



MINUTES*

OF THE

83RD MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD

25 March 2020 – Teleconference

Present:

Members, RRB

Ms C. BEAUMIER, Chairman

Mr N. VARLAMOV, Vice-Chairman

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

Executive Secretary, RRB

Mr M. MANIEWICZ, Director, BR

Précis-writers

Mr T. ELDRIDGE, Ms S. MUTTI, Mr P. METHVEN

Also present:

Ms J. WILSON, Deputy Director, BR and Chief IAP

Mr A. VALLET, Chief, SSD

Mr C.C. LOO, Head, SSD/SPR

Mr M. SAKAMOTO, Head, SSD/SSC

Mr J. WANG, Head, SSD/SNP

Mr N. VASSILIEV, Chief, TSD

Mr K. BOGENS, Head TSD/FMD

Mr B. BA, Head, TSD/TPR

Ms I. GHAZI, Head, TSD/BCD

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 83rd meeting of the Board. The official decisions of the 83rd meeting of the Radio Regulations Board can be found in Document RRB20-1/16.

Subjects discussed	Documents
1 Opening of the meeting	—
2 Adoption of the agenda, late submissions and deferral of items to the 84 th Board meeting	RRB20-1/OJ/1(Rev.2)
3 Report by the Director of BR	RRB20-1/6+Add. 1-4
4 Issues related to the implementation of Resolution 559 [COM5/3] (WRC-19)	RRB20-1/6, RRB20-1/11(Rev.1), RRB20-1/12, RRB20-1/DELAYED/1
5 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring or bring back into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of China requesting an extension of the regulatory time limits for the bringing into use of the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-115.5E, CHINASAT-D-115.5E_1 and CHINASAT-30B-115.5E satellite networks at 115.5°E	RRB20-1/14
6 Rules of procedure	RRB20-1/7, RRB20-1/15; CR/456, CCRR/64
7 Submission by the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	RRB20-1/13
8 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the ATS-5 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB20-1/1
9 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the HA-1 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB20-1/2
10 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the KOMPSAT-1 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB20-1/3
11 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the OPTOS satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB20-1/4
12 Status of the USASAT-NGSO-4 and USABSS-36 satellite networks	RRB20-1/8, RRB20-1/9
13 Submission by the Administration of Bolivia regarding the recording of the BOLSAT BSS satellite network in the MIFR	RRB20-1/10

- | | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 14 | Confirmation of the next meeting and indicative dates for subsequent meetings | – |
| 15 | Approval of the summary of decisions | RRB20-1/16 |
| 16 | Closure of the meeting | – |

1 Opening of the meeting

1.1 The **Chairman** opened the meeting at 1305 hours on Wednesday, 25 March 2020 and welcomed the members of the Board to the 83rd meeting, which was being held in extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances owing to the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on many countries and the members of the Board.

1.2 The **Director**, speaking also on behalf of the Secretary-General, welcomed the members of the Board, wished them a successful meeting and expressed his appreciation for their participation under the exceptional circumstances.

2 Adoption of the agenda, late submissions and deferral of items to the 84th Board meeting (Document RRB20-1/OJ/1(Rev.2))

2.1 At the proposal of the **Chairman**, the Board **agreed** on that agenda item as follows:

“The draft agenda was adopted with modifications as provided in Document RRB20-1/OJ/1(Rev.2). The Board decided to include Document RRB20-1/DELAYED/1 under agenda item 4.1 for information.

Given the circumstances of the meeting, the Board decided to defer all non-time critical items on the agenda to the 84th Board meeting, except for agenda items 4, 5 and 6.1 that would be considered at this meeting, and that section 9 of Document RRB20-1/6 under agenda item 3 would be considered under agenda item 4. Appropriate actions to be taken in the interim period would be noted against each of the deferred items.”

3 Report by the Director of BR (Document RRB20-1/6 and Addenda 1–4)

3.1 At the proposal of the **Chairman**, the Board **agreed** on that agenda item as follows:

“The Board expressed its appreciation to the Bureau for the information provided in Document RRB20-1/6 and its addenda and decided to defer discussion of the document except as follows:

- a) The Board decided to consider section 9 of Document RRB20-1/6 under agenda item 4. All other sections and addenda of this document were deferred to the 84th Board meeting.”

4 Issues related to the implementation of Resolution 559 [COM5/3] (WRC-19) (Documents RRB20-1/6, RRB20-1/11(Rev.1), RRB20-1/12 and RRB20-1/DELAYED/1)

Resubmission in accordance with the additional temporary regulatory measures in attachment to Resolution 559 [COM5/3] (WRC-19) (§9.1 of Document RRB20-1/6)

4.1 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** drew attention to §9.1 of Document RRB20-1/6, relating to the special procedure set out in Resolution 559 (WRC-19) for Regions 1 and 3 administrations with degraded BSS assignments to regain resources in the BSS Plan. The related submissions were to be sent to the Bureau between 23 March and 21 May 2020. The Bureau, which had received three submissions to date, would make all the submissions available, as received, on a dedicated webpage, so that administrations could make cross-checks. In so doing, administrations might discover that some submissions were incompatible and decide to amend, for example, their orbital positions. It was the Bureau’s understanding that, although each administration could have only one submission under Resolution 559 on 21 May 2020, notifying administrations would be allowed to withdraw and resubmit a notice for the purpose of ensuring compatibility as often as necessary, so long as the final resubmission was received before 21 May 2020. It was also the Bureau’s understanding that such resubmission(s) would incur no additional cost recovery fee, in line with *decides* 10 of Council Decision 482 (Modified 2019). The Board was requested to confirm that understanding.

