



SUMMARY OF DECISIONS
OF THE
88TH MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD

11 – 15 October – Hybrid meeting

Present:

Members, RRB

Mr N. VARLAMOV, Chairman

Mr E. AZZOUZ, Vice-Chairman

Mr T. ALAMRI, Ms C. BEAUMIER, 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

Ms C. RAMAGE and Ms S. MUTTI

Also present:

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 M. COSIC, Head, IAP/SAS

Mr D. BOTHA, SGD

Ms K. GOZAL, Administrative Secretary

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
1	Opening of the meeting	<p>The Chairman, Mr N. VARLAMOV, welcomed the members of the Board to the 88th meeting and noted with satisfaction that this was the first meeting of the Board since October 2019 with most of the Board members present in person.</p> <p>The Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau, Mr M. MANIEWICZ, on behalf of the Secretary-General, Mr H. ZHAO, also welcomed the members of the Board, indicating his hope that at the next meeting all the Board members would be able to attend in person. The Director furthermore wished the Board a fruitful meeting.</p>	-
2	Adoption of the agenda RRB21-3/OJ/1(Rev.1) ; RRB21-3/DELAYED/4	<p>The Board adopted the draft agenda with modifications as provided in Document RRB21-3/OJ/1(Rev.1). The Board decided to include Documents RRB21-3/DELAYED/1, RRB21-3/DELAYED/3, RRB21-3/DELAYED/5 and RRB21-3/DELAYED/6 under agenda item 3, and Document RRB21-3/DELAYED/2 under agenda item 5.6 for information. The Board also decided to defer to its 89th meeting the consideration of Document RRB21-3/DELAYED/4 and instructed the Bureau to add this document to the agenda for the 89th meeting and to continue to take into account the frequency assignments to the ARABSAT-AXB30.5E satellite network until the end of the 89th Board meeting.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the Administration of Saudi Arabia.</p> <p>Bureau to add Document RRB21-3/DELAYED/4 to the agenda for the 89th meeting and to continue to take into account the frequency assignments to the ARABSAT-AXB30.5E satellite network until the end of the 89th Board meeting.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
3	<p>Report by the Director, BR RRB21-3/4; RRB21-3/4(Add.1); RRB21-3/4(Add.2); RRB21-3/4(Add.3); RRB21-3/4(Add.4); RRB21-3/4(Add.5); RRB21-3/DELAYED/1; RRB21-3/DELAYED/3; RRB21-3/DELAYED/5; RRB21-3/DELAYED/6</p>	<p>The Board considered in detail the Report of the Director, as contained in Document RRB21-3/4 and its addenda, and thanked the Bureau for the extensive and detailed information provided.</p>	-
		<p>a) The Board considered in detail §1 and Annex 1 of Document RRB21-3/4 concerning actions arising from the decisions of the 87th Board meeting and specifically the following items:</p>	-
		<p>a-i) With reference to §3 p) regarding the coordination activities between the Administrations of France and Greece concerning the ATHENA-FIDUS-38E satellite network at 38°E and the HELLAS-SAT-2G satellite network at 39°E, the Board thanked the Bureau for the assistance provided to the two administrations. The Board again encouraged the Administrations of France and Greece to continue their coordination efforts in good will to reach a successful outcome and instructed the Bureau to continue to assist the two administrations in these efforts and to report on any progress to the Board.</p>	Bureau to continue to assist the two administrations in these efforts and to report on any progress to the Board.
		<p>a-ii) Under §3 q) on the statistics regarding the data submitted under Resolution 40 (Rev.WRC-19) to ITU-R Working Party 4A as contained in Document 4A/402 and subsequent updated information that the Bureau would provide, the Board thanked the Bureau for the information provided. The Board instructed the Bureau to provide updated information on this matter when available.</p>	Bureau to provide updated information on this matter when available.
		<p>a-iii) With reference to s) regarding harmful interference to emissions of United Kingdom high frequency broadcasting stations published in accordance with RR Article 12, the Board noted Document RRB21-3/DELAYED/1 for information. The Board encouraged the Administration of China to continue to find solutions to eliminate the harmful interference to the emissions of United Kingdom high frequency broadcasting stations.</p>	Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administrations concerned.

