

**Revision 1 to  
Document RRB19-1/13-E  
16 May 2019  
Original: English**

MINUTES\*  
OF THE  
80<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD

18 – 22 March 2019

Present:

Members, RRB

Ms L. JEANTY, Chairman

Ms C. BEAUMIER, Vice-Chairman

Mr T. ALAMRI, Mr E. AZZOUZ, Mr L. F. BORJÓN, Ms S. HASANOVA,  
Mr A. HASHIMOTO, Mr Y. HENRI, Mr D. Q. HOAN, Mr S. M. MCHUNU,  
Mr H. TALIB, Mr N. VARLAMOV

Executive Secretary, RRB

Mr M. MANIEWICZ, Director, BR

Précis-Writers

Mr T. ELDRIDGE and Ms S. MUTTI

Also present:

Mr A. GUILLOT, ITU Legal Adviser  
Mr A. VALLET, Chief, SSD  
Mr C.C. LOO, Head, SSD/SPR  
Mr J. CICCROSSI, acting Head, SSD/SSC  
Mr J. WANG, Head, SSD/SNP  
Mr N. VASSILIEV, Chief, TSD  
Mr K. BOGENS, Head, TSD/FMD  
Ms I. GHAZI, Head, TSD/BCD  
Mr E. SESTACOV, TSD/BCD  
Mr B. BA, Head, TSD/TPR  
Mr W. IJEH, BR Administrator  
Mr D. BOTHA, SGD  
Ms K. GOZAL, Administrative Secretary

\*The minutes of the meeting reflect the detailed and comprehensive consideration by the members of the Radio Regulations Board of the items that were under consideration on the agenda of the 80<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board. The official decisions of the 80<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Radio Regulations Board can be found in Document RRB19-1/12.

<b>Subjects discussed</b>	<b>Documents</b>
1 Opening of the meeting	-
2 Minute of silence	-
3 Election of chairmen and vice-chairmen of the Board and of the working groups of the Board	-
4 Adoption of the agenda and late submissions	-
5 Working procedures	-
6 Report by the Director of BR	<a href="#">RRB19-1/4</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/4(Add.1)</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/4(Add.2)</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/4(Add.3)</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/4(Add.4)</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/DELAYED/3</a>
7 Rules of procedure	<a href="#">RRB19-1/1</a> ; <a href="#">RRB16-2/3(Rev.10)</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/4(Add.5)</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/5</a> ; Circular Letter <a href="#">CCRR/61</a>
8 Status of the DBL-G5-28.5E satellite network	<a href="#">RRB19-1/3</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/7</a>
9 Requests for the cancellation of frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of France requesting the suppression of the frequency assignments to the Greek satellite network HELLAS-SAT-2G at 39°E in the frequency bands 17.7-19.7 GHz, 20.2-21.2 GHz, 27.5-29.5 GHz and 30-31 GHz	<a href="#">RRB19-1/10</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/DELAYED/5</a>
10 Requests for the cancellation of frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of the United Kingdom requesting the suppression of the frequency assignments to the ARABSAT-KA-30.5E, ARABSAT 5A-30.5E and ARABSAT 7A- 30.5E satellite networks in the ranges 17 700-22 000 MHz and 27 500-30 000 MHz	<a href="#">RRB19-1/11</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/DELAYED/2</a> ; <a href="#">RRB19-1/DELAYED/6</a>
11 Requests relating to extensions of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use satellite network frequency assignments: Submission by the Administration of Cyprus requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the KYPROS-SAT-5 (39°E) and KYPROS-SAT-3 (39°E) satellite networks	<a href="#">RRB19-1/6</a>
12 Requests relating to extensions of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use satellite network frequency assignments: Submission by the Administration of Greece requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the HELLAS-SAT-2G (39°E) and HELLAS-SAT-3G (39°E) satellite networks	<a href="#">RRB19-1/8</a>

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 13 | Submission by the Administration of the United Kingdom requesting consideration of interference issues affecting the reception of United Kingdom coordinated and agreed HF broadcasting stations | <a href="#">RRB19-1/9</a> ;<br><a href="#">RRB19-1/DELAYED/1</a> ;<br><a href="#">RRB19-1/DELAYED/4</a> |
| 14 | Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07)  | <a href="#">RRB19-1/2</a>   |
| 15 | Confirmation of the dates of the next meeting in 2019 and indicative dates for subsequent meetings   | -   |
| 16 | Approval of the summary of decisions   | <a href="#">RRB19-1/12</a>  |
| 17 | Closure of the meeting   | -   |

## **1 Opening of the meeting**

1.1 **Ms Jeanty**, who had been appointed interim chairman by the Board at its 79<sup>th</sup> meeting, opened the meeting at 1400 hours on Monday, 18 March 2019 and welcomed participants. She congratulated all Board members on their election or re-election to the Board, and Mr Maniewicz on his election as Director of BR. She looked forward to working with everyone in a spirit of friendship and cooperation.

1.2 The **Director**, speaking also on behalf of the Secretary-General, echoed the Chairman's remarks, congratulated all Board members and welcomed them to their first meeting of the inter-plenipotentiary period. He assured them of the Bureau's full support in all their work.

## **2 Minute of silence**

2.1 The Board observed a minute of silence in tribute to two ITU staff members, Ms Maygenet Abebe and Mr Marcelino Tayob, who had recently lost their lives in a tragic air crash, and to Mr J. Tandoh, former Board member, who had recently passed away.

## **3 Election of chairmen and vice-chairmen of the Board and of the working groups of the Board**

3.1 **Ms Jeanty** said that, further to informal consultations that morning, it was proposed that she serve as chairman and Ms Beaumier as vice-chairman of the Board in 2019.

3.2 It was so **agreed**.

3.3 **Ms Jeanty** and **Ms Beaumier** thanked their fellow Board members for the trust thus placed in them.

3.4 The **Chairman** said that, also further to informal consultations, it was proposed that Mr Henri and Mr Alamri serve as chairman and vice-chairman, respectively, of the Board's Working Group on the Rules of Procedure; and that Ms Beaumier and Mr Talib serve as chairman and vice-chairman, respectively, of the Board's Working Group on Resolution 80.

3.5 It was so **agreed**.

## **4 Adoption of the agenda and late submissions**

4.1 **Mr Botha (SGD)** drew attention to six late submissions, all of which related to items already on the Board's draft agenda. He noted that in one of those late submissions, Document RRB-19/1/DELAYED/5, the Administration of Greece pointed out that the submission by the Administration of France in Document RRB19-1/10 should not appear on the agenda of the present meeting as it contained dates that suggested that it had been prepared and submitted to the Bureau after the deadline for submissions to the present meeting of 1600 hours on 25 February 2019. In that regard, he said that the submission by France in Document RRB19-1/10 had been received by the deadline: the confusion arose because certain dates in the French submission were altered by an automatic update system activated each time the document was opened, which meant that certain dates could not be taken at face value.

4.2 It was **agreed** that the six late submissions would be taken up under the agenda items to which they related.

4.3 **Mr Botha (SGD)** also drew attention to Addendum 5 to Document RRB19-1/4, which concerned a draft rule of procedure and had been prepared once the Board's draft agenda had been published. It was proposed that it be taken up under the relevant agenda item.

4.4 It was so **agreed**.

4.5 The Board **adopted** its agenda as contained in Document RRB19-1/OJ/1(Rev.1).

## **5 Working procedures**

5.1 Following the adoption of the agenda, **Mr Henri** said that he would have preferred to take up the submission by the United Kingdom in Document RRB19-1/11 concerning certain Arabsat networks (agenda item 7.2) before taking up the submission by France in Document RRB19-1/10 (agenda item 7.1): the former might involve discussion of an approach that had a bearing on the latter, but based on No. 98 of the ITU Constitution he would have to refrain from intervening in discussion on the latter since the administration of his country had made the submission.

5.2 The **Chairman** said that, in principle, the Board member from France could not participate in the discussion on agenda item 7.1, and the Board member from Saudi Arabia, which was the notifying administration for Arabsat, could not participate in the discussion on agenda item 7.2.

5.3 **Mr Henri** questioned the non-participation of the Board member from Saudi Arabia in the discussions on agenda item 7.2, as Saudi Arabia was the notifying administration of Arabsat intergovernmental organisation, and as such serving as a letter box for the organisation and acting on behalf of a group of named administrations whilst keeping its regulatory rights in respect of its own terrestrial or space stations vis-à-vis Arabsat.

5.4 The **Director** said that, prior to the present meeting, the Bureau had looked into the question of Board member participation in discussions involving intergovernmental organizations of which their country was a member, with a particular view to ascertaining whether or not the Board members from Saudi Arabia (notifying administration for Arabsat), Egypt and Morocco (members of Arabsat) could participate in the discussion on agenda item 7.2. It had approached the ITU Legal Adviser, who had observed that the ITU Constitution did not cover the matter specifically and that past practice on the matter should prevail. The Legal Adviser had subsequently confirmed the Bureau's findings based on past practice over the past 10 years, according to which the Board member from a country that was the notifying administration for an intergovernmental organization could not participate in the Board's discussions involving that organization, whereas Board members from other countries that were members of the organization could; thus, the Board member from Saudi Arabia could not participate in the discussion on agenda item 7.2, whereas the Board members from Egypt and Morocco could.

5.5 **Mr Varlamov** endorsed that understanding.

5.6 **Mr Alamri** wondered whether the understanding outlined by the Director was enshrined in any written text in any of the ITU publications.

5.7 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that No. 98 of the Constitution set out the basic principle that a Board member should not intervene in decisions directly concerning his/her own administration. It did not, however, deal specifically with the case of intergovernmental organizations, which was why the Bureau had looked into the matter. No specific written text existed on the matter.

5.8 **Mr Henri** said he was not fully convinced that the past practice was either correct or a sufficient basis for the Board's approach to the matter. He would like the ITU Legal Adviser to present his opinion to the Board with a view to its adoption, if appropriate, as a Board decision included in the minutes of the meeting.

5.9 Attending the meeting at the request of the Board, the **ITU Legal Adviser** confirmed the Director's résumé of the consultations that had taken place between the Bureau and himself prior

to the present meeting. No. 98 of the Constitution did not cover *stricto sensu* the case of international organizations operating satellite systems; if interpreted literally, it could be construed as not being applicable to such organizations. Such an interpretation, however, evidently would not correspond to the intention of the legislator, which was clearly that the provision should guarantee the independence and neutrality of Board members and avoid one or more of them from being placed in a situation of conflict of interests when the Board was required to take a decision that directly concerned the administration(s) of the Board member(s) concerned. The provision was also intended to ensure that decisions taken by the Board were credible and objective. The basic question, therefore, was whether a decision concerning an international organization operating satellite systems could be considered to bring into play the specific interests of each of the Member States composing the international organization. As already mentioned, the wording of No. 98 of the Constitution did not provide a definitive answer to that question. Under international law, and based on the principles applied when interpreting international treaties, the practice of the body concerned subsequent to adoption of the provision was recognized as a key element when it came to its interpretation. It was for that reason that the Board's past practice had been investigated, allowing him to confirm, as indicated by the Director, that over a significant period of time – the most recent ten years of the work of the Board – the practice was clear and – of fundamental importance – unchallenged: only the notifying administration abstained from participation in the decision-making process in cases involving an international organization operating satellites of which that administration was a member. It was both plausible and possible to interpret No. 98 of the Constitution in the light of that practice.

5.10 **Mr Henri** thanked the ITU Legal Adviser for the opinion he had expressed, and requested that it be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. He noted that the interpretation could be construed as attributing more power to the notifying administration of an intergovernmental organisation than it had vis-à-vis the other administrations, members of the international organization concerned, which could give rise to misperception in respect of the notifying administration role as defined in the Radio Regulations. He requested the ITU Legal Adviser to clarify what should be understood from the phrase “each member of the Board shall refrain from intervening in decisions directly concerning the member's own administration” in No. 98 of the Constitution.

5.11 The **Chairman** considered that the phrase quoted by Mr Henri should be understood to mean that the member concerned should refrain from participating in any discussion of the matter in question, and not just the decision-making part thereof.

5.12 The **Director** said that past practice bore out the Chairman's interpretation. He added that if the notifying administration and all other members of a given international organization were deemed to have the same status for the purposes of discussions at Board meetings, a situation could arise in which not enough Board members could participate in a discussion and form the quorum required to take a decision. That practical aspect must also be borne in mind.

5.13 The **ITU Legal Adviser** said that a very literal reading of No. 98 of the Constitution could indeed lead to the kind of situation described by the Director, whereas clearly any interpretation of the provision must be constructive, and could not be such as to bring the Board's work to a standstill. He confirmed the Chairman's understanding of No. 98, which was borne out by unchallenged past practice. Such practice was, moreover, based on the fact that the Board's decisions were made by consensus, which itself was achieved in the course of the discussions held, providing further grounds for Board members to refrain from participating in any discussion of cases of direct concern to their administration. That approach was confirmed by No. 98 in so far as it existed to protect Board

members from any conflict of interests or perception thereof: such a perception could easily arise if Board members were seen to participate in the discussion of cases of direct concern to their administration.

5.14 Responding to comments by **Mr Henri**, he confirmed that on one occasion in the past he had been asked to confirm – and had done so – the legal validity of one Board member participating in the discussion on a question of direct concern to his administration in order to provide clarifications on the issue. That had occurred only with the explicit agreement of all the other Board members at the time, including its Chairman.

5.15 **Ms Beaumier** thanked the ITU Legal Adviser for his explanations, which answered any questions she might have had on the matter. They confirmed her understanding that the intent of No. 98 is to protect Board members from conflict of interest situations, and that there is not only the need to avoid such situations but also situations where there could be the perception of a conflict of interest, irrespective of whether this perception is justified or not.

5.16 The **Chairman** thanked the ITU Legal Adviser for his valuable clarifications.

## **6 Report by the Director of BR (Documents RB19-1/4, Addenda 1-4 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/3)**

6.1 The **Director** introduced his customary report in Document RRB19-1/4. Referring to §2, he reported that progress continued to be made in terms of reducing delays in processing times for filings and that most filings were currently processed within the regulatory deadlines. He drew attention to the 28 cases of earth stations located in disputed territories or having a coordination contour overlapping a disputed territory and to the 178 terrestrial assignments notified in a disputed territory. Those filings were not currently being processed by the Bureau, which sought the Board's guidance on how to deal with them. With regard to §6, he informed the Board that the Council Expert Group on Decision 482, which had met after Document RRB19-1/4 had been issued, had decided that it would convene for the last time the day before Council-19. It had further agreed to issue a provisional report in the interval and to incorporate any amendments made at its last meeting just before Council-19.

### **Actions arising from the last RRB meeting (§1 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.2 The Board **noted** §1, which should refer to “decisions of the 79<sup>th</sup> meeting”, not “decisions of the 80<sup>th</sup> meeting”.