- 4.2 **Ms Jeanty** said that she agreed with the Bureau's understanding.
- 4.3 **Mr Alamri** confirmed that such was his understanding as well, especially when it came to notices by which administrations having observed an incompatibility modified their submissions.
- 4.4 **Ms Hasanova, Mr Varlamov, Mr Hoan, Mr Talib, Mr Mchunu and Mr Borjón** also indicated their agreement with the Bureau's understanding.
- 4.5 **Mr Borjón** asked whether the Board should confirm its understanding of the cost recovery principle as referred to by Mr Vallet (Chief SSD) or simply note that Council Decision 482 applied, and whether the Bureau anticipated any difficulties in providing assistance to administrations in line with *instructs the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau 2* of Resolution 559.
- 4.6 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** replied that the Bureau had as yet encountered no difficulties in providing assistance. It had published Circular Letter CR/455 to explain the submission process. It had also taken part in two workshops in Africa at which the continent's countries had obtained hands-on experience with the process and with the software tools made available by the Bureau to, for example, simulate new orbital positions. In addition to maintaining the usual channels of communication for assistance, it had opened a dedicated e-mail address to receive questions now that the submission period had started.
- 4.7 Referring to Mr Borjón's question, **Mr Henri** indicated that the Board should simply note the Bureau's approach to cost recovery, the application of Decision 482 being the responsibility of the Council.
- 4.8 **Mr Azzouz** said that he also shared the Bureau's understanding. Noting that the Bureau would not start to examine Resolution 559 submissions until 22 May 2020, he asked what the consequences would be for administrations receiving an unfavourable finding. He urged the Bureau to assist administrations with their submissions.
- 4.9 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)**, noting that Resolution 559 submissions were the equivalent of Part A submissions in the BSS Plan, said that it was extremely rare for the Bureau to issue unfavourable findings in such cases, as the procedure employed generally led to favourable findings: the Bureau checked that the filings received were complete and correct and informed the administration concerned of any omissions; the administration then had 30 days to provide the missing information, after which the filing was processed and published. All necessary corrections were made during the 30-day period. In the case of Resolution 559 submissions, the Bureau had made available model cover letters and examples of the input database that administrations could adapt to their filings; it was therefore confident that the submissions would be of high quality. Unfavourable findings were sometimes issued for unplanned bands, either because the band concerned had not been allocated or because power levels had been exceeded. For Resolution 559 submissions, however, the submission could concern only frequency bands already allocated. Conformity with the Table of Frequency Allocations was therefore guaranteed and it was anticipated that the power limits would be generally met.
- 4.10 **Mr Mchunu and Mr Alamri** pointed out that administrations could opt to use their annual free entitlement for cost recovery.
- 4.11 The **Chairman**, summing up the discussion thus far, took it that the Board wished to note with appreciation the additional explanations provided by the Bureau, to confirm that a notifying administration could withdraw and resubmit a notice as long as there was only one complete submission per eligible administration submitted by 21 May 2020, and to note that, in accordance with *decides 10* of Council Decision 482, no additional cost recovery fees would be charged for resubmissions received within 15 days of the initial date of receipt of the filings.
- 4.12 It was so **agreed** (see §4.56 for the Board's full decision on the agenda item).

Submission by some administrations of Region 1 regarding difficulties encountered in the implementation of Resolution 559 [COM5/3] (WRC-19) (§9.2 of Document RRB20-1/6 and Documents RRB20/11(Rev.1) and RRB20/DELAYED/1)

4.13 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that, in order to identify new orbital positions and new channels, eligible administrations under Resolution 559 would have to take into account the existing BSS Plan List; they would also have to coordinate with certain other submissions that they could not take into account, namely Part A submissions received before the end of WRC-19 or before 21 May 2020 in the GSO arcs that were already available. Such Part A submissions would have a date of receipt prior to the date of receipt of Resolution 559 submissions; however, because they had not yet been entered in the List, their final characteristics were unknown. Moreover, Part A submissions tended to have generic parameters; therefore, even if their characteristics were considered, the results of taking them into account would be less reliable and it would be almost impossible to determine an orbital position that involved no Part A interference.

