BR** suggested that *invites ITU-R* could be made more general by altering it to read: “to develop technical criteria for the application of No. 9.21 in order to ensure the protection of the broadcasting service from IMT”.

2.44 The **delegate of Germany** said that there was a risk of overlap with bands in which the GE-06 Agreement applied, which could cause severe difficulties for studies in Region 1. The best option would be to follow the suggestion by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran and to delete *invites ITU-R*.

2.45 It was so **agreed**.

2.46 The **delegate of Italy** proposed that, in *resolves* 2, the word “existing” should be added before “relevant ITU-R studies”.

2.47 It was so **agreed**.

2.48 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** suggested that *recognizing* *l*) be amended to read: “that, in some countries, the frequency band 470-862 MHz, or parts thereof, for Regions 2 and 3 and the frequency band 694-862 MHz for Region 1 are allocated to the mobile service on a primary basis”.

2.49 It was so **agreed**.

2.50 The **delegate of China** said that, as footnote No. 5.idR3 had been approved, *resolves* 2 should be altered accordingly. He proposed the following wording: “…the frequency band 470-790 MHz, or portions thereof, for those administrations mentioned in No. 5.313A and No. 5.idR3”.

2.51 It was so **agreed**.

2.52 The **Chairman** took it that the conference was willing to approve the text of Resolution 224, as amended, for submission to the Editorial Committee.

2.53 It was so **agreed**.

# 3 Report by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on Agenda Item 1.5 (Document 465)

3.1 The **Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Committee 4 on Agenda Item 1.5**, introducing Document 465, explained that it contained a revised version of one of the four options presented in Document 455 for satisfying the agenda item, representing the outcome of informal consultations involving all interested parties in which great flexibility had been shown in attempting to reach a compromise. He sincerely hoped that it would be acceptable to the conference.

3.2 The **Chairman**, urging the conference not to re-open discussion on matters of substance, invited the plenary to take up the various texts contained in Document 465 with a view to approval and submission to the Editorial Committee.

Article 5 (MOD Table 10-11.7 GHz, MOD Table 11.7-14 GHz, MOD Table 14-15.4 GHz, MOD Table 18.4-22 GHz, MOD Table 24.75-29.9 GHz, MOD Table 29.9-34.2 GHz, ADD 5.A15)

3.3 **Approved**.

ADD Resolution [COM4/5] (WRC-15) – Regulatory provisions related to earth stations on board unmanned aircraft which operate with geostationary-satellite networks in the fixed-satellite service in certain frequency bands not subject to a Plan of Appendices 30, 30A and 30B for the control and non-payload communications of unmanned aircraft systems in non-segregated airspaces

3.4 The **delegate of the Netherlands** said that draft Resolution COM4/5 seemed to represent the best result that could be achieved at present on such a delicate issue; however, despite extensive discussions over several years, it did not address the serious concerns of his delegation and others and had not been the subject of consensus in informal negotiations. He considered the text very unstable. Moreover, ICAO had raised doubts as to the feasibility of the measures proposed. ICAO’s position was clear: aeronautical systems must operate in spectrum allocated to an appropriate aeronautical safety service, and evidence-based studies should be carried out to ensure that safety-of-life concerns were sufficiently addressed. Member States could best support ICAO by not approving the draft resolution, on which more work was still needed.

3.5 The **delegate of Norway** said that he shared the concerns expressed by the delegate of the Netherlands: draft Resolution COM4/5 did not satisfy the agenda item and he could not support it. Further studies were required.

3.6 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that he had expected the plenary to consider Document 455. While he did not object in principle to discussing only the compromise option set out in Document 465, his delegation had a number of concerns regarding its content, as had been clearly stated at meetings of the ad hoc group. In particular, he could not accept the footnote attached to the title of the draft Resolution COM4/5 and to *resolves* 1.

3.7 The **delegate of Spain** supported the three previous speakers.

3.8 The **delegate of the United States**,speaking on behalf of CITEL, supported by the **delegate of Germany**, expressed disappointment at the lack of support for the compromise text proposed, which he had believed to enjoy consensus and to address the concerns of all. He urged the conference not to turn its back on the valuable work done to tackle what was a difficult issue.

3.9 The **delegate of Slovenia**, echoing those remarks, added that efforts had been made to take account of the concerns expressed by ICAO and others regarding non-segregated airspace by including the footnote referred to by the delegate of the Russian Federation.The wording of *resolves* 8 should allay the safety concerns expressed by some European administrations. She urged the conference to approve the draft resolution by consensus.

3.10 The **delegate of the United States** said that a way forward on the issue must be found, as unmanned aircraft provided the most innovative advancements in aviation. It was inconceivable that two consecutive WRCs could pursue a “no change” approach. She sought the views of ICAO on whether the draft resolution would enable it to fulfil its tasks.