### **Processing of filings for terrestrial and space systems (§2 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.3 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, referring to filings for space systems, drew attention to Annex 3 to Document RRB19-1/4, for which an update to include February 2019 was available, and confirmed that most processing deadlines were currently being met. For example, although the processing time for coordination request publication (CR/C) had risen slightly above the regulatory four-month deadline at the end of January 2019 (notably because of the end-of-year closure of ITU, which automatically introduced a delay), it had fallen back to below the deadline in February 2019. The processing time for submissions under §4.1.3/4.2.6 of Article 4 of Appendices 30/30A had fallen to record low levels. For submissions under Articles 6 and 7 of Appendix 30B, it was currently eight months and falling; the Bureau hoped to achieve its target of six months in April 2019. The average processing time for space network submissions under Article 11 and for Part I-S publications for earth stations had stabilized and also remained within the regulatory deadlines. Referring to the cases of earth stations and terrestrial assignments involving a disputed territory mentioned by the Director, he said that the Bureau was not able to resolve those cases as the administrations

concerned were unable to agree on how to proceed; the cases were therefore currently suspended. The Bureau did not propose that they be resolved at the current meeting of the Board; rather, it wanted to know whether the Board wished to receive a more in-depth analysis of the issue, with a view to assessing the relevance of the rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97) and to examining various options at its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting.

6.4 The **Chairman, Mr Azzouz, Mr Hoan, Mr Varlamov, Ms Beaumier, Mr Talib** and **Mr Alamri** congratulated the Bureau on the progress it had made towards reducing delays in processing times for satellite network filings.

6.5 **Mr Hoan** and **Mr Talib** further encouraged the Bureau to pursue its efforts to keep processing times within the regulatory deadlines. So did **Mr Azzouz**, who added that the Bureau should continue to provide training to administrations in e-submissions.

6.6 **Mr Varlamov** and **Mr Alamri** said that they hoped that processing times for submissions under Articles 6 and 7 of Appendix 30B would also have fallen to within the regulatory deadline by the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board.

6.7 **Mr Talib**, referring to Tables 3 and 4 in Annex 3 to Document RRB19-1/4, said that they indicated some abnormally long processing times and asked the Bureau to minimize those exceptions so as to limit the delays for the administrations concerned.

6.8 **Mr Hashimoto** asked whether processing times had improved as a result of the introduction of the e-submission system for satellite filings.

6.9 The **Director** replied that the unusually long processing times indicated in Tables 3 and 4 of Annex 3 to Document RRB19-1/4 had occurred before 2019. The improvements in processing times were only partially the result of the introduction of the e-submission system, which had certainly enhanced the Bureau's efficiency; in addition, the Member States had provided the Bureau with additional resources, which had been used to hire additional staff in the Space Services Department and the Space Applications Software Division.

6.10 **Mr Varlamov** asked whether the Board was authorized to consider cases such as those relating to earth stations and terrestrial assignments involving a disputed territory. Given the sensitive nature of the information to be provided by the Bureau, he suggested that it should be published on the Board SharePoint, so as to limit access to Board members.

6.11 **Ms Beaumier** said that it would be helpful to receive more information on the nature of those cases. It would be interesting to know, for example, whether it had not been possible to obtain agreement on a coordination request or whether one administration had not accepted that a request be submitted by another administration.

6.12 **Ms Hasanova** agreed that it would be useful to receive more information on those cases.

6.13 **Mr Henri**, referring to the phrase "the Board may wish to request the Bureau to provide a more detailed analysis of the above-mentioned cases", said that, in terms of form, it was for the Board to decide on what action it may wish to take; it would have been preferable to say simply "the Bureau can provide further information". In terms of substance, it was important that third countries potentially affected by those cases be able to obtain some information on the stations concerned in the event of potential interference. The issue was political and extremely sensitive. He would therefore appreciate receiving additional information, in particular with regard to the countries and stations concerned, actions already undertaken by the Bureau and the possible means of resolving the cases.



6.14 **Mr Alamri** asked what the existing Bureau procedure was for dealing with notices in disputed territories and what kind of information the Bureau could provide.

6.15 The **Director**, responding to comments, said that the phrase “the Board may wish to request the Bureau to provide a more detailed analysis” had been used because the Board might not wish to request such information, either because it preferred not to take up the issue or out of concern that the politically sensitive information involved would become public. Disputed territories recognized as such figured on the Bureau’s digital maps as disputed territories; the Bureau referred assignments relating to those territories to the administrations concerned and asked them whether they agreed to the filing, which it processed if they did. Other territories were disputed in practice but not formally (for example, some occupied territories). In the case at hand, the territory did not figure on the Bureau’s digital map as disputed, but it was indicated as disputed on United Nations maps (which are not currently used by the Bureau); that discrepancy had prompted the Bureau’s request for guidance from the Board.

6.16 **Mr Borjón** asked what action the Board could take, as making information public could add fuel to the fire on the discussions on this sensitive issue.

6.17 The **Director** said that he believed that the Board could provide guidance. In the Bureau’s view, such politically sensitive issues were examined by the United Nations, which produced a map that includes disputed territories; there was therefore no need to reproduce the discussions at ITU – the Bureau could simply operate on the basis of the United Nations map. Given the discrepancy between the maps, however, it needed guidance.

6.18 **Mr Alamri** suggested that the information provided should take the form of statistics and not depict the area concerned.

6.19 The **Director** said that the information to be provided by the Bureau could remain conceptual in nature or be more detailed in terms of the actual territories concerned. The Bureau would provide whatever information the Board wished to receive.

6.20 **Mr Henri** suggested that it would be useful to have at least the list of the stations concerned, but may be not in a public document. It would also be interesting to know what action the Bureau had taken in recent years to solve the problem. The Board might consequently decide that there was nothing more to be done or it might advise a specific course of action.

6.21 **Ms Beaumier** agreed with Mr Henri regarding the kind of information that might be useful for the Board’s deliberations and that it should be made available on a restricted basis. Any information made public should be purely conceptual in nature.

6.22 **Mr Varlamov** said that the Board needed general information, not a list of stations. He suggested that the Board apply the approach used for ITU-R Recommendations, which described “cases” and “action” without using geographical designations or identifying the stations involved.

6.23 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)**, addressing the processing of filings for terrestrial systems, drew attention to Annex 2 to Document RRB19-1/4 and said that Table 1 showed that only 34 coordination requests had been received under No. 9.21 between January 2018 and January 2019, in spite of the large number of footnotes referring to No. 9.21. Tables 2 and 3 contained statistics on modifications to terrestrial plans, with GE-84 and GE-06 being the most active. Table 4 summarized the number of notifications in the Master Register under Article 11.

6.24 The **Chairman** suggested that the Board conclude on §2 of the Director's report (excluding §2.1) as follows:

"In relation to §2 of Document RRB19-1/4, the Board:

- Noted with appreciation the continued efforts from the Bureau to reduce the treatment time of satellite network filings and that, with the exception [of] the treatment of filings under Appendix 30B, the regulatory time limits for the treatment of satellite network filings have been observed in all cases;
- Also noted that a number of stations, located in some disputed territories or having a coordination contour overlapping disputed territories, were kept in abeyance and this delay had an impact on the statistics for the treatment time of submissions of stations under Article 11. The Board considered that more information would be required in order to decide whether the Board would be able to provide guidance on this matter.

The Board decided to instruct the Bureau to:

- Continue efforts to observe the regulatory deadlines for the processing of filings for satellite networks, and to apply further efforts to reduce the treatment time of filings under Appendix 30B;
- Provide additional information at the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board on submissions under Article 11 of stations located in disputed territories or having a coordination contour overlapping disputed territories. The information should be of a conceptual nature, cases should be reported in a general manner and any actions that the Bureau had taken should also be included."

6.25 It was so **agreed**.

#### **Implementation of Resolution 908 (Rev. WRC-15) (§2.1 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.26 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, commenting briefly on §2.1 of Document RRB19-1/4, said that 89 administrations had now registered for the e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings application; that represented a very high percentage of administrations directly concerned by the submission of filings. He confirmed to **Mr Henri** that only one administration had experienced real difficulties in implementing the application.

6.27 **Mr Hoan, Mr Henri and Mr Azzouz** complimented the Bureau on its successful implementation of Resolution 908 and the e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings application.

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

"In relation to §2.1 of Document RRB19-1/4, the Board noted with satisfaction that the application 'e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings' had been successfully implemented in response to Resolution 908 (Rev.WRC-15) and that only one administration had reported difficulties. The Board instructed the Bureau to continue to assist administrations in the use of the application 'e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings'".

#### **Implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings (late payments) (§3 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.29 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** drew attention to Annex 4 to Document RRB19-1/4, §1 of which presented the list of filings for which payment had been received after the due date but prior to the BR IFIC meeting that would have cancelled them; and §2 of which reflected the fact that no filings had been cancelled as a result of non-payment of invoices.

6.30 The Board **noted** the information provided in §3 of Document RRB19-1/4.

## **Reports of harmful interference/infringements of the Radio Regulations (Article 15 of the Radio Regulations) (§4.1 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.31 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)**, drawing attention to §4.1 of Document RRB19-1/4 and the tables contained therein, noted that 365 cases of harmful interference/infringements of the Radio Regulations had been reported to the Bureau in the period 1 January 2018 to 31 January 2019. The cases related to safety services were normally handled by the Bureau within 48 hours. Responding to a question by **Mr Borjón**, he said that it was generally not possible for the Bureau to report to the Board those cases that were subsequently resolved, as nothing in the Radio Regulations or Rules of Procedure obliged administrations to report successful outcomes to the Bureau, and the Bureau had no means to check for itself.

6.32 The Board **agreed** to conclude on §4.1 of Document RRB19-1/4 as follows:

“The Board noted the information provided in §4.1 of Document RRB19-1/4. With regard to the statistics on reports of harmful interference, the Board expressed an interest in receiving information on the number of cases solved, where possible. The Board also noted that it was difficult for the Bureau to present such figures, since administrations rarely reported back on resolved cases of interference.”

## **Harmful interference to broadcasting stations in the VHF/UHF bands between Italy and its neighbouring countries (§4.2 of Document RRB90-1/4, Addenda 1-4 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/3)**

6.33 **Mr Vassiliev (Chef TSD)** drew attention to §4.2 of Document RRB19-1/4, which reported on the situation regarding interference caused by Italian stations to neighbouring countries since the Board’s 79<sup>th</sup> meeting, and to Addenda 1, 2 and 3 to the same document, in which the Administrations of Slovenia, Croatia and Switzerland, respectively, provided updates on the effects of Italian stations on their services. Addendum 4 to Document RRB19-1/4 contained an updated road map provided by Italy outlining the measures it was taking to eliminate the harmful interference to VHF sound broadcasting stations of its neighbouring countries. Basically, the situation had not changed since the Board’s 79<sup>th</sup> meeting. Although two cases involving Switzerland had been resolved, the corresponding programmes were still being disrupted by other emissions. The fact that those cases had been resolved constituted the only change made to the list of priority FM sound broadcasting stations published on the ITU website following the Board’s 79<sup>th</sup> meeting.

6.34 **Mr Azzouz** stressed that, when seeking to resolve problems of the kind under consideration, it was not always necessarily a question of coordination and the number of assignments involved: the key could often lie in bringing the necessary technical expertise to bear and tackling the issue at the technical level, at the stations directly involved.

6.35 **Mr Borjón** drew attention to §4.9.1 of the Board’s draft report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07) (Document RRB19-1/2), which spoke of the problem of the status of assignments involved in harmful interference situations in general but fairly strong terms, seeming to suggest that the problem was of a global nature rather than specific to a limited number of countries. He wondered whether §4.9.1 was intended to pertain to the Italian interference problem specifically, and whether technical expertise could help resolve matters.

6.36 The **Chairman** confirmed that §4.9.1 did relate to a large extent to the problem of the interference caused by Italy, and the strong terms employed reflected the seriousness of the situation that some of Italy’s neighbouring countries found themselves in despite all the efforts made to resolve matters over the past decade or so. The problems encountered were far more

political and regulatory than technical; in fact, had they been simply technical, it might have been possible to resolve them long ago.

6.37 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** endorsed the Chairman's comments. Although some technical aspects such as the propagation conditions in the area concerned aggravated the situation, political, regulatory and financial issues were the main problem – for example, the fact that Italian legislation allowed operators to use frequencies which the GE-06 Agreement had allocated to other countries. Efforts made by the Bureau over the years had included numerous bilateral/multilateral meetings, the Secretary-General himself had intervened with the Prime Minister of Italy in 2011, CEPT had sought to resolve matters by holding meetings, and the Italian Government had launched a process to buy frequencies back from Italian operators in a bid to get them to use other frequencies. Results had been achieved over the years mainly in regard to TV broadcasting, and at the political and regulatory rather than the technical level. The main outstanding issues related to FM broadcasting and no effort was being spared by the Bureau to resolve them. One major obstacle lay in the fact that Italy adhered to and applied the GE-06 Agreement, whereas it appeared not to consider itself as being bound by the GE-84 Agreement. A further matter of concern was the growing trend on the part of Italy to use the GE06 T-DAB channels of other countries that those countries were not yet using.

6.38 **Mr Alamri** agreed that matters should be addressed not only at the technical level, but at the regulatory level as well. The recorded technical characters of the assignments concerned should serve as the basis for their coordination, in accordance with the relevant Plans and related provision in their final acts.

6.39 **Mr Hoan** said that the Bureau and the Board should continue to pursue all possible ways to resolve the longstanding problem of the interference caused by Italian stations, and in that regard he recalled the step taken to publish the list of priority FM sound broadcasting stations. He nevertheless wondered why so few data had been updated.

6.40 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that the Bureau could only make updates based on the progress reported to it by administrations, and although Italy had commented on how some cases might be resolved, nothing had actually changed. Only two cases had been resolved, as reported by Switzerland.

6.41 **Mr Azzouz** said that the Bureau should be encouraged to continue the efforts it was making at all levels, in particular by holding bilateral meetings, at which all necessary technical advice should be provided in order to facilitate coordination and agreement. No doubt all parties involved would have to review the technical characteristics of their assignments in order to solve the problems.

6.42 **Mr Talib** said that the Bureau was to be thanked for all the efforts it was making to resolve the longstanding problem now under discussion, and the possibilities of making progress through coordination processes between administrations should be pursued. Regarding the general question of feedback from administrations on interference problems successfully resolved, thought might be given to establishing a period beyond which it would be assumed that a given problem had been resolved if the Bureau received no further information to the contrary from the administration(s) concerned.

6.43 **Mr Varlamov** said that ITU, and the Bureau in particular, had made outstanding efforts over the years to resolve the problem under discussion, even to the extent of persuading Italy to change its national legislation. Regarding the establishment of periods within which administrations should provide feedback regarding whether or not specific cases had been resolved, the Board did not set

deadlines for reporting successful outcomes, and could not impose deadlines where they did not exist. It must adhere to the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations, and in particular those of Article 15 in regard to the matter at hand.

6.44 The **Chairman** said that the Bureau was monitoring all matters regarding the matter at hand very closely, and she therefore questioned whether it would be necessary to introduce a mechanism for reporting successes.