4.14 Various proposals had been made to ensure that a Part B submission associated with a Part A submission received before 21 May 2020 did not degrade submissions under Resolution 559:

- In §9.2 of Document RRB20-1/6, the Bureau proposed that it should review Part B submissions corresponding to Part A submissions received before 21 May 2020, so as to ascertain whether they would have a negative impact on Resolution 559 submissions. If that proved to be the case, it would ask the Part B notifying administration to review the submission and its characteristics, in order to avoid any negative impact on the Resolution 559 submissions. The Bureau also planned to make suggestions to the notifying administrations to avoid such negative impact.
- In Document RRB20-1/11(Rev.1), 24 countries of Region 1 made four other proposals (§8 of the document), namely to request the Board as follows:
 - “a) At the time of frequency assignments of any of the above-mentioned Part B submissions enter in the List, if the EPM value of the RES 559 submissions fall more than 0.45 dB below 0 dB or if already negative more than 0.45 dB below that value by any of the above-mentioned Part B submissions, the Board to instruct the Bureau not to update the EPM value of the RES 559 submissions pending a decision of WRC-23. The purpose of this procedure is to protect the RES 559 submissions from the interference of the submissions after 21 May 2020 noting that an assignment in the List can only have a period of operation of up to 15 years + 15 years.
 - b) The Board to invite administrations with assignments in the List as published in BR IFIC 2912 to consider modifying, without any change in their date of protection, some characteristics to help eligible administrations with RES 559 submissions, especially those still having low EPM values at the new orbital position.
 - c) The Board to urge administrations with the Part A submissions mentioned in section 4, when preparing the Part B submissions, to make the utmost effort to accommodate RES 559 submissions.
 - d) The Board to instruct the Bureau to remind administrations with the above-mentioned Part A submissions of the need to take into account RES 559 submissions. Those administrations will be identified by using a coordination arc of +/-9 degrees apart from each of the RES 559 submissions.”

4.15 A further six countries of Region 1 had joined the original co-signatories of Document RRB20-1/11(Rev.1) to submit Document RRB20-1/DELAYED/1, in which they informed the Board that new orbital positions had been identified by 31 administrations with very bad reference situations.

4.16 The proposals made in §§8c) and d) of Document RRB20-1/11(Rev.1) were similar to the Bureau's proposal in §9.2 of Document RRB20-1/6. The proposal made in §8b) would be extremely difficult to implement because it was impossible to change the characteristics of assignments already in the List and keep the original date of protection (in the BSS Plan, the same values were used for interference and sensitivity analyses; changes in power level or antenna gain therefore implied changes in interfering power and sensitivity). Regarding the proposal made in §8a), it would be best to ascertain the situation after 21 May 2020 and to conduct a first review at the next Board meeting in July 2020 of the potential action required. There was no urgency, as the Bureau would not start processing Part B submissions before July 2020.

4.17 **Mr Hoan**, having recalled that the basic intention of Resolution 559 was to enable administrations to improve the situation of their Plan assignments, endorsed the proposals made in §§8c) and d).

4.18 **Mr Hashimoto** agreed with the Bureau that it would be best to wait until all Resolution 559 submissions had been received before looking at the impact of Part B submissions and taking action in line with the proposal made in §8a). He endorsed the proposals set out in §§8c) and d).

4.19 **Mr Varlamov** said that, given the difficulties that arose when the reference situation was frozen, he supported the Bureau's proposal to conduct a comprehensive assessment after 21 May 2020 and decide how to move forward on the basis of the results. It must be borne in mind that incompatibilities between Resolution 559 submissions would mean that filings would have to be modified and a date of protection decided on, either 21 May or another date.

4.20 **Ms Jeanty** agreed with the actions indicated in §§8c) and d). She thought that it was certainly advantageous to ask administrations to make their best efforts in this respect, however she noted that these actions are not mandatory according Resolution 559. She also agreed to postpone action on the request made in §8a) until July 2020 and that it was not feasible to modify assignments in line with the proposal made in §8b).

4.21 **Mr Henri, Mr Borjón and Mr Mchunu** indicated that they endorsed the proposals set out in §§8c) and d). They were joined by **Ms Hasanova** in agreeing to postpone action under the proposal made in §8a) until the Board's 84th meeting, when it would have a full picture of all Resolution 559 submissions and the impact of Part B submissions. **Mr Henri** further agreed with the Bureau's analysis of the difficulties in implementing the proposal made in §8b).

4.22 **Mr Talib** agreed with the conclusions and proposal set out in §9.2 of Document RRB20-1/6 and that the Board should wait until after 21 May 2020 to take action in line with §8a), so as to have a complete picture of the situation.

4.23 **Mr Alamri**, referring to the Bureau's proposal in §9.2 of Document RRB20-1/6, expressed concern that the Bureau would be powerless to act if a Part B notifying administration insisted on maintaining its submission and its characteristics that may have a negative impact on Resolution 559 submissions. More practical solutions would therefore have to be sought to protect Resolution 559 submissions. He recalled that the purpose of Resolution 559 was to help administrations with very low equivalent protection margins to obtain new orbital positions affording greater such margins. Unfortunately, WRC-19 had not considered points raised by African administrations in respect of adjacent arcs. He agreed that any decision should be postponed to the Board's 84th meeting, by which time all Resolution 559 submissions would have been received. It was very important, in that connection, to ensure that the Bureau processed no Part B submissions until that decision had been taken. He agreed with Mr Varlamov that it was important to bear in mind the incompatibilities that might arise between Resolution 559 submissions themselves. The Bureau had a role to play after 21 May 2020 to identify any such incompatibilities and inform administrations of any modifications they could make to resolve them.