3.11 The **delegate of Australia**, expressing support for the comments made on behalf of CITEL and by the delegates of the United States and Germany, said that the issue was important and urgent. While the text before the conference might not be perfect, it represented a genuine and necessary step forward.

3.12 The **delegate of Belarus**, speaking on behalf of RCC, said that the text of the draft resolution could be discussed as a compromise; however, the footnote attached to the title and *resolves* 1 did not satisfy agenda item 1.5.

3.13 The **delegate of the United Kingdom**, underlining the complex nature of the issue, said that an imperfect text should not be approved for application in regard to aeronautical services.

3.14 The **delegate of Italy** said that many points remained to be studied. As there was no guarantee of protection for links, he could not support the draft resolution.

3.15 The **delegate of Luxembourg** observed that the complexity of the text reflected the efforts made to ensure that the concerns of all administrations were properly addressed. The result was a delicate balance. It was also a first step, rather than a definitive solution, and might need to be reviewed in due course. Nonetheless, action should be delayed no further. He urged the conference to approve the draft resolution.

3.16 The **delegate of Switzerland** said that, despite some concerns, he could support the draft resolution, particularly as it would be revisited in 2023, when a different approach could be taken if necessary, in consultation with ICAO.

3.17 The **delegate of France** said that the text, while not perfect, had the merit of identifying problems and setting out potential avenues to be explored in resolving them. He therefore supported the draft resolution.

3.18 The **delegate of Austria** echoed the remarks made by the delegate of Switzerland. He also pointed out that there were almost no applications currently marketed in the relevant technical area.

3.19 The **delegates of Liechtenstein**, **Mexico, Colombia,** **Canada, Nigeria**, **Greece** and **Cameroon**,speaking on behalf of the African group, expressed support for the text as presented.

3.20 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** requested the Chairman to rule that no amendments could be made to the text. It might not be perfect but it represented the outcome of lengthy negotiation, and further discussion would not be productive. He emphasized that, despite ICAO’s obvious and legitimate interest in the text, a number of the issues it covered were fundamentally matters for ITU. He suggested that including the following text in the minutes of the plenary might reflect the views and address the concerns expressed:

“In considering Document 465, in view of the complexity of the issue and the complexity of various elements contained in this resolution, including the degree of difficulties and uncertainties expressed, it was felt appropriate to indicate that it is early to authorize the use of the frequency band mentioned in this resolution for CNPC UAS until the result of the studies and action called for in the resolution are reported to WRC-23 and agreed upon by that conference.”

3.21 The **Chairman** asked whether ICAO was comfortable with the text of the draft resolution.

3.22 The **observer for ICAO** said that the concerns it had expressed prior to the conference were addressed in the text, which, while not perfect, represented a delicate balance for the introduction of a service with safety-of-life implications. The draft resolution contained language consistent with No. 4.10 of the Radio Regulations, protected the current FSS environment and addressed the interference environment. Given that the action to be taken was provisional, and that the resolution could be improved or abrogated if necessary, based among other things on feedback from ICAO itself, he expressed reasonable satisfaction with the text.

3.23 The **Chairman** asked whether the plenary could agree to approve draft new Resolution [COM4/5] (WRC-15) as presented in Document 465 without change, taking into account the views of ICAO and on the understanding that the text suggested by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran would be included in the minutes of the meeting.

3.24 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, speaking on behalf of the RCC countries and supported by the **delegate of Belarus**, reiterated his position that the text did not satisfy agenda item 1.5, nor did it meet several air-safety concerns. In particular, the footnotes extended the scope of the draft resolution to cover segregated airspace. As a compromise, he could agree to approve the text of the resolution if the footnotes to the title and *resolves* 1 were deleted; otherwise, if the plenary decided to approve the entire text as submitted, a separate statement would be delivered on behalf of a number of countries.

3.25 The **delegate of the United States** said that the issue of segregated and non-segregated airspace was essentially a matter for ICAO. If the two footnotes were to be deleted from the text, reference to non-segregated airspace should also be removed from the title of the draft resolution.

3.26 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** opposed that suggestion. The reference to non-segregated airspace must remain in the title of the draft resolution as it was taken directly from agenda item 1.5. The views of ICAO were valuable but not decisive in matters falling under the remit of ITU. He stressed that he could not agree to approve the text unless the two footnotes were deleted.

3.27 The **Chairman** suggested that the text should be transmitted to the Editorial Committee with the two footnotes in square brackets, in the hope that a solution could be found before it was discussed again by the plenary.