6.45 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that resolved cases regarding the list of priority FM sound broadcasting stations were already highlighted, and the same could be done for resolved TV broadcasting cases.

6.46 The **Director** said that the matter at hand was a very particular case involving regulatory rather than technical issues and that the concerned administration had acknowledged and was indeed embarrassed by an issue caused by the fact that its own legislation allowed broadcasters to operate on frequencies allocated to other countries. The Bureau was kept fully up to date regarding successes achieved. Thought might nevertheless be given to devising a way to ensure that it was kept up to date regarding other cases of harmful interference successfully resolved.

6.47 **Mr Borjón** said that the enormous efforts made by the Bureau had certainly produced results, and it would be useful to highlight those results and how they were achieved and report them to administrations, perhaps in the Director's report to WRC-19, at least when possible.

6.48 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** said that the Bureau could and would report successfully resolved, straightforward cases regarding the Italian issue when possible. He recalled, however, with regard to FM broadcasting, that only two cases had been resolved successfully, in regard to Switzerland, and that the stations involved continued to receive interference from other Italian stations.

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

"In considering §4.2 of Document RRB19-1/4 and its Addenda 1 to 4, the Board noted with concern the continued cases of harmful interference from the television and sound broadcasting stations of Italy to its neighbouring countries and that little progress has been made since the 79<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board. The Board reiterated its request to the Administration of Italy to comply with the GE-06 Regional Agreement for digital sound broadcasting. The Board further noted with satisfaction that the Bureau had published on the ITU website the list of priority FM sound broadcasting stations of neighbouring countries of Italy for which harmful interference must be mitigated. The Board encouraged the administrations concerned to provide the Bureau with any updates to the list and instructed the Bureau to update the list accordingly, indicating any progress and resolved cases when possible. The Board decided to further instruct the Bureau to continue to assist the administrations concerned in bi- and multilateral meetings, which may include technical assistance when appropriate."

6.50 It was so **agreed**.

#### **Harmful interference caused by China to HF broadcasting stations of the United Kingdom (§4.3 of Document RRB90-1/4)**

6.51 The Board **noted** that that matter was to be taken up under a separate agenda item at the present meeting (see §13 below).

**Implementation of No.11.44.1, No. 11.47, No. 11.48, No. 11.49, No. 9.38.1, RES49 and No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (§5 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.52 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, introducing §5 of the Director's report, said that Table 5 provided statistics on the cancellation of satellite networks not subject to a plan, Table 6 on satellite networks subject to the plans under Appendix 30/30A, and Table 7 on networks subject to the plan under Appendix 30B. The statistics were routine and called for no particular comment.

6.53 The **Chairman** asked why there had been so few inquiries under No. 13.6 in 2018.

6.54 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** replied that there had not been fewer inquiries; rather, cases in which the satellite network did not correspond to the operational data had become rarer, and inquiries under No. 13.6 had therefore led to fewer cancellations. In addition, the Bureau had observed that such inquiries, when they had an outcome, increasingly tended to result in partial as opposed to complete cancellations.

6.55 **Mr Mchunu** asked whether the modification of No. 11.49 by WRC-15 had led to an increase in the number of cancellations.

6.56 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** replied that, while the modification of No. 11.49 had not had a major impact in terms of the number of cancellations, it had affected late notifications of suspension. Before WRC-15, late notifications had been noted, with regret, by the Board but had not had any consequences. Since WRC-15, late notifications had been governed by No. 11.49 and incurred a penalty: the loss of a number of days out of the three years of suspension authorized. The application of the penalty had in some cases led to cancellation, some administrations having filed their notification far too late and therefore benefiting from a sharply reduced period of suspension. The modification of No. 11.49 had had another – positive – effect, in that late notifications of suspension were increasingly rare.

6.57 The Board **noted** §5 of Document RRB19-1/4.

**Council work on cost recovery for satellite filings (§6 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.58 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** pointed out that the Director's report had been issued in mid-February, before the second meeting of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482 (28 February-1 March 2019). At that meeting, the Council Expert Group had tentatively agreed that Procedure B should be implemented for non-GSO networks, introducing rates based on breakpoints that meant that very large networks would be billed double the amount of simpler networks. It would confirm that agreement at its third meeting, the two last days of the week before Council-19. The Council Expert Group had also agreed that epfd examination under Procedure C involved chiefly software development and maintenance costs, along with manual processing costs that would be reviewed by WRC-19. It would therefore not recommend to the Council that it modify Decision 482 for such case, but would instead ensure that the Council allocated the funds required for software development in the budget.

6.59 The second part of §6 contained the Bureau's analysis subsequent to the request of the Council Expert Group that it reports to the Board on the progress achieved and the course of action to be taken by the Board regarding amendments to certain rules of procedure, in particular on No. 11.31, with a view to reducing and facilitating the tasks performed by the Bureau. Given that rules of procedure were generally drafted by the Bureau, the administrations and the Board, they did not usually present an obstacle to the Bureau's work. The request from the Council Expert Group was similar to a request by Council-01, at a time when the backlog due to "paper satellites" was over four years. In response to that request, the Board had adopted a provisional rule of procedure

on No. 9.35 at its 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, whereby it requested the Bureau not to examine the power limits contained in the rule of procedure on No. 11.31 and instead to issue a “qualified favourable” finding at coordination stage and conduct the full regulatory examination under No. 11.31 at the notification stage. That provisional rule of procedure had subsequently given rise to debate, prompting WRC-03 to adopt Resolution 900 instructing the Board to suppress it. The Bureau did not think it wise to repeat that precedent. The situation in terms of backlog had changed significantly since 2001. In addition, most of the rules of procedure related to No. 11.31 concerned essential functions of the Bureau and would therefore be difficult to change. When specific difficulties arose related to software availability or computation time, the Bureau reported the situation to the Board, which suggested temporary measures. Those temporary measures had never been contested by the Member States and allowed the Bureau to handle a temporary situation without having to modify the examination procedures. In conclusion, the Bureau had found no rule of procedure that currently required a modification to reduce and facilitate its tasks.

6.60 **Mr Varlamov**, who was the Chairman of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482, said that the group had also briefly discussed the situation with regard to complex GSO networks. The preliminary results showed that the processing time was unrelated to the cost of notifications. The processing time for complex networks often exceeded the usual processing time by a factor of 16; thus, even if the cost recovery rates were increased tenfold, the Bureau would not be able to process the notification more quickly. Another difficulty related to complex GSO notifications was that their coordination by administrations was a resource-heavy process. The Council Expert Group would report both difficulties to Council-19 and thereby to WRC-19.

6.61 **Mr Hashimoto** asked whether the Bureau would submit a formal response to the Council Expert Group.

6.62 **Mr Henri**, referring to the desire “to avoid a similar situation” stated in the penultimate paragraph of §6, said that the situation twenty years previously had been completely different and that therefore no parallels could be drawn with the present. He was pleased that the satellite network registration framework had evolved and significantly improved since then and that the rules of procedure on processing of filings did not currently require modification.

6.63 **Mr Hoan** agreed with the Bureau’s conclusion that no rule of procedure currently increased or complicated its role in respect of No. 9.35 filings.

6.64 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, responding to Mr Hashimoto, said that the Council Expert Group had asked the Bureau to report to the Board because rules of procedure could only be modified by the Board. The Bureau would therefore inform the Council Expert Group that it had reported to the Board and the Council Expert Group would take note of that report and the Board’s decision.

6.65 The **Chairman** agreed that it was up to the Board to decide whether a rule of procedure needed modifying and up to the Bureau to draft a proposed modification.

6.66 **Ms Beaumier** said that the historical references set out in Document RRB19-1/4 might be somewhat detailed, but they were useful as a cautionary note. She and **Mr Hashimoto** endorsed the conclusion that no modification was currently required to a rule of procedure.

6.67 **Mr Azzouz** asked for further information about the cost recovery rates deliberated by the Council Expert Group, as they now rose in linear fashion where they had once been flat. When the Council Expert Group finished its deliberations, it would forward the results to the Council; he therefore found it difficult to understand the role of the Board in the matter.

6.68 The **Chairman** and the **Director** said that it was the Council that decided on matters deliberated by a Council working group and that it was therefore the Council that would decide on a new cost-recovery mechanism. The Board had been involved from the outset because the issue concerned its work and it had been asked to consider whether a rule of procedure was needed.

6.69 **Mr Azzouz** said that, in that case, the Board should provide more information before Council-19.

6.70 **Mr Alamri**, referring to Mr Varlamov's remarks on complex GSO network filings, said that, at its second meeting, the Council Expert Group had agreed to ask the Bureau to provide proposals relating to Procedure B for cost recovery for such networks, with a view to identifying two or three breakpoints in the light of the statistics provided by the Bureau at the first meeting. The Board should consult the report of the Council Expert Group's second meeting, which had not yet been published, in order to obtain a clear picture of the outcome of the group's deliberations.

6.71 **Mr Varlamov**, Chairman of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482, said that additional breakpoints had been tentatively identified for Procedure B: from 0 to 25 000 units, there would be no changes in rates and the procedure currently in place would therefore be maintained; from 25 000 to 75 000 units, the rates would increase in linear fashion; above 75 000 units, the rate would be flat. In terms of the number of networks in the categories, the values of 25 000 and 75 000 units for implementation of Procedure B corresponded to 96% and 98%, respectively, of non-GSO submissions according to statistics provided by the Bureau; 2% of filings would be outside those limits. The Council Expert Group considered that the increases were acceptable. With regard to Procedure C (related to epfd examination), he said that the Council Expert Group considered that, in view of the modernizations required, the Council could perhaps be asked to secure the necessary regular budget allocations for software development. Few filings currently fell under Procedure C. He confirmed that the final decision on a cost-recovery mechanism would be taken by the Council. The Board had been asked to provide comments and had therefore requested an analysis from the Bureau. It was on the basis of that analysis that the Bureau had concluded that no rule of procedure currently required modification to reduce and facilitate the Bureau's tasks.

6.72 The **Director** reminded the Board that the cost recovery mechanism was being reviewed, not only so as to reflect the actual costs incurred by the Bureau when it processed complex filings, but also to discourage the submission of unnecessarily complex filings of non-GSO networks. It was therefore important that there be financial consequences. While only 2% of non-GSO filings were unnecessarily complex, they nevertheless had the capacity to block the Bureau's work and to hold up normal filings.

6.73 In reply to a question from **Mr Alamri**, **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that, at the first meeting of the Council Expert Group, the Bureau had submitted a document listing the very large GSO networks notified in the previous ten years, with an estimate of the extra workload incurred by the largest such networks (those exceeding 300 000 units). It would provide an update at the next meeting of the Council Expert Group, in which it would state that the Bureau had received no new notifications of very large GSO networks in the interval.

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

"After consideration of the information as provided in the report from the Bureau on the Council work on cost recovery in §6 of Document RRB19-1/4, the Board reached the same conclusion as the Bureau that there was no need for new or modified rules of procedure to facilitate the work of the



Bureau and reduce its tasks. The Board decided that there was no additional information relating to cost recovery to report to the Council Expert Group.”

6.75 It was so agreed.

**Review of findings for frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems under Resolution 85 (WRC-03) (§7 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.76 **Mr Hashimoto** noted that Resolution 85 (WRC-03) dated back to 2003. Perhaps the status of its implementation could be reported by the BR Director to the forthcoming WRC, with a view to either updating or suppressing it.

6.77 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that Resolution 85 was indeed being brought to the conference’s attention with a view to its modification to take account of latest developments regarding epfd-related software.

6.78 The Board **noted** §7 of Document RRB19-1/4.

**Class-of-station symbols for stations in the space operation service or providing space operation functions (§8 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.79 Noting that the Board had commenced consideration of that matter at its 79<sup>th</sup> meeting (§3.36-3.40 of Document RRB18-3/14 – Minutes of the 79<sup>th</sup> meeting), **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** re-introduced the subject as presented in §8 of Document RRB19-1/4, recalling the Board’s instructions to the Bureau to submit a detailed report on the application of No. 1.23 of the Radio Regulations to the present meeting. The Bureau had not, however, carried out the Board’s further instruction to issue a circular letter to inform administrations of the issue, since various points required clarification first. In that regard, following the 79<sup>th</sup> meeting the Bureau had examined the different bands where an allocation to the space operation service coexisted with allocations to various other space services under different regulatory conditions, as presented in the table in the section of the Director’s report now under discussion. There were numerous such cases, all of which begged the question of how to deal with the assignments concerned vis-à-vis the class of station symbols ET, ED, EK and ER. The Bureau had identified three possible ways of understanding the WRC’s intent, as presented in the penultimate paragraph of §8 of Document RRB19-1/4. The first alternative was the most restrictive, as it precluded the use of RR 1.23 in order to benefit from the regulatory conditions of other allocated space services. That alternative would lead to a profound shift in current practice and would change the status of some stations to non-compliant. The third alternative was the least restrictive, the interpretation being that the existence of an allocation to the space operation service did not indicate any intent with regard to the use of No. 1.23 in the frequency band. The second alternative fell between the two extremes, the interpretation being that the existence of an allocation to the space operation service indicated the intent to allow general space operations under some specific regulatory conditions attached to the space operation services, without, however, preventing space stations operating frequency assignments to other space services in the same frequency band from using No. 1.23. The issue was extremely complex, requiring the Board to clarify the WRC’s intent, and the best way forward might be for the Bureau to provide full background information on the matter vis-à-vis the different bands concerned, for consideration by the Board at its next meeting, with a view to the development of new or modified rules of procedure.

6.80 **Mr Henri** said that the first alternative appeared only to take into consideration the concerns of TT&C operators but not the ones of others users of the frequency band. Under the second, the allocation to the space operation service would have no specific regulatory impact on

administration choice for its TT&C operation. As to the third, he understood that ED, EK and ER classes of station would have to comply with the regulations applicable to the space services in which the space station is operating without the requirement for the network to operate frequency assignments in this space service. If possible, it would be best to adopt a single approach for all the bands, and the three alternatives put forward by the Bureau had their merits. However, a fourth, already suggested in the first alternative, could be envisaged according to which, given the wording of No. 1.23, when there is a specific allocation to the space operation service, the intent of WRC that has adopted the specific allocation could have been to restrict the TT&C operation in these specific bands to the space service allocation only with specific constraints. As a consequence, examination of TT&C not notified as ET in these particular bands should lead to an unfavourable finding. Such an interpretation might nevertheless be deemed over-restrictive in the light of practice to date. Before taking a decision, it would be useful to know how the space operation provisions had been adopted by WRCs and how the Bureau took account of Recommendation ITU-R SA 363-6 when dealing with space operation systems.

6.81 **Mr Talib** thanked the Bureau for the information it had made available and said that a circular letter should be sent out to administrations as soon as possible so that all stakeholders were properly informed of the situation. As to the alternatives put forward regarding the WRC's intent, he would favour the second in Document RRB19-1/4, but considered that it would not be possible to apply the same interpretation to all bands. The matter should be addressed band by band.