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>a-iv) Regarding §5.1 on the request from the Administration of India for an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the INSAT-KA68E satellite network, the Board noted Document RRB21-3/DELAYED/6 for information and further noted that the Administration of India did not provide any additional information to demonstrate that all the conditions of <i>force majeure</i> had been met in support of its request, as it had been invited to do by the Board at its 87th meeting. Consequently, the Board decided that it could not accede to the request from the Administration of India and instructed the Bureau to suppress the frequency assignments to the INSAT-KA68E satellite network from the MIFR.</p> <p>a-v) With reference to §§8.1 and 8.2 concerning the coordination of the ARABSAT satellite networks 5A and 6A at 30.5°E, for which the Administration of Saudi Arabia was the notifying administration, and the TURKSAT-5A satellite network at 31°E, for which Turkey was the notifying administration, the Board considered Addendum 5 to Document RRB21-3/4 and also considered Documents RRB21-3/DELAYED/3 and RRB21-3/DELAYED/5 for information. The Board noted that both administrations had taken considerable measures to maintain their rights to these frequency assignments, but that these measures had led to the difficulties that the two administrations were currently facing. The Board encouraged the two administrations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue their coordination efforts in good will and in an equitable manner, taking into account the rules of procedure on RR No. 9.6, to find mutually acceptable solutions that would eliminate all harmful interference on a permanent basis; • pursue all possible technical solutions, including, but not limited to, frequency band segmentation, service area definition and change of orbital position by 0.25°. 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to suppress the frequency assignments to the INSAT-KA68E satellite network from the MIFR.</p> <p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administrations concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to continue to assist the two administration in their coordination efforts, to continue to organize coordination meetings as required and to report on any progress to future meetings of the Board.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>The Board instructed the Bureau to continue to assist the two administrations in their coordination efforts, to continue to organize coordination meetings as required and to report on any progress to future meetings of the Board.</p>	
		<p>a-vi) Regarding §9 on the implementation of the decisions of the Board on the coordination of satellite networks at 25.5°E/26°E in the Ku and Ka bands, the Board thanked the Bureau for assisting the administrations in their coordination efforts. The Board reiterated its decision at the 87th meeting, namely to continue to encourage the Administrations of Saudi Arabia, France and the Islamic Republic of Iran to formalize the coordination of their satellite networks at the position 25.5°E/26°E in the Ku band, and the Administrations of Saudi Arabia and France to formalize the coordination of their satellite networks at the position 25.5°E/26°E in the Ka band as soon as possible. The Board further encouraged the administrations to continue to discuss the coordination efforts in the Ku and Ka bands in parallel and in a spirit of good will, with a view to finalizing the required coordination between their satellite networks to avoid harmful interference. The Board instructed the Bureau to continue to provide the necessary assistance to the administrations and to report on progress to the 89th meeting of the Board.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administrations concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to continue to provide the necessary assistance to the administrations and to report on progress to the 89th meeting of the Board.</p>
		<p>b) The Board noted §2 of Document RRB21-3/4 dealing with the processing of filings for terrestrial and space systems.</p>	-
		<p>c) The Board noted §3 of Document RRB21-3/4 concerning the implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings.</p>	-
		<p>d) The Board noted §4.1 of Document RRB21-3/4 on reports of harmful interference and infringements of the Radio Regulations.</p>	-
		<p>e) In considering §4.2 of Document RRB21-3/4 and its Addenda 2, 3 and 4 on the harmful interference to broadcasting stations in the VHF/UHF</p>	Executive Secretary to communicate these