3.28 The **delegate of the United States** agreed to that suggestion, provided that the term “non-segregated” was also placed in square brackets wherever it appeared.

3.29 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** suggested that adding the phrase “consistent with international standards and practices” to the two footnotes after the words “may also be used”, rather than deleting any text or placing it in square brackets pending agreement, might address the concerns raised.

3.30 The **Chairman** asked whether the plenary could agree to submit the text to the Editorial Committee with square brackets around the two footnotes and the term “non-segregated” wherever it appeared.

3.31 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** reiterated that no square brackets should be placed around words in the title of the draft resolution, as it was taken directly from the wording of the conference’s relevant agenda item. Such an approach was illogical.

3.32 The **Director of BR** emphasized that submitting a text to the Editorial Committee with square brackets did not prejudge the outcome of any discussion; it merely served to indicate that there was disagreement concerning the text.

3.33 The **Chairman** took it that the plenary was prepared to submit the draft resolution to the Editorial Committee with square brackets around the footnotes and the term “non-segregated”, pending further discussion among interested parties.

3.34 It was so **agreed**.

SUP Resolution 153 (WRC-12)

3.35 **Approved**.

3.36 The **Chairman** observed that the meeting had concluded consideration of Document 465, which would be submitted, as amended, to the Editorial Committee.

# 4 Proposals for the frequency bands 3 600-3 700 MHz and 3 700-3 800 MHz for Regions 1 and 3 (agenda item 1.1) (Document 467(Rev.1))

4.1 Introducing Document 467(Rev.1), the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Committee 4 on the C‑band recalled that the text of footnote 5.A11 had been corrected to align it with the note adopted regarding Region 2. For the frequency band 3 700-3 800 MHz in Regions 1 and 3, it had been agreed not to make any changes to the Radio Regulations, as had been decided for Region 2. With regard to the band 3 600-3 700 MHz, in Region 1 it was proposed to make no change to the Regulations; nevertheless the CEPT wished to continue studying the question with other relevant regional organizations. In Region 3, the common position of the APT was to make no change, but some countries had suggested adding a footnote. The speaker noted that the solutions proposed were clearly linked to those regarding other bands under agenda item 1.1, but called in participants, in order to make progress, to submit Document 467(Rev.1) to the Editorial Committee.

4.2 The **delegate of China** suggested deferring examination of the document pending the outcome of discussions involving the countries of Regions 1 and 3 and the conclusions reached regarding other bands, and advocated adopting a unified solution.

4.3 The **Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Committee 4 on the C-band** acknowledged the validity of that argument but observed that the document could be reviewed with those regarding other bands when submitted for first reading.

4.4 The **delegate of China** said that he reserved the right to return to Document 467(Rev.1) once the conclusions concerning the other bands had been made known.

4.5 The **delegate of Nigeria** thanked the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group for his efforts but noted that the summary did not accurately reflect the compromise that had been reached by the group, which had agreed to make no change to the Radio Regulations for the 3 600-3 700 MHz band, but had not agreed to include in the compromise the wish of the CEPT to continue discussions with regional bodies. If the CEPT wished to pursue discussions and reach a compromise, it would have to rejoin the group. The speaker therefore proposed deletion of the first paragraph of the document under discussion.

4.6 The **delegate of Indonesia** recalled that the APT had proposed for Region 3 that no change be made for the band 3 600-3 800 MHz, and wanted some clarification regarding the addition of a new footnote for the 3 600-3 700 MHz band.

4.7 The **delegate of Finland** noted that, quite apart from the fact that the informal regional consultations had left Region 1 organizations with mixed feelings, Finland considered that the consultations on the 3‑4 GHz band in particular had not led to equal results for all the affected parties of Region 1 and wanted to see continued consultations with the regional organizations of Region 1 on the possibility of restricting allocation of the 3 600- 3 700 MHz band to the countries of the CEPT. That additional resource would enable the entire Region over the longer term to implement broadband services before the end of the 5G era. He invited the plenary to authorize continued consultations and not to approve the part of the document concerning the 3 600-3 700 MHz band.

4.8 The **delegate of Rwanda**, speaking on behalf of the countries of the East African Community, considered that the agreement reached within the group was not accurately reflected in Document 467(Rev.1). If the discussions between the CEPT countries were to continue, all pending bands under agenda item 1.1 would have to be re-examined.

4.9 The **delegate of India** emphasized that in India and in Region 3, the 3 600-3 700 MHz band was widely used, which was why his country and the APT countries were not in favour of using it for IMT. He therefore reserved his position pending the outcome of discussions on other bands.