6.82 **Ms Beaumier** agreed that the same interpretation might not be applicable to all bands, and indeed the WRC might not have had any specific intent in mind when adopting the provisions in question. She could think of another possible interpretation but without historical information for each of the bands in question, it would be premature to consider it. More information was certainly required before the Board decided on a way forward – for example, it might be interesting to know which allocations had been made first.

6.83 **Mr Hashimoto** pointed out that if the intention was to revise the rule of procedure on No. 1.23, due account must also be taken of No. 1.61 defining “station” and its associated rule of procedure.

6.84 **Mr Hoan** said that the Board's consideration of the matter at its 79<sup>th</sup> and present meetings pointed to its complexity and to the difficulty of separating space operations from functions, particularly when current networks implemented operations and all three functions using a single control station. Nevertheless, with different regulatory conditions applicable to space operation services and other space services, clarification was needed in order to avoid difficulties in the processing of filings. While appreciating the analysis made by the Bureau and recognizing the importance of TT&C, his preference would be for the third alternative put forward by the Bureau. A revised rule of procedure on No. 1.23 should be prepared, and a band-by-band approach adopted.

6.85 **Mr Varlamov** also noted the complexity of the matter, compounded by the fact that, whereas in the past several stations had carried out the operations/functions concerned, now a single station often did so. Without further information and clarification, he would be at pains to choose the best alternative among those put forward, and indeed it might not be possible to apply the same approach to all cases. In his view, each frequency should be examined individually, since each could pose different complications.

6.86 **Mr Azzouz** agreed with previous speakers that further information was required. His preference would nevertheless be for the third alternative put forward by the Bureau, as no provisions of the Radio Regulations clarified the matter. With the new software producing a fatal

error for validation whenever the class-of-station symbol ET was used in a frequency band where there was no allocation for the space operation service, he proposed that a circular letter be sent to administrations explaining the difficulties involved regarding the class-of-station symbols, thus helping administrations submitting filings. Based on the information provided to the next meeting, the Board would decide whether or not the rules of procedure should be modified.

6.87 **Mr Alamri** said that it was clear that, for the purposes of coordination, space operation provisions should apply to ET classes of station and space service provisions should apply to ED, EK and ER classes of stations. Such should be the basis of any revision of the relevant rules of procedure and any interpretation endorsed by the Board. He agreed that further information should be provided on each of the bands concerned, in order to allow the Board to reach a decision.

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

“The Board considered §8 of Document RRB19-1/4 on the complex and important aspect of the class-of-station symbols used for stations in the space operation service or providing space operation functions. The Board concluded that, based on the information provided, it was not yet in a position to propose appropriate guidance on the understanding on which basis a modification to the rule of procedure on RR No. 1.23 should be developed. Consequently, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to provide further analysis on the matter to the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board. This analysis should be provided on a band-by-band basis, including the history and the manner in which the Bureau had treated the various cases.”

6.89 It was so **agreed**.

6.90 The Board **further agreed** not to send out a circular letter on the matter to administrations for the time being, as various aspects required clarification before doing so.

#### **Update to the Rule of Procedure on No. 11.31 (§9 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.91 **Mr Vallet**, introducing §9 of Document RRB19-1/4, said that No. 22.40, which had entered into force on 1 January 2017, stipulated a pfd limit that the Bureau had to verify. Furthermore, No. 11.31.2 indicated that the “other provisions” examined under No. 11.31 “shall be identified and included in the rules of procedure”. The Bureau had to date forgotten to add that pfd limit to §2.6.6 of the rule of procedure on No. 11.31, although it did verify the limit. If the Board agreed with that understanding of the situation, the Bureau would circulate a draft update to the rule of procedure on No. 11.31, in order to remedy that oversight.

6.92 **Mr Henri**, speaking as the Chairman of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, suggested that the draft revised rule of procedure should be examined by the Board at its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting, once it had been published in a CCRR circular letter and administrations had been given the opportunity to comment.

6.93 **Mr Hoan** agreed with the Bureau’s understanding of the situation and endorsed the proposal to develop a draft update to the rule of procedure on No. 11.31.

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

“The Board considered the information provided in §9 of Document RRB19-1/4 on the need to update the rule of procedure on RR No. 11.31 as a result of the adoption of RR No. 22.40 by WRC-15. The Board concluded that it was necessary to update the rule of procedure on RR No. 11.31 and instructed the Bureau to prepare a draft rule of procedure and to circulate it to administrations for comments and consideration at the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board.”

6.95 It was so agreed.

**Difference between items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4 (§10 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.96 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, introducing §10 of Document RRB19-1/4, explained that, on 19 December 2018 and following consultations with the Bureau, the Administration of Norway, in agreement with the Administration of the United States, had requested the Bureau to add the latter administration as “a secondary notifying administration” to the filings for the Norwegian STEAM-1, STEAM-2 and STEAM-2B satellite networks, for which the Administration of Norway would remain the “responsible administration”. The request was to be executed by inserting the administration symbol of the United States in the publications relating to the three satellite networks under item A.1.f.2 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4. Pursuant to that request, the Bureau had published a modification to the special sections of the STEAM-1, STEAM-2 and STEAM-2B satellite networks whereby “USA” was added as an administration under item A.1.f.2. In so doing, and in reviewing other, past cases for which a similar approach had been adopted, it had remarked that the procedure could lead to confusion regarding the applicability of No. 9.6.1, according to which an administration could act on behalf of a group of named administrations.

6.97 There were two methods of implementing No. 9.6.1, as described in the fifth and sixth paragraphs of §10 in Document RRB19-1/4. According to the first, the administrations concerned wished to clearly distinguish between their satellite networks from the regulatory viewpoint. In that case, an administration was designated by the group of administrations to act as their representative vis-à-vis the Bureau; that group was called an “intergovernmental satellite organization”. According to the second method, in a number of cases, the administrations concerned did not want to distinguish between their satellite networks from the regulatory point of view. They nevertheless wished to let other administrations know that the networks were jointly coordinated by several administrations. In those cases, the Bureau did not apply No. 9.6.1; instead, it published the list of countries associated with the publication, there being no regulatory implications for the Bureau. However, a comparison of the wording of No. 9.6.1 and of items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4 might lead to confusion. To clarify the distinction between the two items, the Bureau therefore proposed to:

- write to the Administrations of Belgium, Canada, France and Mexico – the four notifying administrations that had acted under A.1.f.2 – asking them to confirm that the practice under item A.1.f.2 corresponded to their original intent, as implied by their tacit acceptance thereof;
- modify the Preface to the BR IFIC with a view to clarifying the differences between items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4;
- raise the matter in the Director’s report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07), for endorsement of the practice and possible clarification of the wording of item A.1.f.2.

6.98 Given that WRC-19 would be held in November 2019, the Bureau did not deem it necessary to develop a rule of procedure. The Board was invited to review the matter and confirm the Bureau’s proposed actions.

6.99 **Mr Varlamov** asked on what grounds the Bureau had decided to add an administration to the filings for the STEAM-1, STEAM-2 and STEAM-2B satellite networks, as to his understanding such decisions should be taken only following consultation with the Board. He considered that difficulties might arise if a new administration was added to the initial list of administrations constituting a group. The relevant coordination agreements were, as a rule, considered confidential and not

communicated to third parties. In the case at hand, they would become known to a third party. No administrations should be added to the filings until the matter had been drawn to the attention of WRC-19.

6.100 **Mr Hoan** agreed with the Bureau's analysis of the situation and with the proposal to draw the attention of WRC-19 to the matter. He recalled a previous discussion involving the Administrations of Norway and the United States, at the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Board. Regarding the transfer of the function of notifying administration from Norway to the United States for the STEAM-0, STEAM-1, STEAM-2 and STEAM-3C satellite networks, the Board had noted that there was "no provision of the Radio Regulations that provides for the transfer of the function of notifying administration applicable to this specific situation. ... Consequently, the Board concluded that it was not in a position to accede to the request from the Administrations of Norway and the United States of America." Regarding the matter at hand, he had no objection to the Norwegian Administration's request to list the Administration of the United States as a "secondary notifying administration" for the STEAM-1, STEAM-2 and STEAM-2B satellite networks, but asked what the difference was between a "primary" and a "secondary" notifying administration. He also shared Mr Varlamov's concerns about prior coordination agreements.

6.101 **Mr Azzouz** supported the Bureau's proposals to modify the Preface to the BR IFIC with a view to clarifying the differences between items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4 and to raise the matter in the Director's report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07). Regarding the proposal to write to certain administrations, he suggested that it might be useful to develop a rule of procedure on the matter, particularly as it was not the first time that kind of issue had arisen in respect of the two administrations concerned.

6.102 The **Chairman** said that, since WRC-19 was only months away, it might be better to submit the issue directly to it, rather than to develop a rule of procedure.

6.103 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, addressing the concerns raised, said that the Bureau had no grounds for refusing to accede to the request of the Administration of Norway to apply a provision of the Radio Regulations. In so doing, however, it had realized that it would be useful to clarify the wording of an item in Appendix 4. In addition, that request was completely different from the previous request submitted to the Board, whereby the Administration of Norway, acting with the agreement of the Administration of the United States, had asked for a transfer of notifying administration. In the current case, the Administration of Norway had simply asked that it continue to be listed as the notifying administration but that the Administration of the United States be listed in the special sections as also involved in coordinating the satellite networks concerned. As to the term "secondary notifying administration", it had been placed in inverted comments in Document RRB19-1/4 because it was quoted from the letter from the Administration of Norway. It was not defined in the Radio Regulations or used by the Bureau. There was only one notifying administration in the case, namely the Administration of Norway; the Administration of the United States had no particular regulatory rights. The Bureau would communicate directly only with the Administration of Norway about the publications concerned. That was how the Bureau had implemented item A.1.f.2 in the past. If the Board wanted the Bureau to draw up a rule of procedure, the Bureau would do so. It had suggested that the matter be reported directly to WRC-19 because of the timing of the conference.

6.104 **Ms Beaumier** agreed with the Bureau's understanding of the implications of adding the name of a notifying administration to a filing. The case at hand did not involve an intergovernmental organization, and she therefore agreed with the Bureau's proposed actions. In her experience, prior

coordination agreements were not necessarily a matter of concern. Such agreements were confidential between the parties – they were usually not communicated to the Bureau – and it was up to the administrations listed in the filing to decide whether earlier agreements needed to be shared; the initial notifying administration continued to be responsible for coordination.

6.105 **Mr Henri** said that it would be useful for Board members to have the list of satellite networks submitted on behalf of a group of named administrations that was not an intergovernmental organization, a copy of the correspondence from the Administrations of Norway and the United States requesting that the latter be added to the satellite system filings, and information on the CR/C publications of the STEAM networks. He shared Mr Hoan’s concern about the term “secondary notifying administration”, which appeared in the current BR IFIC. Undefined regulatory terms were thus therefore being introduced into official Bureau publications *de facto*. It would be important for other administrations to fully understand the meaning of that expression. While there was nothing in the Radio Regulations to prevent an administration from being added to a filing under item A.1.f.2 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4, the consequences of doing so had to be clarified. Points calling for further reflection included the regulatory consequence of an administration joining or forming a ‘group of named administrations’ under A.1.f.2 – at the beginning of the process – API ( No.9.1.1), in the middle – CR (No.9.6.1) or just for Notification (No. 11.15.1); the consequence of an administration leaving a ‘group of named administrations’ (what happens if e.g. Administration A is the original administration, Administration B is added and then Administration A leaves); Which administration, member of the ‘group of named administrations’ is the ‘owner/keeper’ of the coordination agreements; the status of coordination agreements completed by one administration before the grouping, the handling of coordination between both administrations that could have been triggered before and after the grouping ? While it was true that the Bureau’s past practice had given rise to no comments on the part of the administrations concerned that was not the same as saying that it had been approved. He reserved judgement on whether it would be best at that stage to draft a rule of procedure or submit the matter directly to WRC-19. It was important, however, clearly to indicate that the possibility to add a notifying administration must not be used to change the initial notifying administration and thereby as a means of trafficking in orbit/spectrum resources between administrations. He agreed with Ms Beaumier that the management of coordination agreements had never posed a problem in the past. That being said, it would be interesting to ascertain, in the case of the STEAM networks, that the coordination agreements concluded to date by the Administration of Norway remained valid. Regarding the measures the Bureau proposed to take, the letter it planned to send to four administrations might be of interest to be sent also to the other administrations added under item A.1.f.2 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4. Regarding the Preface, it would be interesting to see the draft amendments proposed by the Bureau before any further consideration.

6.106 **Ms Beaumier** agreed that it would be beneficial to document the Bureau’s practice, which had given rise to no difficulties to date. She was also concerned that all administrations should have a common understanding of the consequences of adding names to filings. It was also important to preclude the potential for abuse; while there was no doubt that the current request from the Administrations of Norway and the United States was legitimate, the Board had to be vigilant going forward.

6.107 **Mr Henri** speaking as the Chairman of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure proposed that the questions raised be submitted to the working group for clarification, so as to enable the Bureau to have a basis for preparing responses for the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board.

6.108 It was so **agreed**.

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

“The Board considered the information provided on the use of items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3 of Annex 2 to Appendix 4 and their relation to RR No. 9.6.1 as provided in §10 of Document RRB19-1/4. In relation to the request from the Administration of Norway, the Board noted that there was no provision in the Radio Regulations, Rules of Procedure, Constitution and Convention that defined ‘secondary notifying administration’. The Board considered that several aspects relating to items A.1.f.2 and A.1.f.3 needed clarification. Consequently, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to report on these aspects together with its current practice to the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board at which time the Board would consider the necessary actions to be taken.”

6.110 It was so agreed.

**Change in the status of coordination between the Administrations of Malta and Papua New Guinea regarding frequency assignments to the AFRISAT 3W-PKU satellite network in the Appendix 30B frequency bands (§11 of Document RRB19-1/4 and Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/3)**

6.111 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** introduced §11 of Document RRB19-1/4, which outlined how the Bureau had handled the status of coordination between the Administrations of Malta and Papua New Guinea with respect to the AFRISAT 3W-PKU satellite network. Given the circumstances of the case and the Administration of Malta’s disagreement regarding the network, and having consulted the Administration of Papua New Guinea, the Bureau had exceptionally allowed Papua New Guinea to modify the technical characteristics of its network so that Malta’s allotment would no longer be identified as affected, and said that it would publish the modified characteristics without reviewing the examination results of other networks. In its late submission in Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/3, taken up by the Board for information, Malta welcomed the approach adopted by the Bureau, but questioned why other networks were not to be reexamined in the light of the changes made to the technical characteristics of AFRISAT 3W-PKU in order to ensure the full protection of Malta’s allotment. The Bureau had therefore checked the impact of the changes made, and had ascertained that only one administration was affected, namely France with respect to eight networks, in regard to which Malta was identified. However, the level of degradation caused to Malta’s network by the French networks as published would now be greater following the modifications made to the technical characteristics of AFRISAT 3W-PKU. Given the delays in processing Appendix 30B notifications and the fact that only one administration was involved, the Bureau did not plan to republish the eight French networks and their new reference situation; instead, it would write to the French Administration warning it of the levels it would have to respect when submitting its Part B notifications for its eight networks in order to ensure full protection for Malta’s allotment.