4.24 **Mr Hashimoto** indicated that he agreed with Mr Alamri that the Board had to take account of the grounds for adopting Resolution 559 when considering the requests set out in Document RRB20-1/11(Rev.1).

4.25 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau would briefly analyse all Resolution 559 submissions on receipt and inform administrations immediately if there were any incompatibilities between them. The aim was to clear up all issues before 21 May 2020, although it might not be possible to do so entirely; further decisions might be required after 21 May 2020. Regarding the processing of Part B submissions, the Bureau had received no Part B submissions affecting the arc since 29 May 2019, and all such submissions had therefore already been published. The Bureau's objective remained to process all Plan submissions within 6 months. The Bureau would therefore have until September 2020, for example, to process a Part B submission it received in the next 24 hours, leaving enough time for it to take account of the Board's deliberations in July 2020. There was no need for a specific instruction to that end, as the Bureau would by default follow that procedure.

4.26 **Mr Henri** indicated that he did not think it advisable to prevent the Bureau from progressing on Resolution 559 submissions before the next Board meeting; any issues it encountered could be discussed at the Board's 84th meeting.

4.27 **Mr Azzouz** expressed agreement with all the explanations provided by Mr Vallet (Chief SSD) in relation to §9.2 of Document RRB20-1/6 and Document RRB20/11(Rev.1). He asked the Bureau to provide an analysis of the final situation for the Board's 84th meeting in July 2020.

4.28 The **Chairman**, summing up the discussion, suggested that the Board note that the intention of WRC-19 in adopting Resolution 559 was to allow administrations with degraded BSS assignments to regain resources in the BSS Plan; that the Bureau would review Part B submissions received after WRC-19 but before 22 May 2020 during the completeness review process and identify additional measures that could be implemented by the notifying administration to avoid a degradation of the EPM levels of submissions made under Resolution 559; that the final impact of Part B submissions on submissions under Resolution 559 would only be known after 21 May 2020 when all the submissions had been received; and that it was not possible to change the characteristics of filings already entered into the List while keeping the initial date of protection. She further suggested that the Board urge administrations with Part A submissions received before 22 May 2020 to make all efforts to accommodate submissions under Resolution 559 and to take into account the results of the Bureau's review when preparing their Part B submissions; and that consequently the Board would instruct the Bureau to:

- remind the notifying administrations, following the review of completeness of Part B submissions, of the need to take into account the submissions under Resolution 559 and the results of the Bureau's analysis with measures to avoid degrading EPM levels further.
- perform an analysis of the situation based on all submissions received on 21 May 2020 and report the results to the 84th Board meeting for further consideration.

4.29 It was so **agreed** (see §4.56 for the Board's full decision on the agenda item).

4.30 In reply to a query from **Mr Alamri**, the **Chairman** suggested that the Board should also note that there were no Part B submissions pending in the arcs affecting the Resolution 559 submissions and that there were therefore no Part B submissions for which processing would have to be completed before July 2020.

4.31 It was so **agreed**.

Submission by the Administration of Mauritius regarding the implementation of Resolution 559 [COM 5/3] (WRC-19) (Documents RRB20-1/11(Rev.1) and RRB20-1/12)

4.32 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** recalled that, when the BSS Plan had been modified in 2000, it had become apparent that some administrations, owing to the country's size or shape, had to place some of their test points outside the national territory, either at sea or in other territories, in order to determine the minimum associated ellipse. WRC-2000 had therefore decided that some countries could have test points outside their national territory. In Document RRB20-1/11(Rev.1), the co-signatories asked the Board to instruct the Bureau to accept Resolution 559 submissions that referred to the set of test points associated with their current Plan assignments. In Document RRB20-1/12, the Administration of Mauritius – one of those that had test points at sea – pointed out that it was unable to meet both requirements of Resolution 559, i.e. to submit a set of test points on land and to obtain the minimum ellipse automatically generated by the Bureau's software. The Administration of Mauritius therefore requested the Board to agree that it could submit the same test points as in the BSS Plan.

4.33 The Bureau agreed that the two requirements might conflict for some administrations. In order not to prevent those administrations from making Resolution 559 submissions, it appeared reasonable to accept the same set of test points as in the Plan, on the grounds that the Plan had been adopted by WRC-2000. In so doing, the Board would not be granting a complete derogation; it would simply be applying the WRC-2000 decision to Resolution 559.

4.34 The **Chairman** pointed out that the Administration of Mauritius had also invoked Article 44 of the Constitution, in particular the need to bear in mind "the geographical situation of particular countries".

4.35 **Ms Jeanty** asked why Resolution 559 was so strict about the test points being "inside the national territory", given that, as WRC-2000 had realized, it was in fact not always possible for all test points to be on land. Why had the issue not come up during the preparatory work for WRC-19? On what basis would the Board adopt a position?

4.36 The **Chairman** agreed that it might be difficult for the Board to make a decision without knowing the intention of WRC-19 in that respect.