4.10 The **delegate of Germany** noted, on behalf of the CEPT, that during the informal consultations, it had been clearly indicated that the CEPT wished to revisit the issue of the 3 600-3 700 MHz band and continue discussions. All the regional organizations were winners in the area of mobile services, except the CEPT and the ASMG. He advocated granting an extension with a view to further consultations, as every effort had to be made to find a solution acceptable to everyone.

4.11 The delegate of **Viet Nam** said that, in the absence of any consensus on the 3 600-3 800 MHz in Region 3, it had been agreed to make no change to the Radio Regulations, and consequently the new footnote 5.A11 should be deleted.

4.12 The **delegate of China**, speaking on behalf of the APT, recalled that the APT proposal regarding the 3 600-3 700 MHz was to make no change to the Radio Regulations. A number of APT countries had, however, proposed to add a footnote concerning the use of the band by IMT systems. Given the differences that had become evident during the coordination meeting, it had been agreed that countries wishing to use the 3 600-3 700 MHz band for IMT should coordinate with neighbouring countries in the APT in order to secure their agreement.

4.13 The **Chairman**, noting the lack of agreement on the document, proposed referring it back to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group for further study.

4.14 It was so **agreed**.

4.15 Several hours later, the **Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Committee 4 for the C‑band** reported on progress made in discussions on Document 467(Rev.1): for Region 1, in the absence of an agreement, the NOC option was maintained, and for Region 3, although there was a proposal for the new footnote 5.A11, the procedural question remained as to whether and when countries would be able to secure the agreement of the affected administrations.

4.16 The **Chairman** proposed that Document 467(Rev.1) be referred to the Editorial Committee, any objections to approval ascertained when the texts were sent back for first reading.

4.17 It was so **agreed**.

# 5 Eighteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B18) (Document 466)

5.1The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee** indicated that the document under discussion contained texts drawn from Document 460 relating to agenda item 1.12.

Article 5 (MOD Table 8 500-10 000 MHz (proposals B18/466/1 and B18/466/2), ADD 5.A112, ADD 5.C112, ADD 5.D112, ADD 5.B112, MOD Table 10-11.7 GHz); Article 21 (MOD Table 21-4); Appendix 4 (MOD Table A); SUP Resolution 651 (WRC-12)

5.2 **Approved**.

5.3 The eighteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B18) (Document 466) was **approved**.

# 6 Eighteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B18) – second reading (Document 466)

6.1 The eighteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B18) was **approved** on second reading.

# 7 Proposals relating to agenda item 1.6 (Documents 468 and 469)

7.1 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 469, which contained the latest proposals relating to agenda item 1.6, and noted that the document was the product of lengthy discussions and difficult compromises to take into account the concerns that had been expressed.

7.2 The **delegate of India**, referring to § 3.4 of Article 3 (Rev.WRC-03) of Appendix 30A, made the following statement:

“The Regions 1 and 3 feeder-link Plan is based on national coverage from the geostationary-satellite orbit. The associated procedures contained in this Appendix are intended to promote long-term flexibility of the Plan and to avoid monopolization of the planned bands and orbit by a country or a group of countries.

The intention of the Plan developed in 1983 is to facilitate equitable access to the geostationary orbit to all countries in this world. Be it developed, developing and the under developed.

Now, after 30/35 years, the current proposal for using 14.5-14.8 GHz band will disturb the basic foundation of the ‘Plan’ and dilute the sanctity of the purpose for which the plan bands have been developed.

So India is greatly concerned about diluting this principle of the plan developed thoughtfully decades ago to facilitate equitable access to all the countries – developed, developing and the under developed. The proposed allocation to FSS in the band 14.5-14.8GHz, will also put additional burden of coordination to those administrations that seek for an additional allocation and modification to the existing Plan. So India strongly objects to allocation of FSS in this band and maintains that NOC status shall be maintained.

India is also of the view that, while concerns exist about excessive filings in non-planned bands the proposed allocation of 14.5-14.8 for non-Planned FSS will open up the band for excessive filing. In the recent SRS database there are more than 200 API filings waiting for submission of CR/C in this band. Also this will unnecessarily burden the administrations with allotment in this band with additional coordination when they wish to file for the modification of the Plan which is not the case today.

In view of this India is not in agreement with the proposed allocation of 14.-14.8 GHz for FSS for use other than feeder link of BSS Plan.”

7.3 The **Chairman of Committee 5** acknowledged that the item in question had remained pending until now because of the concerns regarding the Plan used by many administrations, and because the frequencies in question were also allocated to feeder links of the satellite-broadcasting service. He nevertheless urged participants to consider the compromise set out in the document, as all the concerns expressed, in particular regarding antenna sizes, had been taken into consideration and incorporated in the proposed solutions.