6.112 **Mr Henri** endorsed the course of action taken by the Bureau as outlined in §11 of Document RRB19-1/4, which appeared to have resolved the basic issue, but he questioned the regulatory validity of a correspondance to inform an administration of the need to comply with technical characteristic values when the only formal means of conveying such information was via special sections.

6.113 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the correspondence sent to France would not set limits as such, but would simply inform France of the levels it would now have to respect in its Part B submissions in the light of the increased sensitivity of Malta’s network. If the French Administration failed to take those levels into account, the Bureau would remind it of the need to do so.

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

“The Board took note of §11 of Document RRB19-1/4 on the coordination status between the Administrations of Malta and Papua New Guinea with respect to the frequency assignments to the AFRISAT 3W-PKU satellite network and considered Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/3 for information. The Board concluded that the Bureau had acted correctly in this regard.”

6.115 It was so **agreed**.

**Bringing back into use of some frequency assignments to the LUX-30B-6 and LUX-30B-G4-23.5E satellite networks (§12 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.116 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** introduced the case outlined in §12 of Document RRB19-1/4, in which the Administration of Luxembourg had failed to inform the Bureau on time of the bringing back into use of its LUX-30B-6 and LUX-30B-G4-23.5E networks. The Administration of Luxembourg referred to confusion caused in its internal process due to the lack of reminder of expiry of the regulatory period for confirming that its networks had been brought back into use. As the actual operations of the networks were compliant with §8.17 of Article 8 of Appendix 30B, the Bureau had decided to accept the confirmation of bringing back into use. He noted that there was in fact no regulatory obligation for the Bureau to send any reminder to an administration regarding confirmation of bringing back into use.

6.117 **Mr Henri** and **Mr Varlamov** endorsed the action taken by the Bureau, noting that the oversight on the part of the Administration of Luxembourg had not involved any conscious intent to break the rules.

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

“The Board took note of §12 of Document RRB19-1/4 on the bringing back into use of some frequency assignments to the LUX-30B-6 and LUX-30B-G4-23.5E satellite networks and the decision taken by the Bureau. The Board also noted that the Bureau was not required by the Radio Regulations to send reminders to administrations on the confirmation of the bringing back into use of suspended frequency assignments to satellite networks.”

**Resubmission of notified frequency assignments to the USGOVSAT-16R satellite network (§13 of Document RRB19-1/4)**

6.119 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** introduced the case outlined in §13 of Document RRB19-1/4, involving failure by the Administration of the United States to comply with the deadline stipulated in No. 11.46 when resubmitting a notice for the USGOVSAT-16R satellite network. The United States Administration had provided a detailed description of the circumstances that had led to its oversight, and referred to the fact that the Bureau had sent it no reminder. Noting that the network concerned was compliant with the provisions of Article 11, the Bureau had decided, on an exceptional basis, to accept the late resubmission.

6.120 **Mr Hoan** said that he had no objection to the decisions taken by the Bureau regarding Luxembourg’s networks or the United States network now under discussion. However, it was a matter of concern that two administrations with considerable experience in notifying networks were committing such oversights, and both cited the Bureau’s failure to send reminders as part of the reason for those oversights. He wondered what the Bureau could do to help avoid the reoccurrence of similar incidents in the future.

6.121 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that there might not be very much the Bureau could do to improve matters, as oversights on the part of administrations could be due to various factors, including complicated internal processes regarding coordination and correspondence with the



Bureau, and extraordinary events such as government shutdowns. Such oversights were nevertheless few, and their impact minor, particularly on the Bureau's work. Matters would be more serious if the delays were much longer. Efforts could be and were being made to send out more reminders, and indeed a proposal involving reminders in regard to No. 11.46 was to be considered by WRC-19. The Bureau would endeavour to send out reminders for all networks in future.

6.122 **Mr Varlamov**, noting that the WRC would be requested to take steps to improve matters, commented that there had been certain differences in the way the Bureau had handled the case now under discussion compared with its handling of Luxembourg's networks – for example, there had been more rounds of consultation with one administration than the other. In future, it would be preferable to adopt the same approach in all cases.

6.123 **Mr Henri** said that, while it was ultimately up to administrations to comply with the provisions of the Radio Regulations no matter what circumstances they faced, it was regrettable that no reminder had been sent to the Administration of the United States under No. 11.46. He could readily endorse the decision taken by the Bureau, but agreed with Mr Varlamov that the same approach should be followed in all cases to the extent possible.

6.124 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the same approach was followed in all cases, but timing could vary, requiring the parties concerned to adapt. For example, in the case under discussion, the United States had made its resubmission before receiving any query from the Bureau, whereas in the case involving Luxembourg there had been a considerable lapse of time between expiry of the regulatory deadline and the Bureau's subsequent query. Following further comments by **Mr Varlamov** and **Mr Alamri** regarding the different timings of the correspondence sent by the Bureau and the regulatory dates involved, and the need for a harmonized approach, he added that the only instructions given to the Bureau in the Radio Regulations and Rules of Procedure were that the Bureau should cancel assignments if the relevant provisions were not satisfied and inform the administrations concerned accordingly. The Bureau often erred on the side of caution by informing administrations before making the cancellation, in order to avoid having to reinstate assignments if so warranted. It would obviously be possible to set down an approach in a rule of procedure, but to do so would place constraints on the Bureau's resources vis-à-vis the priorities it had to meet.

6.125 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** added that other factors affecting timing could come into play. For example, in the case involving Luxembourg that the Board would take up later on in the present meeting, the regulatory deadline for the submission of Appendix 4 data had expired just before the end-of-year lull, meaning that the Bureau had not sent out a query until 23 January 2019. And only after the end-of-year period had it become apparent that the Luxembourg Administration had failed to submit the uplink part of its network.

6.126 **Ms Beaumier** said that, in the light of the explanations given, the Bureau should be left sufficient flexibility to deal with such cases in the manner it deemed most appropriate.

6.127 **Mr Borjón** agreed, noting that the Bureau had clearly focused on the fundamental elements involved in each case, bearing in mind the best interests of those concerned.

6.128 **Mr Azzouz** noted that changes might have to be made to certain rules of procedure, for example those on Nos. 11.46 and 11.49, if WRC-19 took certain decisions regarding reminders.

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

"The Board took note of §13 of Document RRB19-1/4 on the resubmission of notified frequency assignments to the USGOVSAT-16R satellite network and the decision of the Bureau taken in this regard. The Board further noted that the Bureau was also not required by the Radio Regulations to

send reminders to administrations on the resubmission of notified frequency assignments under RR No. 11.46.”

6.130 It was so **agreed**.

6.131 The Board **noted** the report of the Director (Documents RRB19-1/4 and Addenda 1-4).

**7 Rules of procedure (Documents RRB19-1/1 (RRB16-2/3(Rev.10)), RRB19-1/4(Add.5) and RRB19-1/5; Circular Letter CCRR/61)**

**List of rules of procedure (Document RRB19-1/1(RRB16-2/3(Rev.10)) and RRB19-1/4(Add.5))**

7.1 **Mr Henri**, speaking as the Chairman of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, introduced Document RRB19-1/1(RRB16-2/3(Rev.10)) and asked the Bureau to confirm that all the rules of procedure listed therein had been approved by the Board.

7.2 The **Director** said that the only rule of procedure that remained to be approved in the document was before the present meeting; it concerned the GE-75 Regional Agreement (see below).

7.3 **Mr Henri** recalled that the discussion of the Director’s report (Document RRB19-1/4) had resulted in the possible need for new or revised rules of procedure. He suggested that the working group convene during the current Board meeting to discuss them and to address the proposal for a new rule of procedure on the GE-84 Agreement set out in Addendum 5 to Document RRB19-1/4.

7.4 **Ms Beaumier** asked when the working group would review the list of rules of procedure with a view to enabling the Board to fulfil its obligation under No. 13.0.1 to submit to WRC-19 a list of the modifications required to the Radio Regulations pursuant to the new rules of procedure adopted since WRC-15.

7.5 **Mr Henri** replied that no information had yet been made available in that regard. The point could be clarified with the Bureau at the working group meeting and the review, if required, conducted at the Board’s 81<sup>st</sup> meeting.

7.6 The **Chairman** said that it was important to establish a timeline for the review.

7.7 Following a meeting of the working group, the Board **agreed** to conclude on the matter as follows:

“Following a meeting of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, the Board decided to update the list of proposed rules of procedure in Document RRB19-1/1 (RRB16 2/3(Rev.10)) taking into account the proposals by the Bureau for the revision of certain rules of procedure.”

**Draft rules of procedure and comments from administrations (Circular Letter CCRR/61 and Document RRB19-1/5)**

7.8 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** introduced the draft rule of procedure on the GE-75 Agreement annexed to Circular Letter CCRR/61. The Bureau had received one comment on the draft rule of procedure, from the Administration of Azerbaijan (Document RRB19-1/5), to the effect that it had no comments. The rule of procedure therefore appeared to present no difficulties for administrations.

7.9 In reply to a question from **Mr Azzouz**, he proposed that the term “Modulation” be replaced everywhere in the draft rule of procedure by “Modulation scheme”, which was used in Section B7 of the Rules of Procedure.

7.10 It was so **agreed**.

7.11 The draft rule of procedure, as amended, was **approved**, with effective date of application immediately upon approval.

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

“The Board discussed the draft rule of procedure circulated to administrations in Circular Letter CCRR/61, along with one comment received from one administration, as contained in Document RRB19-1/5. The Board adopted the rule of procedure with modifications as contained in Annex 1 to this summary of decisions.”

## **8 Status of the DBL-G5-28.5E satellite network (Documents RRB19-1/3 and RRB19-1/7)**

8.1 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)**, introducing Documents RRB19-1/3 and RRB19-1/7, said that the Bureau had sent the Administration of Luxembourg a reminder on 14 June 2018 that the regulatory deadline for the DBL-G5-28.5E satellite network submitted under Appendix 30A was 13 December 2018. In a further communication dated 23 January 2019, the Bureau had informed the Administration of Luxembourg that it had not received confirmation that the assignments in question had been brought into use or the due diligence information under Resolution 49 and that the assignments of that network would therefore be cancelled. In its responses of 30 January 2019, the Administration of Luxembourg had stated that it had had to make several attempts to send the submission in early December, owing to unspecified technical difficulties, and that, as it had subsequently discovered, the part of the submission relating to the feeder link had failed to reach the Bureau. The late submission for the assignments of the satellite network in question was received by the Bureau on 31 January 2019. On 7 February 2019, the Bureau had informed the Administration of Luxembourg that it could not accept the late submission and would refer the matter to the Board, which was asked to decide whether to accept the late submission. In that connection, the Board might wish to bear in mind that the space station of the satellite network in question had been brought into use.

8.2 **Mr Alamri**, observing that under Part D of Appendix 30 many administrations were affected by the downlink and that, according to the Administration of Luxembourg, the satellite had been brought into use, asked what the coordination status was for the administrations involved.

8.3 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** replied that the information in the Part D publication only indicated the coordination requirements based on the examination results of the Part A submission, which was the start of the coordination process. The notifying administration could subsequently modify the network’s characteristics with a view to reducing the impact on other networks. Some of the requirements indicated in the Part D publication might no longer exist in the Part B submission, and the notifying administration might have reached an agreement with some of the other administrations concerned. The Bureau could not know whether there were any pending coordination issues until it had completed the Part B examination. Processing of the DBL-G5-28.5E network was incomplete and had been suspended pending the Board’s decision.

8.4 **Mr Alamri** asked for confirmation that the Part B examination had not yet started. The question was whether to accept the late submission of the uplink so that the Bureau could start the Part B examination and publish the results.

8.5 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** confirmed that understanding of the situation.

8.6 **Ms Beaumier** asked when the Administration of Luxembourg had made the submission and whether the Bureau was able to confirm that the space station had been brought into use.

8.7 **Mr Wang (Head SSD/SNP)** replied that the Bureau had received the Part B submission and notification together with Resolution 49 and Resolution 40 information from the Administration of Luxembourg on 3 December 2018, but only for the downlink, not for the feeder link. He added that notifying administrations could see the delivery status of e-submissions immediately after sending a submission. The problem in the current case was that the Administration of Luxembourg had tried to send a great deal of information all at once, but had been unable to see from the delivery status that only part of the submission had been received by the Bureau. Regarding the confirmation of bringing into use, the Bureau had received the information but had not yet verified it. It would do so at the time of publication.

8.8 **Mr Azzouz** said that, in view of the timeline, the case had to be considered from two points of view. On the one hand, the Administration of Luxembourg had missed the deadline for providing the requisite information by 45 days; if it had encountered difficulties in sending the information, it could have made the submission by other means. On the other hand, the network was operational, there were no outstanding coordination requirements and no other administrations were affected. He proposed a three-pronged solution: the Board should refer the case to WRC-19 for decision; the Bureau should provide WRC-19 with information on the network's coordination status; and the Bureau should provide administrations with extra training on e-submissions to avoid further problems.

8.9 **Mr Hoan** observed that the Administration of Luxembourg had been unaware that the uplink part of the submission had not been transmitted. The Bureau had handled the case correctly; the Board had no grounds to overrule its decision. In its letter of 25 February 2019 to the Board (Document RRB19-1/7), the Administration of Luxembourg said that it had put in place new procedures to prevent such issues from arising in the future. The requirement regarding the e-submission of satellite network filings had entered into force on 1 August 2018; according to the Director's report (Document RRB19-1/4), to date only one administration had experienced difficulties with such submissions. He was at pains to understand the difficulties encountered by the Administration of Luxembourg with regard to the uplink submission.

8.10 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau had not taken a decision in the case, which involved a Part B submission after the regulatory deadline of eight years and therefore fell outside the Bureau's remit. The Board's finding would therefore not overrule a Bureau decision.

8.11 **Ms Beaumier** said that, having no experience herself of the e-submission system, she found it difficult to gauge what precisely had happened in the case. That being said, the satellite had been launched and there was no impact on other administrations. The Board could consider that the case involved a technical/administrative error in software use. Given that the Board had adopted a lenient approach in similar cases in the past, it would be within its prerogative to give the Administration of Luxembourg the benefit of the doubt in the present case. She agreed that administrations needed to be better informed about the use of the software and was pleased that the Administration of Luxembourg had taken measures to ensure the same error did not reoccur.

8.12 **Mr Varlamov** said that, given that no new assignments were affected and that the satellite was in orbit and operational, and in view of the Board's past practice in such matters, he considered that the Board was in a position to rule in favour of the Administration of Luxembourg and to instruct the Bureau to continue processing the filing; it did not need to refer the matter to WRC-19.