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>bands between Italy and its neighbouring countries, the Board thanked the Bureau for assisting the administrations in their efforts to resolve the cases of harmful interference and also thanked the Administration of Italy for the updated roadmap. The Board noted that though some progress had been made, there had been once more a lack of substantial progress in resolving cases of harmful interference to the FM sound, DAB and television broadcasting stations of the neighbouring countries of Italy. The Board urged the Administration of Italy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • take all possible measures to eliminate harmful interference to the FM sound, DAB and television broadcasting stations of its neighbouring countries; • concentrate on the priority list of FM sound broadcasting stations in order to resolve these instances of harmful interference on a case-by-case basis. <p>The Board instructed the Bureau to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue assisting the administrations concerned; • undertake preparations for the coordination meeting in May 2022; • continue reporting on any progress on this matter as well as on the outcome of the planned multilateral coordination meeting. <p>f) The Board considered in detail §4.3 and Addendum 1 of Document RRB21-3/4 on harmful interference to analogue broadcasting stations of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. The Board noted once more with extreme grave concern the continued lack of response from the Republic of Korea to the two <i>notes verbales</i> which the Bureau had sent to the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea requesting it to forward letters addressed to the Minister of Science and ICT of the Republic of Korea on this matter. The Board further noted that the technical characteristics of the reported television signals from the Republic of</p>	<p>decisions to the administrations concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue assisting administrations concerned; • undertake preparations for the coordination meeting in May 2022; • continue reporting on any progress on this matter as well as on the outcome of the planned multilateral coordination meeting. <p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administrations concerned.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>Korea causing harmful interference differed from those assignments recorded for the Republic of Korea in the MIFR.</p> <p>The Board agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strongly encourage the Administration of the Republic of Korea to implement all measures to eliminate harmful interference to the television broadcasting stations of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea; • indicate to the Administration of the Republic of Korea that it was in direct contravention of RR Nos. 15.1, 15.2, 15.21 and 23.3, and No. 97 (Article 45) of the ITU Constitution; • reiterate the extreme grave concern of the Board on the lack of response from the Administration of the Republic of Korea to the communications from the Board. <p>The Board invited both administrations to cooperate in a spirit of good will to eliminate all harmful interference.</p> <p>The Board decided to include this issue in the Report on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) to WRC-23.</p> <p>g) In considering §4.4 on the harmful interference to the EMARSAT-1G, EMARSAT-5G, YAHSAT and MADAR-52.5E satellite networks from the Administration of the United Arab Emirates, the Board noted the lack of response from the Administration of Ukraine on communication on this matter since 28 May 2021. The Board encouraged the Administrations of the United Arab Emirates and Ukraine to cooperate and to take all measures to eliminate the harmful interference.</p> <p>The Board decided to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • invite the Administration of Ukraine to take appropriate actions to resolve this interference problem and to communicate these actions to the Bureau; 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administrations concerned.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encourage both administrations to exercise the utmost goodwill and mutual assistance in the application of the provisions of Article 45 of the Constitution and of Section VI of Article 15 of the Radio Regulations. 	
		<p>h) The Board noted §5 of Document RRB21-3/4 on the implementation of No. 11.44.1, No. 11.47, No. 11.48, No. 11.49, No. 9.38.1, Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-19) and No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations.</p>	-
		<p>i) The Board considered §6 on the FM frequency coordination meeting between the Administrations of Bahrain and the Islamic Republic of Iran and noted that the two administrations were attempting to agree on the methodology to be used for the coordination. The Board encouraged the two administrations to continue to cooperate in order to resolve the coordination issues as soon as possible. The Board instructed the Bureau to continue to provide assistance to the two administrations in their coordination efforts.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administrations concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to continue to provide assistance to the two administrations in their coordination efforts.</p>
		<p>j) The Board noted §7 of Document RRB21-3/4 on the review of findings to frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems under Resolution 85 (WRC-03).</p>	-
		<p>k) In considering §8 on the progress of work on Resolution 559 (WRC-19) submissions, the Board noted with satisfaction the continued successful implementation of the procedures. The Board expressed its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> gratitude to the Bureau for its actions in this matter and the support provided to the administrations; 	-