7.4 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** noted that all possible precautions had been taken in the past under the terms of Appendices 30 and 30A to provide protection against interference. The present conference had not only improved protection in terms of power flux-density but had also adopted new provisions requesting administrations to give a formal undertaking that in the event of unacceptable interference they would eliminate it immediately. As all the protection measures had been adopted in response to the concerns expressed, he called on participants to approve the document.

7.5 The **delegates of Bahrain**, the **United Arab Emirates**, **Egypt**, **Iraq** and **Saudi Arabia** requested that the names of their countries be added to the *resolves* clause of the draft new Resolution [REGION 1&2-FSS] (WRC-15) – Deployment of earth stations in some Regions 1 and 2 countries in the frequency band 14.5-14.75 GHz in the fixed-satellite service (Earth-to-space) not for feeder links for the broadcasting-satellite service.

7.6 The **Director of BR** drew attention to a discrepancy in the provisions of MOD 5.510, as the 14.5-14.8 GHz band was limited exclusively to feeder links. The solution would be to modify the note as follows: “The use of the frequency band 14.5-14.75 GHz by the fixed-satellite service is subject to the provisions of Appendix 30A. The use of this band for feeder links for the broadcasting-satellite service is reserved for countries outside Europe.”

7.7 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that he was prepared to accept the text proposed by the Director but expected to see it in writing for examination on first reading.

7.8 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** considered that the proposal made by the Director of BR needed to be considered in greater detail in order to ascertain all the possible consequences.

7.9 The **Chairman** proposed re-examination of the text of footnote 5.510 when it was resubmitted to the plenary by the Editorial Committee for first reading.

7.10 The **delegate of Italy** noted that the text of the proposed Resolution for Regions 1 and 2 was based on limiting the density of geographical deployment of earth stations and that increasing the number of countries could undermine the very purpose of the Resolution. He said that he was in favour of keeping the text as it was.

7.11 The **delegate of the United States** cautioned participants against making new changes which could negate the difficult compromise reached by the group, a view shared by the **delegates of France** and **the Republic of Korea**.

7.12 It was **agreed** to refer Document 469 to the Editorial Committee and to review it on its submission for first reading at the next plenary meeting.

7.13 The **Chairman of Committee 5** introduced Document 468, which reported on the discussions regarding receivability of requests for coordination for the new FSS allocation in the band 13.4-13.65 GHz. Two opposing points of view had emerged in those discussions: one in favour of adopting a date at least six months following the conference, after which all coordination requests received by the Bureau for the frequency band in question would be accepted; and the other, in favour of maintaining the Bureau’s current practice of adopting a date preceding the entry into force of the Final Acts, as a decision had been taken by the Conference on the frequency band in question and that “qualified favourable” findings could be issued for coordination requests submitted for that band. As it had not been possible to bridge those viewpoints, and the compromise text had not been adopted, the speaker requested the Bureau to provide clarification on its practice in that area with a view to finding a solution to the question that was still pending.

7.14 The **representative of BR** explained that if the Bureau received a coordination request for an allocation which had been the subject of a conference decision but was not yet in force, it applied §3.3 of the Rule of Procedure regarding No. 9.11A. The Bureau then issued a “qualified favourable” finding (which became favourable at the date of coming into force of the allocation) if, at the date of receipt by the Bureau of the coordination request, the allocation concerned was not in force but would come into force before the planned date of bringing the assignment into use. Such a finding allowed coordination of assignments to the network concerned and to take that network into account when applying No. 9.27.

7.15 The **delegate off the Islamic Republic of Iran** observed that the practice referred to was not applicable to the allocation in question but to those under No. 9.11A. While extending the application of “qualified favourable” conclusions to cover the band in question could be envisaged, he noted that such an option would not reconcile the two viewpoints.

7.16 The **delegate of Norway** stressed that No. 9.11A concerned coordination between systems using the geostationary orbit and non-geostationary satellite systems and did not concern the case under discussion. He wanted to know whether the Rule of Procedure in question was also applicable to advance publication and to coordination under provisions of the Radio Regulations other than No. 9.11A.

7.17 The **representative of BR**, replying, said that the Rule of Procedure in question did not apply to advance publication, which was not subject to regulatory examination, which was why information relating to an allocation subject to the advance publication procedure was published on the date on which it was received.

7.18 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** shared the concerns of the delegate of Norway. According to the explanation that had been given, when the Bureau received advance publication information for a frequency band not allocated in the Table of Frequency Allocations, it applied §3.3 of the Rules of Procedure dealing with No. 9.11A. That provision, however, when referred to in the Table, required coordination and was therefore not applicable to new bands. In order to ensure equitable access to those bands for all administrations, further study of the question was required.

7.19 The **representative of BR** reiterated that the procedure under §3.3 of the Rule of Procedure dealing with No. 9.11A was not applicable to advance publication, for which neither regulatory examination nor a qualified favourable finding were required.