8.13 **Mr Henri** said that, given that e-submission receipts apparently did not show notifying administrations what part(s) of their submissions had been or had not been received, the Administration of Luxembourg might not have noticed that part of its submission had not been

delivered. It had nevertheless provided all the missing information and had thereby met the regulatory conditions enabling the Bureau to continue processing the network. In view of the Bureau's additional explanations and of the measures taken by the Administration of Luxembourg to ensure that similar issues did not arise in the future, he considered that the Board could agree in the administration's favour and instruct the Bureau to continue processing the system.

8.14 **Mr Alamri** said that, given that a space station was operating in the orbital position concerned, the Board should encourage the Administration of Luxembourg to complete the coordination process with other administrations.

8.15 **Mr Borjón** pointed out that a decision by the Board to instruct the Bureau to continue processing the submission would of necessity entail completion of the coordination process.

8.16 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau's e-submission receipts were generated automatically and were therefore generic in nature; they did not list the contents of the submission. The website listing the data received had until recently listed only Resolution 55 information in respect of Part A, not Part B, of the Plan. With the e-submission system, the Bureau could now provide information on all the data received, enabling administrations to verify that the submission was complete; that option had not been available, however, at the time that the Administration of Luxembourg had made its submission.

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

"The Board considered Documents RRB19-1/3 and RRB19-1/7 from the Administration of Luxembourg on the submission of the information related to the DBL-G5-28.5E satellite network. The Board noted that:

- The Administration of Luxembourg, in applying the 'e-Submission of Satellite Network Filings' software, failed to send all required information on time, but was not able to verify the information received by the Bureau despite having received an acknowledgment of receipt, given its generic nature;
- The Administration of Luxembourg had taken measures to ensure that this issue would not reoccur;
- A satellite was operational in conformity with the technical characteristics of the DBL-G5-28.5E satellite network.

Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request of the Administration of Luxembourg and instructed the Bureau to accept the Part B submission and notification of the uplink information for the DBL-G5-28.5E satellite network and to continue to process the filing. The Board further encouraged the Administration of Luxembourg to continue with the coordination with other administrations."

8.18 It was so **agreed**.

## **9 Requests for the cancellation of frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of France requesting the suppression of the frequency assignments to the Greek satellite network HELLAS-SAT-2G at 39°E in the frequency bands 17.7-19.7 GHz, 20.2-21.2 GHz, 27.5-29.5 GHz and 30-31 GHz (Documents RRB19-1/10 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/5)**

9.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB19-1/10, in which the Administration of France requested the Bureau to cancel the frequency assignments to the Greek satellite network HELLAS-SAT-2G at 39°E in the frequency bands 17.7-19.7 GHz, 20.2-21.2 GHz, 27.5-29.5 GHz and 30-

31 GHz on the grounds that they had not been brought into use, as claimed by the Administration of Greece, on 18 October 2013, and as such they could not have been suspended on 18 January 2014, brought back into use on 7 March 2016 and re-suspended on 6 June 2016. In support of its request, the French Administration said that the bands on board satellite NIMIQ-2, which was supposed to have brought the above-mentioned bands into use on 18 October 2013, had not included the above-mentioned bands, as was borne out by the correspondence from Lockheed Martin reproduced in Annex 3 to France's letter, the information published in various special sections on Resolution 49 listed in Annex 2 and the information furnished in Annex 4 by the United Nations secretariat in conformity with the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space. Annexes 5 and 6 reproduced exchanges of correspondence between the French and Greek Administrations, in which Greece responded positively regarding coordination but failed to clarify the basic issue. France said the matter was of particular importance to it in terms of its implications for coordination of its satellite ATHENA-FIDUS, which was operational at 38°E, with satellite HS-4 (also known as "HS-4/SGS-1"), launched by Greece on 5 February 2019 for positioning at 39°E. It was to be noted that, in response to queries raised by the Bureau regarding the bringing back into use of the Greek network in 2016, Greece had invoked Article 48 of the ITU Constitution for the frequency bands 20.2-21.2 GHz and 30-31 GHz.

9.2 Turning to the late submission by Greece in Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/5, taken up by the Board for information, he noted that the question of the date of receipt of France's submission by the Bureau had been clarified by Mr Botha (SGD) when the Board had adopted its agenda for the present meeting; the submission was thus receivable. Greece nevertheless expressed significant concerns regarding the unorthodox procedure followed by the French Administration in requesting the Director to submit its request to the Board without first requesting clarification, in accordance with No. 13.6, from the Bureau. The Greek Administration therefore requested that, if it was deemed receivable, consideration of France's request should at least be deferred to the Board's 81<sup>st</sup> meeting in order to give Greece time to prepare the defence of its position for consideration by the Board. Greece nevertheless went on to make various points regarding the substance of the case, *inter alia*: unlike France, Greece had no filings at orbital slots other than 39°E in the frequency bands which France wanted to suppress; it questioned why France had chosen orbital position 38°E rather than a number of other positions available to it; it expressed astonishment that France had submitted its formal request to the Board out of the blue, despite positive discussions held in good faith over several years between the two administrations to try to coordinate the filings concerned; and it questioned France's timing in submitting its request vis-à-vis the launch of Greece's satellite and its bringing back into use of network HELLAS-SAT-2G in full conformity with the Radio Regulations. Greece also stressed the importance of the filings concerned to Greece's public and military sectors.

9.3 **Mr Varlamov** regretted that the late submission from Greece was available only in English, and requested that efforts be made in the future to ensure that all documents were available in the working languages required by the Board.

9.4 **Mr Botha (SGD)** said that every effort was always made to do so, but it was not always possible, depending on the workload facing the translation services and the length of the documents. Regarding late submissions, there was no formal requirement to have them translated.

9.5 The **Director** added that the translation services had faced considerable workloads recently, not least with CPM-2, which had produced its voluminous report to WRC-19 in all working languages. Every effort would be made in the future, particularly regarding late submissions relating

to items already on the Board's agenda, as those submissions were more likely be taken up by the Board than other late submissions.

9.6 **Mr Mchunu** requested clarification regarding Greece's objection to the fact that France had made its submission directly to the Board, without proceeding under No. 13.6 and thereby ensuring that Greece was consulted first on the matter.

9.7 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** and **Mr Botha (SGD)** said that, although the procedure under No. 13.6 was most often followed, administrations were free to make submissions in regard to the Radio Regulations directly to the Board at any time.

9.8 **Mr Talib** said that the matter before the Board was both complex and sensitive, with France basing its case on non-use of the bands concerned and Greece invoking Article 48 for some of the bands. Moreover, the filings had acquired a certain status, having been notified and recorded in the Master Register for some time. He, too, noted that not all documentation was available in the languages required by Board members. His proposal at the present juncture would be to take no steps to cancel the assignments and to ask the parties involved to continue their coordination efforts.

9.9 **Mr Azzouz** noted that the initial bringing into use of Greece's network was already registered in the MIFR, so if there was to be any discussion of the bands and characteristics used, the Bureau should be consulted rather than the manufacturer and launcher, as all the relevant information was in the BR database, and it must be assumed to be correct. He also noted that Greece had requested the bringing into use of the entire Ka band, which was of considerable importance to development and investment on the part of developing countries. Bearing in mind the list of possible types of information (Circular Letter CR/343) that might be requested to verify the receiving and transmitting capability of a satellite for the purposes of confirming bringing into use and the date thereof, he said that a possible compromise way forward might be to suggest that the Bureau conduct an investigation under No. 13.6 and in doing so request the notifying administration to provide full details on such items as launch vehicle, launch facilities, contract, etc., with a view to checking that everything matched. Once that information had been received, a frequency plan should also be requested. The Bureau should be requested to organize coordination meetings between the two administrations and report back to the Board at its next meeting. The administrations should be encouraged to spare no effort to reach consensus on a way forward, and cancellation of the assignments should not be envisaged, not least because of the investment made.

9.10 **Mr Alamri** agreed that the matter was extremely sensitive particular when it is related request of suppression of frequency assignments of satellite network recorded in the MIFR many years ago. On the one hand, Greece's assignments had been recorded in the MIFR since 2013, and had met all regulatory requirements in terms of bringing into use, suspension, bringing back into use and resuspension, and the successful launch of new satellite in 05 Feb 2019 to bring back into use the frequency assignments by the regulatory deadline was a result of significant investment based on the satellite network defined regulatory status confirmed by BR in 2013 after fulfilling all regulatory requirements and in compliance with related provisions of Radio Regulations; on the other, the French Administration main point raised is related to their doubt about the initial bringing into use of most of KA band by HELLAS-SAT-2G back in 2013 based on various elements collected from different industrial parties and provided as evidence of their request. In principle, verifying bringing into use and other statuses fell under the Bureau's responsibility under Article 13, in particular No. 13.6, and included consulting the notifying administration at first stage requesting clarification, and in case of disagreement establishing a report and presenting the case to the Board

along with the views of all the parties concerned. He would therefore be in favour of referring the matter to the Bureau to deal with under Article 13 according to the normal procedure.

9.11 **Mr Borjón** said that the matter was both sensitive and exceptional, and due process should be followed, applying No. 13.6 in order to ensure that the interests of all parties were respected. He questioned whether the Board could even consider taking a retroactive decision regarding a system when a new satellite, presumably with the capacity to implement all the frequencies, was moving to the orbital position concerned in order to bring the system back into use.

9.12 **Mr Hashimoto** agreed with previous speakers. The Greek Administration should be given time to react adequately to the proposed suppression, and investigation by the Bureau under Article 13 should be recommended. Dialogue between the two parties should be encouraged. The Board could take a decision on the matter at its next meeting, based on any further developments.

9.13 **Ms Beaumier** agreed with most of the points made by previous speakers, but warned that the fact that a new satellite had been launched with all the necessary capabilities could not *per se* justify failure to comply with regulatory requirements, whether past or present, and the Board must avoid sending out such a message. It was unfortunate that concerns had not been raised much earlier with the Bureau of the Board – although it seemed they had been raised in 2016 by the French administration to the Greek administration. Every effort should be made to accommodate all systems to the extent possible, but the evidence submitted by France should be looked into as it came not only from the industry, but from the manufacturer and government agencies as well. The Bureau had obviously carried out all relevant examinations in the past regarding bringing into use, due diligence, etc., but when new information emerged matters should be looked into again. The Bureau should therefore be requested to investigate the matter, *inter alia* by seeking to clarify various inconsistencies in Greece's late submission, including the possible use of one satellite to bring more than one network into use. The parties should be encouraged to continue to meet to find a common way forward, including with the assistance of the Bureau. Ultimately, even if the French Administration was correct in its assertions, the parties concerned would still need to find a way to accommodate one another through coordination.

9.14 **Mr Hoan** said that the Board must examine the submissions before it very carefully. The information submitted by France appeared to be very clear. The Greek Administration, for its part, complained about the manner in which the French Administration had raised the matter. He recalled that in its report to WRC-15 under Resolution 80, the Board had addressed the matter of requests under No. 13.6 based on reliable information, and what precisely was meant by reliable information and for what purposes it could be used, bearing in mind that not all information available was accurate. In all events, the Board could certainly not cancel Greece's assignments without first consulting the Greek Administration properly. The matter should be referred to the Bureau, requesting it to communicate with the Greek Administration, to investigate the case and to report back to the Board at its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting.

9.15 **Mr Varlamov**, also stressing the sensitivity of the matter, said that a number of elements required clarification in the submissions by both parties (but had not been checked by the Bureau because the matter had been submitted directly to the Board), relating for example to the conditions under which the correspondence from Lockheed Martin in France's submission had been published. Moreover, Annex 4 in France's submission contained various data from the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, some of which were incomplete, but nothing to confirm what frequencies had actually been used. No reports of interference had been made; objections had only been raised when a new satellite had been launched, with the French



Administration requesting the Board to cancel the assignments for which it had been built. He further noted that the table in Annex 2 to Document RRB19-1/10 appeared to suggest that one satellite had been used to bring more than one network into use, which should also be looked into. The Board should not contemplate cancelling the assignments at the present juncture, but should refer the matter to the Bureau for investigation. He was confident the Bureau, with its extensive experience, would be able to get the parties concerned to reach agreement.

9.16 **Ms Hasanova** also noted the sensitivity of the issue, and said that the participants concerned should be given the time required to continue their discussions to reach agreement on coordination, with the Bureau reporting to the Board at its next meeting.

9.17 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** observed that the French Administration specifically challenged the initial bringing into use of the assignments, i.e. concerning the period 2013-2016, and not the subsequent period. It was therefore the Bureau's understanding that, if asked to conduct an investigation under No. 13.6, it should investigate that specific period. The difference between the present case and many others – for example, the request by the United Kingdom regarding certain Arabsat networks at the present meeting – was that in the present case the French Administration had not requested an investigation under No. 13.6 before bringing the matter before the Board. He further observed that the Bureau had looked into the list of Resolution 49 provided in Annex 2, and all appeared to be correct. Commenting briefly on the Bureau's investigations under No. 13.6 in general, he said that the Bureau had begun such investigations in 2009, honing its approach more and more over the years, so that now they had become more precise and often involved partial suppressions relating to small portions of band.

9.18 **Mr Alamri** said that the implications of modifying the status of networks and assignments brought into use and recorded in the Master Register many years ago in compliance with related provisions of Radio Regulations must be weighed very carefully, as, over and above the investment made, such modifications could undermine the records kept in the Master Register and indeed the entire notification process. Any such modification must be fully justified and clearly based on specific regulatory provisions.

9.19 **Mr Varlamov** observed that consideration of the present case begged the question of how far into the past investigations under No. 13.6 could be conducted. Great caution must be exerted in applying No. 13.6 retroactively, as elements regarding cases might have become unavailable with the passing of time.

9.20 The **Chairman** said that the Board had discussed the retroactive application of No. 13.6 at past meetings and had not reached a specific decision, except to say that a case-by-case approach must always apply.

9.21 **Mr Alamri** questioned what specifically could justify the retroactive application of No. 13.6 in the present case, while if there was any objections from administrations about the initial bring into use of frequency assignments in 2013, should be raised during that period.

9.22 **Ms Beaumier** said that, in general, the retroactive application of No. 13.6 should be avoided. In the present case, however, some of the information provided might warrant making an exception to that general approach.

9.23 **Mr Varlamov** added that the present case could be deemed exceptional because the usual sequence had not been followed: usually, an administration requested the application of No. 13.6 before the case was submitted to the Board.

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

“The Board considered Document RRB19-1/10 and noted Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/5 for information. The Board confirmed that Document RRB19-1/10 was received before the regulatory limit for submissions. The Board further considered that:

- The suppression of frequency assignments was a sensitive matter and should be considered very carefully according to the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations;
- The submission from the Administration of France referred to the initial bringing-into-use period from 18 October 2013 to 18 January 2014 only;
- The Administration of Greece had invoked CS Article 48 for the frequency assignments to the HELLAS-SAT-2G satellite network in the frequency bands 20.2-21.2 GHz and 30-31 GHz during the bringing back into use of these frequency assignments in 2016;
- The normal procedure for such cases would be for administrations to request the Bureau to perform an investigation under RR No. 13.6 before reporting the matter to the Board, if an administration disagrees with the conclusions of the Bureau.