4.37 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that an oversight was to blame. Test points posed a problem only when they had to be used to determine the minimum ellipse. The initial intention had been to ask administrations to submit a set of test points and to have a beam encompassing those test points. It was subsequently decided that the beam would be automatically generated using the ellipse, and it was at that point that the test point issue should have been discussed. However, it was not very well known – and indeed often forgotten – that some administrations had test points at sea or outside the national territory; hence the two conflicting requirements. One possibility might have been to allow administrations to submit shaped beams in Part A, but WRC-19 had envisaged that possibility in respect of Part B submissions only.

4.38 The **Chairman** asked whether that meant that the problem would disappear with the Part B submissions, which would require provision of a shaped beam.

4.39 **Mr Varlamov** confirmed that it had been difficult to take all aspects into account during WRC-19, in particular the location of test points. He did not think that test points located at sea would result in a deterioration of the reference situation in terms of planned assignments. On the other hand, he wondered whether test points located on the territory of another country might have such an effect and might therefore require additional coordination for Resolution 559 submissions.

4.40 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that test points located in other countries would not lead to additional degradation in terms of Part A Resolution 559 submissions; they might, however,

complicate the situation when it came to Part B. The Board might therefore consider allowing the submission of test points outside the national territory only for Resolution 559 submissions received before 22 May 2020 and deferring consideration of whether to allow them for Part B submissions pending further analysis. WRC-19 had foreseen that difficulty by allowing administrations to submit shaped beams in Part B, which eliminated the reason for having test points outside the national territory.

4.41 **Mr Hoan** pointed out that, according to the Attachment to Resolution 559, “Administrations seeking to apply this special procedure shall submit their request to the Bureau , which shall include, in particular: a set of a maximum of 20 test points inside the national territory.” The Board could not decide on measures that were contrary to a WRC decision, and it would therefore be very difficult to accept test points outside the national territory. On the other hand, test points at sea might be accepted to the extent that they were located in territorial or interior waters that formed part of the national territory. It could indeed be difficult for the Bureau to determine whether a test point at sea was inside or outside a national territory. The Board could also, however, consider that Article 44 of the Constitution applied in the case of countries with special geographical situations, such as Mauritius.

4.42 **Mr Azzouz** agreed that the Bureau should accept Resolution 559 submissions that referred to the set of test points associated with their current Plan assignments.

4.43 **Mr Borjón** agreed with the way forward proposed by the Bureau in terms of what had been previously decided by WRC-2000 for Part A submissions.

4.44 **Mr Hashimoto, Mr Talib and Ms Hasanova** endorsed the Bureau’s view that test points approved in the current Plan assignments should be accepted when used in Resolution 559 submissions.

4.45 **Mr Henri** proposed that the Board should provisionally agree that the Bureau should accept test points at sea for Part A submissions if those test points had been previously agreed at WRC-2000, because there was no other way to establish a minimum ellipse covering the national territory. At its next meeting, the Board could discuss the way forward, e.g. to draw up a rule of procedure referring to the possibility for Part B stemming from a Resolution 559 Part A with test points at sea to change the ellipse beam with a shaped beam with new test points in accordance with WRC-19 decisions and for those Resolution 559 still at Part A with test points at sea at WRC-23, to ask the conference for a final decision.

4.46 The **Chairman** observed that certain administrations endeavouring to comply with both §§2c) and d) of the Attachment to Resolution 559 might not be able to cover their entire territory. That stood in contradiction to the intent of WRC-19 in adopting Resolution 559, which was to allow administrations with degraded assignments to regain resources in the Plan.

4.47 **Ms Jeanty** agreed with the points raised by Mr Henri and endorsed the suggestion to base the Board’s decision on Article 44 of the Constitution, in view of the potential conflict inherent in the provisions of Resolution 559 in the case of island nations and the need to determine the minimum ellipse. She was nevertheless uncertain at the present juncture whether the matter should be referred to WRC-23 for decision or whether a rule of procedure should be developed.

4.48 **Mr Varlamov and Mr Hoan** expressed support for the development of a rule of procedure.

4.49 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** questioned the need for a rule of procedure. Rules of procedure were usually developed for recurrent issues. In the case at hand, the rule of procedure would concern a specific case and would, moreover, only be adopted after the end of the submission period.

4.50 The **Chairman** said that the rule of procedure would concern not so much acceptance of test points in Part A submissions but what would happen next in terms of Part B submissions associated with Resolution 559 submissions comprising test points located outside the national territory.

4.51 **Mr Hashimoto, Ms Jeanty, Mr Azzouz, Mr Varlamov, Mr Alamri, Ms Hasanova and Mr Hoan** agreed that the rule of procedure should relate to Part B submissions.

4.52 **Mr Henri** said that drafting a rule of procedure would bring transparency to this delicate item by allowing administrations to comment and the Bureau to explain why it had accepted some test points at sea in implementing Resolution 559. That being said, there was no urgent need to draft a rule of procedure at the current stage of the proceedings; the Board could defer a decision on the matter until its 84th meeting.

4.53 **Mr Alamri** proposed that the Bureau be instructed to check with administrations whether they could determine the minimum ellipse and to accept test points at sea as required for that purpose.