7.20 The **delegate off the Russian Federation** shared the point of view of the delegates of Norway and the United Kingdom regarding the possible application of §3.3 of the Rule of Procedure dealing with No. 9.11A. Given the lack of time for a more in-depth study of the question, he suggested that the RRB should examine the application of those provisions of the Rule of Procedure to all coordination requests for satellite networks and terrestrial services, and that pending the conclusion of that examination, BR should not process coordination requests for those bands.

7.21 The **delegate of France**, turning again to the previous proposal, was favourable to the RRB studying the situation but suggested that administrations willing and able to do so should submit their coordination requests to the Bureau in accordance with current regulations. Once the RRB studies were completed, BR would be instructed to publish those coordination requests, and the date of receipt of those requests would be determined in accordance with the RRB’s conclusions.

7.22 The **delegate of Israel** recalled that applying the Rule of Procedure regarding No. 9.11A had been established practice for 23 years, for all frequency allocations after every WRC. The proposal put forward by the Russian Federation, like the text proposed by the Chairman of Committee 5, only blocked filings and did nothing to ensure equitable access to spectrum for all administrations, unlike the legitimate established practice. She emphasized that the number of coordination requests (CR/C) was already limited by virtue of their nature as compared to advance publication information. She reminded participants that the discussion was not about the Plans but about unplanned bands to which the principle “first come, first served” had always applied, a principle which should not always benefit the same administrations. She had no objection to further examination of the question, but objected to conducting that examination during the final hours of the conference, given in particular that the subject had not been dealt with in the previous study period and no contribution had been submitted on the subject, which had been raised only in the previous two days. Lastly, she emphasized that the final document on agenda item 1.6.1 already approved by the plenary referred in footnote 5.A161 to 27 November 2015 as the date from which coordination requests could be submitted for newly allocated bands. For all the reasons referred to, she was opposed to the adoption of the proposed measures.

7.23 The **delegate of Turkey** was also opposed to the proposal made by the Russian Federation.

7.24 The **delegate of Egypt**, favouring the proposal of the Russian Federation, considered that the RRB alone was in a position to provide clarification. He considered that without an allocation, there could be no submission of a coordination request. Most administrations had not submitted advance publication information for the band in question before the Conference had taken a decision. If 27 November were the date adopted, all the administrations that had not submitted advance publication information would have to wait at least six months in order to do so. The speaker also noted that nothing prevented administrations from submitting coordination requests (CR/C), albeit subject to cost recovery, but the last to submit their requests could face difficulties in access to spectrum. He emphasized that the proposal of the Russian Federation was intended to clarify matters, without establishing priority or blocking, and he hoped for confirmation that application of the Rule of Procedure in question was current practice. He was resolutely opposed to allowing allocations in the band in question to be subject to coordination requests from 27 November 2015, and suggested that a transition period should be applied for those allocations in order to avoid any blockage for administrations that had not submitted advance publication information.

7.25 The **Director of** **BR**, noting the diverging views which appeared to him to be irreconcilable during the present Conference, suggested referring the study of the question to the RRB, a body in which all the Regions were represented and which had the necessary expertise and time.

7.26 The **delegate of Israel** wished to have confirmation that administrations were authorized to submit coordination requests immediately after the WRC and that the RRB would examine the question and submit its conclusions at a later date. She wondered what would become of the cost recovery fees paid on submission of the initial coordination request in the event of a different conclusion from the RRB.

7.27 The **Chairman of RRB** said that the Board needed to take time to study the question before replying.

7.28 The **Director of** **BR** explained that if RRB modified the date of receipt, the Bureau would have to review the situation but would not charge any additional fees. The process would have no impact on cost recovery.

7.29 Replying to a request for clarification from the **delegate of Sweden** concerning the proposal that would be submitted to RRB, the **Director of BR** said that he understood the French proposal as the retroactive application of RRB decisions. The date of receipt would thus be modified retroactively in the light of RRB’s conclusions. He proposed to draft a text based on the French proposal for submission at the next plenary meeting.

7.30 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** suggested, in order to avoid retroactive application of RRB decisions, that BR should no longer process filings for that band until RRB had formulated its conclusions.

7.31 Replying to an observation by the **Chairman of Committee 5** concerning the application to the uplink of the decision taken, the **delegate of France** recalled that the decision to be adopted would not be applicable to the uplink because there was already an existing allocation for the FSS.

7.32 It was **agreed**, in the light of all the comments that had been made, to refer to RRB for detailed study the question of the receivability of coordination requests for the new FSS allocation in the band 13.4-13.65 GHz before the date on which the allocation entered into force.