The Board noted that a satellite had been launched on 5 February 2019 to implement the HELLAS-SAT-2G satellite network at 39°E, but considered that this fact as such should not be a reason to disregard the applicable provisions of the Radio Regulations.

Consequently, the Board decided that it was not yet in a position to take a decision on this matter, and therefore the Board instructed the Bureau to:

- Perform an investigation on this case under RR No. 13.6 and report the outcome to the 81<sup>st</sup> Board meeting;
- Convene a coordination meeting(s) with the Administrations of France and Greece.

The Board further noted the use of one satellite to bring into use several satellite networks and instructed the Bureau to investigate this practice under Resolution 40 (WRC-15) and to report the outcome to its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting.”

9.25 It was so **agreed**.

9.26 Making a general comment, **Mr Henri** said that it would be useful for the Board to discuss the sensitive question of retroactive application fully at some stage, in order to avoid having to rediscuss it each time it arose.

## **10 Requests for the cancellation of frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of the United Kingdom requesting the suppression of the frequency assignments to the ARABSAT-KA-30.5E, ARABSAT 5A-30.5E and ARABSAT 7A- 30.5E satellite networks in the ranges 17 700-22 000 MHz and 27 500-30 000 MHz (Documents RRB19-1/11, RRB19-1/DELAYED/2 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/6)**

10.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** provided a detailed introduction to Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/2, which replaced Document RRB19-1/11 and in which the Administration of the United Kingdom requested the Board to suppress the frequency assignments associated with the ARABSAT-KA-30.5E, ARABSAT 5A-30.5E and ARABSAT 7A-30.5E satellite networks in the ranges 17 700-22 000 MHz and 27 500-30 000 MHz on the grounds that certain provisions of Article 11 had not been complied with. He noted *inter alia* that, according to the Administration of the United Kingdom, a number of coordination meetings had been held between 2012 and 2017 but had resulted in no

agreements; that the Administration of the United Kingdom had proposed a further meeting in November 2018, but had been informed by the Administration of Saudi Arabia that it was not available before April 2019; and that any Arabsat priority rights were not absolute and could not be exercised to harm or impede the United Kingdom's networks. The United Kingdom also pointed out that dates of receipt of the coordination requests for the Arabsat networks were slightly earlier than that of Avanti, meaning that there was a distinct risk that Arabsat would claim a priority and argue that coordination could not be completed. The United Kingdom wished to avoid a situation in which it would have to take action against its operator, Avanti, at the request of the Administration of Saudi Arabia (acting on behalf of Arabsat) after the launch of the Arabsat-6A space station in March 2019. In the absence of a coordination agreement, that launch created an imminent risk of harmful interference to the United Kingdom's frequency assignments. Should the Board decide not to suppress the frequency assignments, it was requested to consider alternative action, such as mandating additional measurements or further meetings between the parties under the auspices of the Bureau.

10.2 He added that the Administration of the United Kingdom had asked the Bureau, in November 2018, to conduct an inquiry under No. 13.6. The Bureau had replied that it had received information from the notifying administration to the effect that all the frequency assignments had been brought into use, and that unless the Administration of the United Kingdom could provide more updated information, it was not in a position to conduct such an inquiry.

10.3 In Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/6, the Administration of Saudi Arabia provided the following further information: the orbital position at 30.5°E had been in use since 1996 and Arabsat had brought into use all registered frequency assignments at that position; the Administration of the United Kingdom had registered its Ka filings on a non-interference basis under No. 11.41; and in 2012, Avanti had deployed the Hylas-2 satellite in the Ka band at 31°E without any preliminary coordination (Avanti reportedly managed its service area in such a way as to avoid coverage overlaps). The Administration of Saudi Arabia was concerned that the Administration of the United Kingdom had proposed a meeting around the time of the launch date of ARABSAT-6A in order to acquire priority and thereby obtain a coordination advantage. It specified that, notwithstanding any information made available publically, ARABSAT-6A would not be launched earlier than the second quarter of 2019. In addition, no information had been made public about ARABSAT-5A, which operated a governmental network providing non-commercial services, as the Bureau had been informed in 2011. In conclusion, the Administration of Saudi Arabia said that it had provided detailed information about the ARABSAT-5A Ka-band satellite system to the Bureau on a non-disclosure basis and had invoked the application of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution in relation to the Arabsat satellite networks at 30.5°E. It encouraged the Administration of the United Kingdom and Avanti to reinstate the coordination process.

10.4 The **Chairman**, referring to Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/6, recalled that previous discussions in the Board and at the WRC had made it clear that the term "military use", not "governmental use", should be employed when invoking Article 48 of the Constitution. Referring to Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/2, she said that she assumed that the suggestion that further meetings be mandated by the Board "which the RRB moderate" was an error; it would be for the Bureau, not the Board, to moderate such meetings.

10.5 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** confirmed that the Administration of Saudi Arabia had provided the Bureau with detailed confidential information on governmental use in 2011. The Bureau had not treated it as Article 48 information at that time, all the information required under the Radio Regulations having been provided. Regarding Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/2, it was his

understanding that the Administration of the United Kingdom wished the Board to conclude that a coordination meeting should be organized and held under Bureau auspices.

10.6 **Mr Varlamov**, noting that both documents contained very similar requests to the effect that the parties should meet under Bureau auspices, said that he was in favour of such a meeting, which would help avoid future harmful interference and save the Board time.

10.7 **Mr Henri** agreed. The goal was to ensure that the two satellite operators were able to reach a coordination agreement enabling their satellites to operate without interference. A coordination meeting should be organized as soon as possible, under the auspices of the Bureau, in view of the imminent launch of ARABSAT-6A satellite.

10.8 **Mr Azzouz** asked whether the Board was mandated to take up issues related to Article 48 of the Constitution. The Board had discussed a similar case involving the Administration of the United Arab Emirates at its 79<sup>th</sup> meeting. It should bear in mind its decision in that case.

10.9 **Mr Talib** said that the Arabsat networks at 30.5°E had been registered since 1996. The Avanti network at 31°E had been notified by the Administration of the United Kingdom under No. 11.41, i.e. on a non-interference and non-protection basis vis-à-vis Arabsat. Avanti had deployed a satellite at 31°E in 2012 without the need for coordination with Arabsat. That need had emerged after the satellite's deployment, and discussions had been held with a view to protecting Arabsat's governmental, non-commercial services. There were three reasons why, as the Administration of the United Kingdom had noted, no interference had been observed between the two satellite networks: Arabsat's steerable beams were directed at very small areas; the transmissions were short; and the frequency used for military purposes, which was not necessarily known to Arabsat, might not have been used during the period monitored. It was well known that application of No. 13.6 involved certain particularities. The Administration of Saudi Arabia had invoked Article 48 of the Constitution in a letter sent to the Bureau in 2011, i.e. before WRC-15 and the entry into force of the requirement that explicit reference be made to "military" use. It now wished to invoke Article 48 of the Constitution in respect of the Ka-band available on ARABSAT 5A-30.5E. Under its terms of reference, the Board could not take a decision with reference to Article 48 of the Constitution. He reminded the Board that ARABSAT-6A, in which large sums had been invested, would soon be launched. Suppression at such a late stage was therefore surely not an option. The annex to Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/6 bore out the fact that an administration was operating ARABSAT-5A in the Ka-band. He therefore considered that the solution was to continue coordination.

10.10 **Mr Hashimoto** observed that both documents suggested a similar approach, namely meaningful coordination between both administrations under Bureau auspices.

10.11 **Ms Beaumier** also noted that both parties wanted coordination discussions to take place under the auspices of the Bureau as soon as possible. In addition, in Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/2, the Administration of the United Kingdom referred to the rule of procedure on No. 9.6, in which the Board had concluded that "in application of Article 9, no administration obtains any particular priority as a result of being the first to start either the advance publication phase or the request for coordination procedure". That principle should be reaffirmed in the Board's decision in the current case. It was unfortunate that, once again, the case had come before the Board so late. Both parties presented reasonable arguments as to why there had been or would be no interference: the Board was not necessarily in a position to judge. Its priority should be to have the parties meet as soon as possible with a view to reaching a coordination agreement.

10.12 **Mr Mchunu** agreed with previous speakers that the Board should propose continued coordination and revisit the matter, as required, at its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting.

10.13 **Mr Henri** pointed out that the frequency assignments of the Administration of the United Kingdom registered in the MIFR under No. 11.41 had been notified on a non-interference basis; thus, if harmful interference under the terms of No. 11.41 occurred, the Administration of the United Kingdom would obviously have to do everything it could to eliminate it. Secondly, under its terms of reference the Board was authorized to take decisions on all cases, however exercising greater caution in cases involving Article 48 of the Constitution. Regarding the case at hand, he agreed that a meeting should be organized as soon as possible, under the auspices of the Bureau, with a view to reaching at least an operational agreement satisfactory to both parties before the new satellite became operational. During the discussions, both parties had to abide by the general rules governing the coordination process, in particular the rule of procedure on No. 9.6, according to which no party obtained an advantage as being first to submit a satellite network filing to the Bureau. The launch of a satellite was also not to be considered a *fait accompli* allowing an administration to escape application of the Radio Regulations.

10.14 In reply to a remark by **Mr Azzouz**, the **Chairman** said that her understanding was that Arabsat questioned the action taken by the Administration of the United Kingdom in the belief that to suppress the frequency assignments involved would result in a change in priority. She believed that the Board's conclusion should be more generally to promote continued coordination under the Bureau's auspices; it should not comment on the arguments invoked by the parties.

10.15 **Ms Beaumier** said that the issue of priority would be addressed by having the conclusion refer to the rule of procedure on No. 9.6.

10.16 **Mr Henri** said that the Board's conclusion should also indicate that a decision on the status of the frequency assignments called into question by the Administration of the United Kingdom remained pending. With regard to the question of priority, he recalled that coordination was established on the basis of the date of receipt of the complete coordination information. In the case at hand, the Bureau had received information on the Arabsat networks before the UK satellite networks. In accordance with the precepts set out in the Radio Regulations, that date could not be changed, but some frequency assignments of the involved networks may be suppressed if not in conformity with the No. 11.44 bringing into use and continuing use. The Board should recall the rule of procedure on No. 9.6 and remind the parties to coordinate in good faith.

10.17 The **Chairman** agreed that the provisions of Appendix 4 established which administration had priority once and for all. She suggested that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

"The Board considered Document RRB19-1/11 and noted Documents RRB19-1/DELAYED/2 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/6 for information. The Board noted that:

- The Administration of the United Kingdom had previously requested the Bureau to perform an investigation under RR No. 13.6, which concluded that all frequency assignments had been brought into use;
- The Administration of Saudi Arabia had invoked CS Article 48 with respect to the use of the frequency assignments to the satellite networks, however all the required information under the provisions of the Radio Regulations had been provided.

Consequently, the Board decided not to take any decision at this stage on the status of the contested ARABSAT frequency assignments and to instruct the Bureau to organize as soon as possible, taking into account the imminent launch of the ARABSAT-6A satellite, a coordination meeting between the

Administrations of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom and encouraged these administrations to observe the rules of procedure on RR No. 9.6 and coordinate in good will. The Board instructed the Bureau to report to the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board the progress on this matter.”

10.18 It was so agreed.

**11 Requests relating to extensions of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use satellite network frequency assignments: Submission by the Administration of Cyprus requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the KYPROS-SAT-5 (39°E) and KYPROS-SAT-3 (39°E) satellite networks (Document RRB19-1/6)**

11.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB19-1/6, in which the Administration of Cyprus requested that the final deadline for the resumption of service of the KYPROS-SAT-5 (39°E) and KYPROS-SAT-3 (39°E) satellite networks under No. 11.49 and §8.17 of Appendix 30B be extended from the current date of 6 June 2019 to 6 October 2019. The case of KYPROS-SAT-5 was straightforward, the frequency assignments having been suspended on 6 June 2016. In the case of KYPROS-SAT-3, however, a suspension had been requested, but not granted, at the 78<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board, which had instructed the Bureau to continue processing the filings for the network, to take into account its frequency assignments until the last day of WRC-19, and to report the case to WRC-19 for a decision. According to the Administration of Cyprus, the KYPROS-SAT-5 and KYPROS-SAT-3 satellite networks had initially been scheduled for launch on the HS-4 satellite in December 2018, but the launch had been postponed to 5 February 2019 owing to an issue of co-passenger readiness, as explained in a letter from Arianespace (annex to Cyprus’ input in Document RRB19-1/6). The HS-4 satellite had subsequently been launched on that date and was currently performing orbit-raising manoeuvres. The fact that it was using electrical propulsion would affect its date of arrival at 39°E, which was why the Administration of Cyprus had requested a four-month extension. The Administration of Cyprus considered that its request was in line with the advice of the ITU Legal Adviser to the Board’s 60<sup>th</sup> meeting and with the decision taken by WRC-12 and confirmed by WRC-15 that the Board was authorized to address requests for time-limit extensions arising from co-passenger delays or *force majeure* in so far as the extension was limited and qualified.

11.2 **Mr Hoan** said that the Board should consider the requests for an extension separately for each satellite network. The extension for KYPROS-SAT-5 was not difficult to approve, in view of the above-mentioned decision by WRC-12 and WRC-15. Regarding KYPROS-SAT-3, he recalled that, at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Board had decided not to accede to the request of the Administration of Cyprus to grant a suspension but had instead decided to refer the matter to WRC-19. The regulatory time-frame was therefore unclear, making it very difficult to grant the present request. The request should be brought to the attention of WRC-19, which would decide on the periods of suspension and extension, if any.

11.3 **Mr Alamri**, observing that the HS-4 satellite had been launched and was currently engaged in orbit-raising manoeuvres with a view to reaching its final orbital position, said that the Board should not distinguish between the requests in respect of KYPROS-SAT-5 and KYPROS-SAT-3. At its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Board had instructed the Bureau to continue processing the KYPROS-SAT-3 filing and to take into account its frequency assignments until the last day of WRC-19. However, the deadline for bringing the frequency assignments back into use was 6 June 2019, several months before WRC-19. Given the decision of both WRC-12 and WRC-15 that the Board had authority to grant extensions in cases involving co-passenger delays or *force majeure*, he considered that it should extend the time-limit for both satellite networks.

11.4 **Mr Azzouz** said that the requests pertaining to KYPROS-SAT-5 and KYPROS-SAT-3 should be considered separately. The case of KYPROS-SAT-5 was easily resolved, as it involved a co-passenger issue. Regarding KYPROS-SAT-3, the conclusion adopted by the Board at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting applied. If WRC-19 decided to extend the deadline to 6 June 2019, the Board could grant a further extension of four months owing to the fact that satellites using electrical propulsion took four to ten months to reach their orbital positions.