4.54 The **Chairman** took it that, regarding the use of test points, the Board wished to note that the Administration of Mauritius had invoked Article 44 of the Constitution in relation to the geographical situation of particular countries and that there was a potential for contradiction in the application of provisions §2c) and d) of the Attachment to Resolution 559 for territories that included islands. She further suggested that the Board therefore instruct the Bureau provisionally to accept test points outside national territories in Part A submissions under Resolution 559 received before 21 May 2020 if they are the same as those found in the Appendices 30 and 30A Plan assignments and if a minimal ellipse cannot be generated over the entire territory of the submitting administration solely from test points on its national territory, noting that WRC-2000 had already approved the use of such test points.

4.55 It was so **agreed** (see §4.56 for the Board's full decision on the agenda item).

4.56 The Board **agreed** to conclude on that agenda item as a whole as follows:

“The Board considered in detail section 9 of Document RRB20-1/6, Documents RRB20-1/11(Rev.1) and RRB20-1/12, and Document RRB20-1/DELAYED/1 for information. The Board noted with appreciation the additional explanations provided by the Bureau and the assistance provided to administrations in the preparation of their filings, and in particular noted that:

- The intention of WRC-19 in adopting Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** was to allow administrations with degraded BSS assignments to regain resources in the BSS Plan;
- The Bureau will review Part B submissions received after WRC-19 but before 22 May 2020 during the completeness process and identify additional measures that could be implemented by the notifying administration to avoid a degradation of the EPM levels of submissions made under Resolution **559 (WRC-19)**;
- The final impact of Part B submissions on submissions under Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** will only be known after 21 May 2020 when all the submissions under Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** have been received;
- In accordance with *decides* 10 of Council Decision 482 (Modified 2019), no additional cost recovery fees shall be charged due to resubmissions within 15 days of the date of receipt of the filings.

The Board also confirmed that:

- A notifying administration may withdraw and resubmit a notice as long as there is only one complete submission (one notice for downlink and one notice for feeder link) per eligible administration submitted by 21 May 2020;
- It is not possible to change the characteristics of filings already entered into the List while keeping the initial date of protection as such a decision would exceed the terms of reference of the Board (this would require a decision by WRC-23).

Furthermore, the Board urged administrations with Part A submissions received before 22 May 2020 to make all efforts to accommodate submissions under *resolves* 1 of Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** and to take into account the results of the Bureau's review when preparing their Part B submissions.

In relation to the use of test points, the Board noted that:

- The Administration of Mauritius invoked CS Article 44 in its request to accept test points located at sea for its submission under *resolves* 1 of Resolution **559 (WRC-19)**, in relation to the geographical situation of particular countries;
- Provision c) of §2 of the Attachment to Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** explicitly requires test points to be located inside national territories and provision d) requires that a minimal ellipse be determined from the test points submitted under provision c);
- There is a potential for contradiction in the application of provisions c) and d) of §2 of the Attachment to Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** for territories that include islands;
- For some countries, test points need to be located at sea so that the elliptical satellite beam generated from these test points encompasses all its territories.

Consequently, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to:

- remind the notifying administrations, following the review of completeness of Part B submissions, of the need to take into account the submissions under Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** and the results of the Bureau's analysis with measures to avoid degrading EPM levels further;
- perform an analysis of the situation based on all submissions received on 21 May 2020 and report the results to the 84th Board meeting for further consideration;
- provisionally accept test points outside national territories in Part A submissions under Resolution **559 (WRC-19)** received before 21 May 2020 if they are the same as those found in the Appendices **30** and **30A** Plan assignments and if a minimal ellipse cannot be generated over the entire territory of the submitting administration solely from test points on its national territory, noting that WRC-2000 had already approved the use of these points.”

5 Requests relating to extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring or bring back into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Submission by the Administration of China requesting an extension of the regulatory time limits for the bringing into use of the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-115.5E, CHINASAT-D-115.5E_1 and CHINASAT-30B-115.5E satellite networks at 115.5°E (Document RRB20-1/14)

5.1 **Mr Loo (Head SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB20-1/14, in which the Administration of China requested the Board to grant an extension, on the grounds of a launch failure arising from *force majeure*, to the regulatory time-limits for the bringing into use of the frequency assignments to satellite networks CHINASAT-D-115.5E (115.5°E) in the frequency band 24.65–25.25 GHz, CHINASAT-D-115.5E_1 (115.5°E) in the frequency band 21.4–22 GHz and CHINASAT-30B-115.5E (115.5°E) in the frequency bands 12.75–13.25 GHz, 10.7–10.95 GHz and 11.2–11.45 GHz. He noted that an annex initially submitted with the request had been withdrawn by the Chinese Administration following consultations with the Bureau. He also drew attention to a typographical error in the document regarding the name of the CHINASAT-D-115.5E_1 satellite network, which had not been present in the original Chinese version of the submission.