7.33 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, noting that Document 468 was the Committee’s most final report, thanked everyone – members of his delegation, representatives of telecommunication authorities, chairmen and vice-chairmen of working groups and subgroups, the ITU secretariat, the Director of BR, and the conference Chairman and Vice-Chairmen – who had assisted the Committee in completing its work.

7.34 The **Chairman**, on behalf of all the delegations, thanked the Chairman of Committee 5 for his dedication and his contribution to the successful work of the Committee.

# 8 Options proposed by the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on other Bands related to agenda item 1.1 (Documents 470, 471, 475, 477, 478, 479, 480 and 481)

8.1 The **Chairman of the** **Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on other Bands** related to agenda item 1.1, introducing Document 471,noted that for the frequency band 4 400-4 500 MHz, Regions 1 and 2 had agreed to make no change to the Radio Regulations. In the absence of proposals from Region 3, he invited the administrations of that Region to adopt the same solution.

8.2 The **delegate of Rwanda**, speaking on behalf of the countries of the East African Community, hoped that all decisions concerning the other bands still under examination under agenda item 1.1 would be taken into account before the proposed solution was approved. At the request of the **Chairman**, he indicated his willingness to continue study of the document and reserved the right to return to the band in question, if necessary, when the bands on which no decision had yet been taken were considered.

8.3 The **delegate of Nigeria** recalled that negotiations were under way for the band 3 600-3 700 MHz in Region 1. His delegation reserved the right to re-examine the decisions regarding the band considered in Document 471 if the negotiations failed.

8.4 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** indicated his support for the solution proposed by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group. Once the document was submitted to the plenary by the Editorial Committee, it would be possible to have a package deal.

8.5 The **delegate of China** requested that the plenary decide only for Regions 1 and 2.

8.6 The **delegates of the Republic of South Africa** and **Kenya** also reserved the right to re-examine the document at a later date.

8.7 With those comments taken into account, Document 471 was **approved**.

8.8 Introducing Document 470, the **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on other Bands** explained that the document contained solutions based on compromises for Regions 1 and 2 for agenda item 1.1 in the frequency band 3 300‑3 400 MHz. Those solutions involved the use of footnotes for additional allocations for the mobile service on a primary basis in certain countries and for the purpose of identification for IMT. In the footnotes for Region 1, countries whose names appeared in square brackets would need to be subjected to verification by administrations in neighbouring countries likely to be adversely affected. He hoped that the square brackets would be removed on a subsequent examination of the text.

8.9 The **delegate of Lebanon** requested that his country’s name be added to footnotes 5.R1a and 5.R1b.

8.10 The **delegate of France** suggested that, as Lebanon was not situated south of the 30° N parallel, it should not be included in footnote 5.R1b.

8.11 It was **agreed** to add Lebanon to footnote 5.Ra only.

8.12 The **delegate of the Republic of South Africa** indicated that he was prepared to approve the document under discussion on condition that the full list of countries would be added in the final version of the footnotes which the Editorial Committee would submit for first reading. He was supported by the **delegate of Kenya**.

8.13 The **delegate of Argentina** noted discrepancies with the final version of the report with regard to the footnote 5.B11. It had been agreed that allocation of the frequency band 3 300-3 400 MHz to the mobile, except aeronautical mobile, service, on a primary basis, was subject to an agreement obtained under No. 9.21. The **delegate of the United States** considered thatthe reference to the provision in question for Region 2 was not necessary. It was accordingly **agreed** to continue discussions on the matter among the countries of Region 2, pending submission of the texts for first reading.

8.14 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** proposed, with regard to footnote 5.R1b, deleting the term after the square brackets “the use of” so that the sentence would read as follows: "In the following countries ... the frequency band 3 300-3 400 MHz is identified for implementation of International Mobile Telecommunications (IMT). Such use shall be in accordance…”.

8.15 That proposal was **approved**.

8.16 It was **agreed** to approve the texts contained in Document 470 as modified, to submit them to the Editorial Committee and to review them where necessary on their submission for first reading.

8.17 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on other Bands** introduced Document 475, which contained compromise solutions agreed by certain administrations of Region 3 under agenda item 1.1 for the frequency band 3 300‑3 400 MHz. Those solutions would involve adding two new country footnotes in Article 5 (5.R3d and 5.R3e).

8.18 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said thatshe hadbeen informed before the meeting that the compromise which had made it possible to produce Document 475 no longer held and the document should therefore not be considered. The **delegate of Indonesia** added that the solutions proposed in the document in question did not ensure protection of existing services, in particular radiolocation; referred to Resolution 223 (Rev.WRC-15), the text of which was not yet established; and posed problems for Indonesia with the presence of Papua New Guinea among the countries included in the two proposed new footnotes.