11.5 **Mr Varlamov** also considered that the request from the Administration of Cyprus involved two different situations. The situation of KYPROS-SAT-5 was simple, and the Board was in a position to grant the extension. In the case of KYPROS-SAT-3, at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Board had instructed the Bureau to continue to process the filing until the last day of WRC-19; it had thereby in a way already granted an extension. In its report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07), the Board might make it clear that it had received a further request regarding KYPROS-SAT-3. Regarding the period of the extension for bringing back into use the frequency assignments, he pointed out that the HS-4 satellite had been launched just five days after the initial window of 15 December 2018 to 31 January 2019, yet the Administration of Cyprus was requesting an extension of four months. Given that extensions should be limited and qualified, the Board should reflect on the duration of extension to be granted in the case of KYPROS-SAT-5 and request a similar extension for KYPROS-SAT-3 in its report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07).

11.6 **Ms Beaumier** agreed that a four-month extension was not justified by the information available in Document RRB19-1/6 and that the extension for KYPROS-SAT-5 posed no difficulties. For KYPROS-SAT-3, the Board should align its conclusion with the decision it had made at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting, but recommend to WRC-19 that, if it agreed to the suspension, the extension should be the same for both networks.

11.7 **Mr Azzouz**, observing that the frequency assignments for KYPROS-SAT-5 had been suspended for the period 6 June 2016 to 6 June 2019, said that the Administration of Cyprus had clearly requested an extension for both networks in respect of the latter date, i.e. to 6 October 2019, not in respect of the launch date.

11.8 **Ms Beaumier** agreed. However, the Administration of Cyprus had expected to meet the deadline of 6 June 2019 with a satellite launch in December 2018; the actual launch had taken place only five to six weeks later.

11.9 **Mr Alamri** confirmed that satellites using electrical propulsion took longer to reach their orbital positions. He pointed out that the four-month extension requested by the Administration of Cyprus would end on 6 October 2019, which was before the start of WRC-19.

11.10 **Mr Borjón** said that his understanding was that the Board had not granted an extension in respect of KYPROS-SAT-3 at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting because no such extension had been requested for reasons of co-passenger delay or *force majeure*. According to the new information made available, a co-passenger delay had arisen in the meantime. The Board should therefore revisit the request, as the co-passenger delay was valid for both KYPROS-SAT-5 and KYPROS-SAT-3.

11.11 **Ms Beaumier**, while agreeing that the period of extension would run from 6 June 2019 to 6 October 2019, said that it was clear from §2 of Document RRB19-1/6 that the Administration of Cyprus had allowed for the longer time required by a satellite using electrical propulsion to reach its orbital position. The justification for a four-month extension therefore remained unclear.

11.12 **Mr Hoan** maintained that the case of KYPROS-SAT-5 should be dealt with separately from that of KYPROS-SAT-3 because, in the latter case, the Board had simply asked the Bureau to continue

processing the filing; it had referred the decision on the suspension to WRC-19. He also shared Mr Varlamov's concern about the duration of any extension granted. In practice, the Bureau and the Board did not analyse how many days and months were needed. The Administration of Cyprus had asked for four months because the satellite concerned used electrical propulsion; it was therefore not difficult to agree to four months in the case of KYPROS-SAT-5.

11.13 **Mr Varlamov** said that the Administration of Cyprus was requesting a period of extension that appeared to be twice as long as the launch delay incurred; one or two months should suffice. In acceding to that request, the Board would set a precedent, and might therefore find it difficult to turn down a future request for an extension of eight months or one year. The decision on KYPROS-SAT-3 had to be taken at WRC-19. In the absence of a decision to suspend the frequency assignments, there could be no decision to extend the period for bringing them back into use. The same extensions had to be granted in both cases, and they were therefore contingent on the decision in respect of KYPROS-SAT-3 made at WRC-19.

11.14 **Ms Beaumier** agreed that the Board should conclude separately on the two cases: on KYPROS-SAT-5 at the current meeting, and on KYPROS-SAT-3, without prejudice to the decision of WRC-19, on aspects other than the duration of the extension, which should be the same in both cases. The question of the duration of the extension involved a matter of principle, and the Board's decision should reflect the fact that there was no rationale for a four-month extension.

11.15 **Mr Hashimoto**, having examined the documents submitted to the 78<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board, noted that the Administration of Cyprus had requested a suspension for the bringing back into use of the frequency assignments to both KYPROS-SAT-5 and KYPROS-SAT-3 at that time. While it was clear that the Board had not agreed to grant a suspension in the case of KYPROS-SAT-3, it was unclear whether it had done so in the case of KYPROS-SAT-5.

11.16 **Mr Hoan** replied that the situations of KYPROS-SAT-5 and KYPROS-SAT-3 had been different as of their registration. KYPROS-SAT-3 had affected a Ukrainian allotment, and the Board had therefore been unable to decide on a suspension. KYPROS-SAT-5 had affected no other allotments, and the Board had therefore been able to make such a decision. He agreed that the Board, in order not to overburden WRC-19, could decide on the duration of the extension in both cases, but it had to refer the decision to suspend the KYPROS-SAT-3 filing to WRC-19. The general issue of the duration of extensions could be raised in the Board's report to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07).

11.17 **Mr Alamri** said that an extension of four months was not long when viewed in terms of the entire launch window, commencing on 15 December 2018.

11.18 **Mr Azzouz** pointed out that, in previous cases, the Board had granted extensions of up to 11 months in cases involving co-passenger delay or *force majeure*. Considered in that light, the request from the Administration of Cyprus for a four-month extension did not appear unreasonable.

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

"The Board considered the submission from the Administration of Cyprus provided in Document RRB19-1/6. The Board further considered the decision of the Board at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting concerning the bringing into use of the KYPROS-SAT-3 (39°E) satellite network.

Based on the information provided the Board concluded that the situation concerning the KYPROS-SAT-5 (39°E) satellite network qualified to be considered as a case of co-passenger delay. Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request from the Administration of Cyprus to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the KYPROS-



SAT-5 (39°E) satellite network until 6 October 2019. However, based on its decision at its 78<sup>th</sup> meeting and concerning the frequency assignment to the KYPROS-SAT-3 (39°E) satellite network, the Board was not able to accede to the request from the Administration of Cyprus. Furthermore, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to continue implementing the decision from the 78<sup>th</sup> Board meeting and to report this case also to WRC-19 for a decision.

The Board observed that should WRC-19 decide favourably on the request presented at the 78<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, WRC-19 might consider a similar extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the KYPROS-SAT-3 (39°E) satellite network.

The Board indicated that it would have appreciated more detailed clarifications on the length of the requested extension period.”

11.20 It was so agreed.

**12 Requests relating to extensions of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use satellite network frequency assignments: Submission by the Administration of Greece requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the HELLAS-SAT-2G (39°E) and HELLAS-SAT-3G (39°E) satellite networks (Document RRB19-1/8)**

12.1 **Mr Loo (SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB19-1/8, in which the Administration of Greece requested an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use satellite networks HELLAS-SAT-2G and HELLAS-SAT-3G on the grounds of co-passenger delay. Those circumstances were confirmed by Arianespace in its correspondence reproduced in Annex 1 to Greece’s submission. The initial launch slot had been from 15 December 2018 to 31 January 2019; the launch had actually taken place on 5 February 2019. The satellite was now in the process of orbit-raising, using an electrical system. The bringing back into use deadline had been 6 June 2019, and a four-month extension was requested, to 6 October 2019. Responding to a question from **Ms Beaumier**, he said that whereas the HELLAS-SAT-3G network came under Appendix 30B, the HELLAS-SAT-2G network came under the unplanned bands. All relevant regulatory provisions had been complied with.

12.2 **Ms Beaumier** said that the case under discussion was very similar to the case just concluded upon by the Board involving the two Cypriot networks. She considered that the Board should grant the extension requested and express the same concern regarding its length.

12.3 **Mr Talib** supported Ms Beaumier, and noted that orbit-raising using electrical systems took longer than with other, hitherto more commonly used methods.

12.4 **Mr Alamri** and **Mr Borjón** agreed with the previous speakers.

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

“The Board considered the submission from the Administration of Greece provided in Document RRB19-1/8. Based on the information provided the Board concluded that the situation qualified to be considered as a case of co-passenger delay. Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request from the Administration of Greece to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the HELLAS-SAT-2G (39°E) and HELLAS-SAT-3G (39°E) satellite networks until 6 October 2019.

The Board further indicated that it would have appreciated more detailed clarifications on the length of the requested extension period.”

12.6 It was so agreed.

**13 Submission by the Administration of the United Kingdom requesting consideration of**

**interference issues affecting the reception of United Kingdom coordinated and agreed HF broadcasting stations (Documents RRB19-1/9, RRB19-1/DELAYED/1 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/4)**

13.1 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)**, introducing Document RRB19-1/9 and, for information, Documents RRB19-1/DELAYED/1 and RRB19-1/DELAYED/4, recalled that the Board had addressed the issue at its 79<sup>th</sup> meeting. Not much had changed since then. In Document RRB19-1/9, the United Kingdom reported that interference continued, and Annex A to its submission listed the frequencies affected. The United Kingdom considered that the problems of interference in question could not be resolved through HFCC meetings, which had routinely and successfully dealt with coordination between the Administrations of China and the United Kingdom in the past; it noted that China's monitoring results as submitted to the Board's 79<sup>th</sup> meeting had not concurred with the United Kingdom's, and that the United Kingdom was confident that the interference was coming from the territory of China. The United Kingdom was prepared to submit a request under No. 15.43 of the Radio Regulations. The United Kingdom confirmed its readiness to participate in Bureau-convened bilateral meetings with China.

13.2 Noting that Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/1 from the United Kingdom simply contained a straightforward correction to Annex A to Document RRB19-1/9, he said that in Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/4 China responded to the United Kingdom's submission in Document RRB19-1/9 by indicating that two of the five frequencies reported by the United Kingdom as receiving interference had been coordinated by the two countries, and that no reports concerning the other three had been received since 2018. China preferred to pursue matters through bilateral negotiations, and was now prepared to participate in a Bureau-convened meeting. It nevertheless observed that radiomonitoring by the United Kingdom on one of the five frequencies had been effected in China, which contravened China's national regulations.

13.3 **Mr Hashimoto** welcomed the progress that appeared to have been made, with China now prepared to participate in a Bureau-convened meeting. He looked forward to positive results in the near future.

13.4 **Mr Azzouz** thanked the Bureau for its work on the matter, which affected an important system. The Bureau should be invited to continue its efforts to help the two administrations, availing itself of the numerous international monitoring facilities to which it had access and reporting on results achieved to the Board's 81<sup>st</sup> meeting. A further way forward could be to invite the Administration of the United Kingdom to invoke No. 15.43. The two administrations should be encouraged to continue their coordination efforts in pursuit of a mutually acceptable solution.

13.5 **Mr Hoan** recalled the decision taken by the Board on the same matter at its 79<sup>th</sup> meeting, made, he noted, in the absence of any specific request on the part of the administration making the submission. To his understanding, despite the comments made by both administrations and the United Kingdom's willingness to implement No. 15.43, no specific request was being made now either, and the only difference regarding China's position was its willingness to participate in a Bureau-convened meeting. Given the apparent goodwill on the part of both administrations, the primary way forward should take the form of bilateral negotiations and coordination, with support from the Bureau, before any other means, including international monitoring, were employed.

13.6 **Mr Varlamov** noted that it appeared from the United Kingdom's submission that the two administrations had reached agreement regarding the HFCC A19 season commencing on 31 March 2019 and foresaw no conflict therein. Such being the case, matters might well be resolved very shortly, although only time would tell. Regarding the application of Article 15, it was unclear why the United Kingdom was addressing itself to the Board rather than availing itself of the relevant

regulatory procedures. The Board should not be required to replace either administrations or the Bureau in tackling interference issues, and should only be required to step in when matters could not be resolved through the usual regulatory processes – as in the case of Italy and its neighbouring countries, for example. Moreover, it would be somewhat difficult for the Board to seek to resolve a matter involving United Kingdom broadcasting into China. The Board should encourage the two administrations to conduct bilateral negotiations with a view to achieving coordination.

13.7 The **Chairman** commented that the fact that agreement had been reached between the two administrations regarding the HFCC season that was about to end had not prevented difficulties from arising. She therefore agreed that only time would tell regarding the new season about to start.

13.8 **Mr Alamri** agreed that the two administrations should be encouraged to hold coordination meetings with a view to reaching agreement under Article 12 in a spirit of goodwill. He noted that under No. 15.43, administrations could approach the Bureau directly for the purposes of identifying sources of interference, without having to go through the Board.

13.9 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)**, responding to Mr Varlamov's query as to why the United Kingdom had brought the matter before the Board, said that the United Kingdom had in fact followed the usual sequence of steps, firstly by holding bilateral meetings followed by recourse to the Bureau and now to the Board. In his view the best way forward would be for the two administrations to pursue their bilateral discussions: to invoke No. 15.43 could be seen as demonstrating a lack of trust, which could adversely affect coordination meetings.

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

“The Board considered the submission from the Administration of the United Kingdom provided in Document RRB19-1/9 and also considered Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/1 from the United Kingdom and Document RRB19-1/DELAYED/4 from the Administration of China for information. The Board thanked the Administrations of China and the United Kingdom for the update of the situation since the 79<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board. The Board noted that:

- The Administration of China indicated its readiness to participate in a coordination meeting to be convened by the Bureau;
- Both the Administrations of China and the United Kingdom remained committed to pursuing coordination efforts to resolve the problem of harmful interference.

Consequently, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to convene as soon as possible a coordination meeting between the Administrations of China and the United Kingdom to address the problem of harmful interference and to report progress to a future meeting of the Board.

The Board encouraged administrations to apply the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations and to revert to the Board if such efforts are unsuccessful.”

13.11 It was so **agreed**.

#### **14 Report by the Radio Regulations Board to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07) (Document RRB19-1/2)**

14.1 Following meetings of the Board’s Working Group on Resolution 80 (WRC-07) on 21 and 22 March, the **Chairman** proposed that the Board conclude on the matter as follows:

“The Working Group on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) continued to review the preliminary draft report of the Board to WRC-19 under Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07). The Board instructed the Bureau to circulate the draft report to administrations for comments and to take the necessary actions to make it available as a contribution to the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting, at which time the Board would review it, taking into account the comments from administrations.”

14.2 It was so **agreed**.

#### **15 Confirmation of the dates of the next meeting in 2019 and indicative dates for subsequent meetings**

15.1 The Board **agreed** to confirm 15-19 July 2019 as the dates of its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting, and to tentatively confirm the following dates for subsequent meetings:

82<sup>nd</sup> meeting 14 – 18 October 2019

83<sup>rd</sup> meeting 23 – 27 March 2020

84<sup>th</sup> meeting 6 – 10 July 2020

85<sup>th</sup> meeting 19 – 23 October 2020

#### **16 Approval of the summary of decisions (Document RRB19-1/12)**

16.1 The Board **approved** the summary of decisions as contained in Document RRB19-1/12.

#### **17 Closure of the meeting**

17.1 The **Chairman** thanked everyone who had participated in the present meeting and contributed to its successful outcome. She closed the meeting at 1200 hours on Friday, 22 March 2019.

The Executive Secretary:  
M. MANIEWICZ

The Chairman:  
L. JEANTY