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appreciation to administrations that were contributing to the better protection of satellite networks and new frequency assignments. 	
		<p>l) The Board noted §9 on the submissions under the provisions of Resolution 35 (WRC-19), that the process was at its initial stage of implementation and that the number of systems was rapidly increasing.</p>	-
4	Rules of procedure		
4.1	<p>List of proposed rules of procedure RRB21-3/1 - RRB20-2/1(Rev.4)</p>	<p>Following a meeting of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, under the chairmanship of Mr Y. HENRI, the Board decided to accept the principles proposed by the Working Group for the modification of the rules of procedure on the treatment of modifications under RR Nos. 11.43A and 11.43B to frequency assignments already recorded in the MIFR, taking into account the comments from the Board members. Consequently, the Board instructed the Bureau to circulate these draft rules of procedure to the administrations for comments for consideration by the Board at its 89th meeting.</p> <p>The Board further decided to update the list of proposed rules of procedure in Document RRB21-3/1 taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rules of procedure in CCRR/67 that were adopted at the meeting; • the decisions on the draft rules of procedure on the simultaneous bringing into use of multiple geostationary satellite networks with a single satellite; • the draft rules of procedure on modifications under RR Nos. 11.43A and 11.43B; • the draft rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97). 	<p>Bureau to circulate the draft rules of procedure to the administrations for comments for consideration by the Board at its 89th meeting.</p> <p>Executive Secretary to publish the list of proposed rules of procedure on the website.</p> <p>Bureau to revise the text of the draft rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97) accordingly and that the draft rules of procedure should be reviewed by the ITU Legal Department before consideration by</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>The Board instructed the Bureau to publish the updated version of the document on the website.</p> <p>On the issue of frequency assignments to stations located in disputed territories, the Board thanked the Bureau for the updated text of the draft rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97). Following thorough discussions, the Board agreed on the elements to be included in the draft rules of procedure and instructed the Bureau to revise the text of the draft rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97) accordingly and to have the draft rules of procedure reviewed by the ITU Legal Department before consideration by the Board at its 89th meeting.</p>	<p>the Board at its 89th meeting.</p>
4.2	Draft Rules of Procedure CCRR/67	<p>The Board discussed the draft rules of procedure circulated to administrations in Circular Letter CCRR/67, along with the comments received from administrations as contained in Document RRB21-3/5. The Board adopted these rules of procedure with modifications as contained in the Attachment to this summary of decisions.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to update and publish the Rules of Procedure accordingly.</p>
4.3	Rules of Procedure: Comments from Administrations RRB21-3/5	<p>After considering the draft rules of procedure for the simultaneous bringing into use of multiple geostationary satellite networks with a single satellite, the Board decided to include the specific reference to bringing back into use and RR No. 11.49 as proposed by the Administration of the United States of America. The Board also decided to add in the draft rules of procedure, the possibility for space stations on a single satellite located at less than 0.5° from two different nominal positions of two satellite networks to be used for bringing into use, bringing back into use or continuing use of frequency assignments with non-overlapping bandwidths of both satellite networks under RR Nos. 11.44, 11.44B, 11.49 or 13.6. Consequently, the Board decided that the additional modifications introduced during the Board meeting would require consultation with the Member States and instructed the Bureau to circulate the draft rules of procedure to the administrations for comments for consideration by the Board at its 89th meeting.</p>	<p>Bureau to circulate the draft rules of procedure to the administrations for comments for consideration by the Board at its 89th meeting.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
5	Issues and requests relating to the extension of regulatory time-limits to bring or to bring back into use frequency assignments to satellite networks		
5.1	<p>Submission by the Administration of Papua New Guinea requesting the extension of the time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the NEW DAWN satellite network</p> <p>RRB21-3/2</p>	<p>The Board carefully considered the submission from the Administration of Papua New Guinea as presented in Document RRB21-3/2. The Board expressed its sympathy with the Administration of Papua New Guinea for the catastrophic in-orbit event that resulted in the total failure of the Intelsat 29e satellite. The Board noted that this submission was a delayed submission to its 87th meeting, during which the Board had indicated that the Administration of Papua New Guinea could benefit by improving its submission with more detail and information, an option that the administration had chosen not to exercise. The Board further noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the frequency assignments to the NEW-DAWN 25 satellite network had been suspended and could remain suspended until 7 April 2022; • while the catastrophic event met the first two conditions of a situation of <i>force majeure</i>, there was insufficient information provided to demonstrate how the case satisfied the other two conditions; • there was no information to explain why it was impossible to meet the 7 April 2022 regulatory deadline, for instance with an in-orbit satellite, and to resume operations prior to the launch of the replacement satellite; • no explanation was provided as to why it had taken 21 months to sign a contract to replace a new satellite that had been in orbit for only three years; • there was no information on a launch provider, no contract had been signed to date and no explanation was provided to explain how the launch date had been decided; 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no justification was provided as to why the bringing back into use of the frequency assignments would occur more than a year after the delivery of the replacement satellite. <p>Consequently, the Board was not able to determine whether the case qualified as a situation of <i>force majeure</i> and whether the requested period for the extension of the regulatory deadline was fully justified. Therefore, the Board concluded that it was not in a position to accede to the request from the Administration of Papua New Guinea. The Board reiterated that the Administration of Papua New Guinea would need to provide additional information on the issues identified above should it wish to resubmit the request to a future Board meeting.</p>	
5.2	<p>Submission by the Administration of Malaysia withdrawing its request for the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the MEASAT satellite network at 148°E</p> <p>RRB21-3/3</p>	<p>The Board noted the withdrawal of the request from the Administration of Malaysia for the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the MEASAT satellite network as presented in Document RRB21-3/3. The Board indicated its regrets that it had not been possible to re-establish the service on the MEASAT-3 satellite. The Board thanked the administration for its decision, for its transparency and for sharing the information, and commended the administration for its efforts to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the MEASAT satellite network, as well as its conscientious action to preserve the radio spectrum and orbital positions. The Board wished the Administration of Malaysia and its operator well in their future endeavours.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p>
5.3	<p>Submission by the Administration of Norway requesting the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the SE-KA-28W satellite network</p> <p>RRB21-3/6</p>	<p>The Board considered in detail the submission from the Administration of Norway as contained in Document RRB21-3/6. The Board noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the case represented a real project and that the satellite was nearly fully constructed; the frequency assignments to the SE-KA-28W satellite network had been suspended and could remain suspended until 26 July 2023; 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some delays identified, such as hardware and test challenges, and programmatic and technical issues did not seem related to the impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic and were therefore unrelated to <i>force majeure</i>; • some delays related to <i>force majeure</i> were identified, but it was not clear whether they were overlapping or sequential; • no schedule had been provided for the manufacture and delivery of the satellite; • no launch operator had been identified and no launch schedule had been provided; • no explanation had been provided as to why an additional 18 months were required for testing and preparation for launch, given that the satellite was nearly constructed; • when Airbus announced the contract, a period of 4 to 6 months had been foreseen for orbit raising, but in the request 8 months were foreseen for this purpose; • it was not in a position to predict the consequences and the future impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic on future project timelines. <p>Consequently, the Board was not able to identify whether the case contained all the elements to qualify as a situation of <i>force majeure</i> and that the requested period for the extension of the regulatory time-limit was fully justified. Therefore, the Board concluded that it was not in a position to accede to the request from the Administration of Norway. The Board observed that the Administration of Norway would need to provide additional information on the issues identified above should it wish to resubmit its request to a future Board meeting.</p>	

