|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-19) Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, 28 October – 22 November 2019** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **PLENARY MEETING** | **Corrigendum 1 to Document 15-E** |
| **17 October 2018** |
| **Original: English** |
| Note by the Secretary-General | |
| Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19  Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) | |
|  | |
|  | |

I have the honour to bring to the attention of the conference, at the request of the Director, Radiocommunication Bureau, the Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19, Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**.

Houlin ZHAO  
 Secretary-General

**Annex:** 1

Annex

Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19 on  
Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07)

Replace section 4.3.4 with the following section:

4.3.4 Situations of co-passenger delay

The Board notes that while the Board is able to apply specific and well-established criteria for determining whether a specific situation should be considered a case of *force majeure*, the same is not true for cases of launch delays due to co-passenger issues. The Board considers co-passengers cases based on the information provided and benefits from being provided substantiating evidence that supports the request. By its nature, requests on the basis of co-passenger delay are typically for only a few months. In light of the Board’s ability to thoroughly examine the facts of a case and that such requests are for a relatively modest extension, the Board is of the view that the guidance provided by previous WRCs is generally adequate and appropriate in light of the Board’s experience to date.

However, while the Board has been able to easily conclude that the requests qualified to be considered as a case of co-passenger delay, and as such, should be granted an extension, determining an appropriate time-limited extension has been difficult in the absence of a detailed rationale for the length of the period requested. Similarly, the Board noted some difficulties when insufficient information is provided on the satellite that would demonstrate its readiness to be launched within the regulatory deadline and on the status of coordination that would demonstrate progress towards completing coordination. This additional information contributes to establish the credibility of the satellite project and as such, the appropriateness of granting the extension itself. Noting that there are no information requirements that are specified for the submission of these requests, the Board is of the view that guidance should be provided to administrations in order to avoid a request for further clarifications and delaying the treatment of the case.

|  |
| --- |
| **WRC-19 may wish to confirm that, as a minimum, the following information should be provided to facilitate the consideration by the Board of a request for extension due to co-passenger delay:**  **– a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency bands;**  **– the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date;**  **– the state of readiness of the satellite to be launched;**  **– the name of the launch service provider and the contract signature date;**  **– the initial and revised launch window;**  **– sufficient detail to justify that the request for extension is due to co-passenger delay (e.g. a letter from the launch service provider indicating that the launch is delayed because of a delay affecting the co-passenger satellite);**  **– status of coordination;**  **– the Board is inviting administrations to provide sufficient detail to justify the length of the requested extension period; and**  **– any other supporting information and documentation**. |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_