5.2 According to the Administration of China, a power supply failure during the launch and early orbit phase (LEOP) had meant that the CHINASAT-18 satellite could not reach its intended geostationary orbital position and bring into use the frequency assignments before the expiry of the regulatory time-limits. Consequently, China requested that the Board recognize the launch failure as

arising from *force majeure*, in accordance with the conditions outlined by the ITU Legal Adviser at the Board's 60th meeting, and grant an extension of the regulatory time-limits until 31 December 2023.

5.3 Lastly, he noted that the relevant Part B notification and Resolution 49 information had been received for the Appendix 30B filing on 19 January, the last day of the regulatory time-limit. As the deadline for the non-planned filings was a year later, no notifications or Resolution 49 information had been received in that regard.

5.4 **Mr Hoan**, while recognizing that the launch failure clearly constituted *force majeure* and noting that §6.31*bis* of Article 6 of Appendix 30B of the Radio Regulations provided for the possibility of a one-time extension of no more than three years of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use of an assignment to a space station of a satellite network due to launch failure, asked if the Board was in a position to take any action regarding the Appendix 30B filing and if the Bureau had received any further information in terms of due diligence on the frequency assignments operational on board the CHINASAT-18 satellite.

5.5 **Mr Vallet (Chief SSD)** said that the Bureau had received no further information from the Chinese Administration. Generally, additional information on satellites used to bring into use frequency assignments was only sought by the Bureau during inquiries under RR No. 13.6, which were not carried out for failed launches. Publicly available information, while not precise enough to ascertain the exact frequency assignments available on board CHINASAT-18, was consistent with the Chinese Administration's statements on the matter.

5.6 **Mr Henri** suggested that the Board might request additional information, in line with the provisions adopted by WRC-19 concerning minimum required information.

5.7 The **Chairman** said that the provisions concerning minimum required information applied in the context of co-passenger delay and might not apply in the case of *force majeure*. Noting that it would nevertheless have been preferable to have received more information on the satellite's capabilities, in order to confirm that all frequencies concerned by the request for extension were present on board, she asked if the Board saw fit to recognize that the launch failure met the conditions of *force majeure* and grant the extension, or if it wished to request further information.

5.8 **Mr Azzouz**, sharing the same concerns as Mr Hoan, said that the Chinese Administration should be asked for more information. He agreed, though, that the launch failure should be considered as arising from *force majeure* and the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations applied.

5.9 **Mr Borjón, Mr Talib, Ms Hasanova, Mr Alamri, Ms Jeanty, Mr Mchunu and Mr Hashimoto** indicated that they agreed that the case met the conditions of *force majeure*, as outlined by the ITU Legal Adviser at the Board's 60th meeting, and were prepared to accede to the request for the extension of the regulatory time-limits.

5.10 **Mr Henri and Mr Hoan** indicated that, given the amount of work foreseen at the Board's next meeting, they were prepared to grant the extension at the current meeting.

5.11 **Mr Varlamov** asked whether the intervention of the Board was in fact required in order to approve the extension requested, or if the Administration of China could have addressed its request directly to the Bureau, given that §6.31*bis* of Article 6 of Appendix 30B of the Radio Regulations provided for the possibility of a one-time extension of up to three years to regulatory time-limits that had not been met owing to launch failure.

5.12 The **Chairman** noted that the regulatory deadline had expired for the Appendix 30B filing on 19 January 2020, thus the requested extension exceeded the three years provided for in §6.31*bis* of Article 6 of Appendix 30B and required the Board's approval. She proposed that the Board conclude on the item as follows:

“The Board considered the request from the Administration of China as provided in Document RRB20-1/14. Given the information provided, the Board further considered that:

- More detailed information on the frequency bands that were supported on board the CHINASAT-18 satellite would have been appreciated;
- The situation presented in this submission met all the conditions of *force majeure*;
- The administration had made considerable efforts to meet the regulatory time-limit;
- The regulatory time-limit for the CHINASAT-30B-115.5E satellite network had already expired on 19 January 2020;
- The request was for a defined and limited extension.

Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request by extending the regulatory period for bringing into use the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-115.5E satellite network in the frequency band 24.65- 25.25 GHz, the CHINASAT-D-115.5E_1 satellite network in the frequency band 21.4-22.0 GHz and the CHINASAT-30B-115.5E satellite network in the frequency bands 12.75-13.25 GHz, 10.7-10.95 GHz and 11.2-11.45 GHz at 115.5°E until 31 December 2023 and instructed the Bureau to continue to take into account the frequency assignments to these three satellite networks.”

5.13 It was so **agreed**.

6 Rules of procedure (Documents RRB20-1/7 and RRB20-1/15; Circular Letters CR/456 and CCRR/64)

6.1 **Mr Vassiliev (Chief TSD)** introduced Document RRB20-1/15 on the impact of WRC-19 decisions on the Rules of Procedure. Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to the document contained, respectively, a preliminary list of WRC-19 decisions which could require review of the existing rules of procedure relating to RR provisions; a preliminary list of WRC-19 decisions which could require new rules of procedure; a preliminary list of existing rules of procedure which might require updates (not related to the WRC-19 decisions) and a list of WRC-19 decisions reflected in the minutes of WRC-19 plenary meetings that might be candidates for rules of procedure. Circular Letter CR/456 contained a list of WRC-19 decisions included in the minutes of the plenary meetings of the conference.