8.19 The **delegate of India** said that the two proposed footnotes were of great importance to his administration. The **delegate of China** said that the country names whose inclusion was contested by one administration could perhaps be removed, although there was no cause to abandon the document as a whole. The **delegates of Pakistan** and **Viet Nam** shared that view.

8.20 As the **delegate of Indonesia** maintained his objections, the **Chairman** noted the absence of agreement on Document 475, and proposed not to continue the examination.

8.21 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on other Bands** introduced Document 477, which set out options based on compromises by some administrations in Region 3 under agenda item 1.1 for the 4 800‑4 900 MHz frequency band. Those options involved adding a country footnote in Article 5 (5.R3f).

8.22 The **delegate of the Republic of Korea** said that the document tabled for discussion should not be discussed as the frequency band concerned had been covered by the compromise agreement which no longer held.

8.23 Several hours later the **Chairman** proposed submitting Documents 475 and 477 to Committee 7 for examination as blue documents.

8.24 It was so **agreed**.

8.25 The **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Committee 4 on other Bands** introduced Document 478, which set out options based on regional compromises for the frequency band 1 427-1 518 MHz. He drew attention to the fact that, with regard to footnotes identifying bands for IMT, there were two options for footnote 5.R1b in the case of Region 1, while Region 3 had agreed on a single version of footnote 5.R3a based on the APT common proposal. It was also important to note that certain APT countries had put forward a proposal in Document 480 concerning the latter footnote which the plenary could if necessary taken into consideration. Document 478 also contained a draft modification to Resolution 750 (Rev.WRC-12) which posed no difficulties, and a draft new Resolution [COM4/7] (WRC-15) – Compatibility of IMT and BSS (sound) in the frequency band 1 452-1 492 MHz in Regions 1 and 3, submitted by Region 1, which was also the subject of a proposal in Document 480 (draft new Resolution [COM4/8] (WRC-15).

8.26 Replying to a request for clarification from the **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, the **Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group** explained that Document 480 was distinguished by the following elements: it contained options, proposed by certain APT members only, concerning the frequency band 1 427-1 518 MHz; it stipulated in the draft new footnote 5.R3g that “The use of this band for implementation of IMT in the frequency bands 1 429-1 452 MHz and 1 492 1 518 MHz is subject to agreement obtained under No. 9.21 from countries using stations of the aeronautical mobile service”; in the draft footnote 5.R3h, it provided possibilities for identification for IMT in the frequency band 1 429-1 452 MHz which were not available previously; and it mentioned the new Resolution [COM4/8] (WRC-15), the text of which as proposed in the same document was explicitly restricted to Region 3, and in which paragraph 2 of *invites Member States* expressly referred to protection of BSS earth stations.

8.27 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** considered that footnote 5.R3g in Document 480 gave better protection to existing services by requiring the application of RR No. 9.21. He was supported by the **delegate of the Russian Federation**, who stressed that the RCC had always been in favour of the universal solution applying No. 9. 21 in all bands, and by the **delegate of China**, in order that options 1 and 2 of Document 478 for Region 1 be replaced with a text aligned with footnote 5.R3g of Document 480.

8.28 The **delegate of France** said that he was against imposing footnote 5.R3g on Region 1, many of whose Member States did not want to be included in that footnote. Option 2 in Document 478 should therefore be kept for Region 1. He was supported by the **delegate of Germany**, who emphasized the significant differences in terms of regulation between Region 1 and Region 3, and by the **delegate of Finland**, who observed that on the basis of the different frequency bands concerned, it was footnote 5.R3a in Document 478 that could be replaced with footnote 5.R3g in Document 480.

8.29 The **delegate of China** requested that footnote 5.R3h and paragraph 2 of *invites Member States* in the draft new Resolution [COM4/8] (WRC-15) contained in Document 480 be adopted for the frequency band 1 452-1 492 MHz. He was supported by the **delegate of the Russian Federation,** who, however, rejected the choice of option 2 in Document 478 for Region 1, noting that in the view of the RCC it was option 1 that was needed for that Region, failing which it would be necessary to revert to NOC for the L-band.

8.30 The **delegate of Finland** strongly supported option 2, as it preserved the special status under RR No. 5.342 which some countries in Region 1 accorded to aeronautical telemetry while allowing those countries the possibility of joining the countries included in the IMT identification footnote or to maintain their rights under No. 5.342.

8.31 The **Chairman** proposed referring the texts contained in Document 478, and those in Documents 479, 480 and 481, to the Editorial Committee and to take a final decision on the matter when they were examined on first reading.

8.32 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting rose at 0610 hours on Thursday, 26 November 2015.**
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