6.2 Several rules of procedure required urgent adoption and had thus been proposed for a target adoption date of the Board’s 84th meeting. Others could be discussed at that meeting or approved by correspondence. It was therefore suggested that the Board instruct the Bureau to prepare the rules of procedure requiring urgent adoption and circulate them for comment in preparation for the 84th meeting and that the Board approve the timeframe and/or means of approving the other rules of procedure. As usual, purely editorial amendments to the Rules of Procedure, arising, *inter alia*, from the updating of documents mentioned therein, would be submitted to the Board without prior publication in a circular letter for comment by administrations.

6.3 Concerning the list of proposed rules of procedure, the Board **agreed** to conclude as follows:

“The Board considered the preliminary draft list of proposed rules of procedure contained in Document RRB20-1/15 as a result of WRC-19 decisions that might require a revision to the Rules of Procedure and WRC-19 decisions included in the minutes of plenary meetings as presented in Circular Letter CR/456 that might also have an impact on the Rules of Procedure. Given the severely reduced duration of this meeting, the Board decided to approve the draft list of proposed rules of procedure by correspondence and instructed the Bureau to prepare any relevant draft rules of procedure according to the schedule indicated in the list and circulate them to administrations for

comments and consideration at appropriate future meetings of the Board. The Board also instructed the Bureau to post the updated list on the RRB website.”

6.4 Concerning the draft rule of procedure on the agenda of the 83rd meeting and the comments received thereon from administrations (Document RRB20-1/7 and Circular Letter CCRR/64), the Board **agreed** to conclude as follows:

“The Board decided to defer this item to its 84th meeting and additionally noted that no further comments on this draft rule of procedure would be allowed as the deadline for such comments had expired.”

7 Submission by the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (Document RRB20-1/13)

7.1 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting.

8 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the ATS-5 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Document RRB20-1/1)

8.1 The Board agreed to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting.

9 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the HA-1 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Document RRB20-1/2)

9.1 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting.

10 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the KOMPSAT-1 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Document RRB20-1/3)

10.1 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting.

11 Requests relating to cancellations of the frequency assignments to satellite networks: Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board for cancellation of the frequency assignments to the OPTOS satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Document RRB20-1/4)

11.1 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting.

12 Status of the USASAT-NGSO-4 and USABSS-36 satellite networks (Documents RRB20-1/8 and RRB20-1/9)

Submission by the Administration of the United States regarding the status of the frequency assignments to the USASAT-NGSO-4 satellite network (Document RRB20-1/8)

12.1 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting and instructed the Bureau to continue to take into account the frequency assignments to the USASAT-NGSO-4 satellite network until the 84th meeting.

Submission by the Administration of the United States regarding the status of the frequency assignments to the USABSS-36 satellite network (Document RRB20-1/9)

12.2 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting and instructed the Bureau to continue to take into account the frequency assignments to the USABSS-36 satellite network until the 84th meeting.

13 Submission by the Administration of Bolivia regarding the recording of the BOLSAT BSS satellite network in the MIFR (Document RRB20-1/10)

13.1 The Board **agreed** to defer consideration of that item to its 84th meeting and instructed the Bureau to continue processing the BOLSAT BSS satellite network until the 84th meeting.

14 Confirmation of the next meeting and indicative dates for subsequent meetings

14.1 While cognizant of the need to remain flexible regarding the duration of its 84th meeting in the light of the ongoing situation with the Covid-19 pandemic and the amount of work deferred to that meeting, the Board **agreed** to confirm the dates of the 84th meeting as 6-15 July 2020 and to tentatively confirm the dates of subsequent meetings in 2020 and 2021 as:

85th meeting: 19-27 October 2020

86th meeting: 22-26 March 2021

87th meeting: 12-16 July 2021

88th meeting: 1-5 November 2021.

15 Approval of the summary of decisions (Document RRB20-1/16)

15.1 The Board **approved** the summary of decisions as contained in Document RRB20-1/16.

16 Closure of the meeting

16.1 Several Board members conveyed their appreciation for the outstanding work of the Chairman in such trying conditions, and for the efforts of the Bureau, other ITU staff and the Board members themselves to make the meeting a success.

16.2 The **Chairman** expressed her gratitude for members' cooperation in helping to complete the agenda of the meeting despite the circumstances and thanked everyone involved for making the meeting possible. She wished all participants safety and good health and expressed the hope that July would bring better times and the possibility to meet in person.

16.3 The **Director** also expressed his gratitude for the efforts made by everyone involved in the meeting. The virtual meeting of the Board had been an historic event, not stopped by Covid-19. ITU, as the leading organization for ICTs, had shown the great difference that ICTs could make. Special thanks were due to the Chairman and her efforts during and in the run-up to the meeting. He looked forward to seeing everyone in July under circumstances that would give cause for celebration.

16.4 The **Chairman** closed the meeting at 1615 hours.

The Executive Secretary:
M. MANIEWICZ

The Chairman:
C. BEAUMIER