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
5.4	<p>Submission by the Administration of the State of Israel requesting the extension of the regulatory deadline to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the AMS-B2-13.8E and AMS-B7-13.8 satellite networks RRB21-3/7</p>	<p>The Board carefully considered the submission from the Administration of Israel as presented in Document RRB21-3/7. The Board noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the case represented a real project based on a satellite using electric propulsion; • the global COVID-19 pandemic had had a significant impact on the manufacturer and launch service provider; • a case of <i>force majeure</i> was invoked due to the impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic but from the information provided, it was not clear that the delays could all be ascribed to the global COVID-19 pandemic; • no information was provided on the status of the two satellites' construction prior to the global COVID-19 pandemic; • it was not clear that the 16 May 2022 regulatory time-limit would have been met in the absence of the global COVID-19 pandemic; • the payload manufacturer had reported in June 2019 that the launch of the first satellite had already slipped to end of May 2021, implying that the second satellite would only be launched between the end of November 2021 and the end of January 2022; • insufficient information was provided on the initial and revised timelines to understand the payload and satellite manufacturing timelines, the duration of orbit raising and the in-orbit testing of the satellite; • the launch secured with Arianespace had slipped considerably and the operator had secured alternate launch options; 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to invite the Administration of the State of Israel to provide additional information on the issues identified to the 89th Board meeting.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no information was provided on the quantitative impact on the timelines of the change in the launch provider and on the mitigation techniques implemented by the satellite manufacturer. <p>Consequently, the Board concluded that, while the case contained some elements of <i>force majeure</i>, there was insufficient information at this time to determine whether the situation met all the conditions of <i>force majeure</i>. Therefore, the Board concluded that it was not in a position to accede to the request from the Administration of Israel. The Board instructed the Bureau to invite the Administration of Israel to provide additional information, including supporting evidence, on the issues identified above to the 89th Board meeting.</p>	
5.5	Submission by the Administration of France requesting the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use frequency assignments to the F-SAT-N5-7W satellite network RRB21-3/10	<p>The Board considered in detail the submission from the Administration of France as contained in Document RRB21-3/10. The Board noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the case was the result of two <i>force majeure</i> events, i.e. flooding of the premises of the satellite manufacturer and the impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic; evidence was provided that the regulatory deadline of 26 May 2022 would have been met in the absence of the <i>force majeure</i> events; the satellite manufacturer provided information on measures taken to mitigate the impact of the <i>force majeure</i> events to the minimum, but that some delays remained that could not be further reduced; the requested date of 26 October 2022 for the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the F-SAT-N5-7W satellite network included contingencies for possible additional delays that could not be forecast and taken into account; the project schedule for the delivery of the satellite did not include orbit raising, in-orbit testing and drifting to the operational orbital position. 	Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>Based on the information provided, the Board concluded that the case met all the conditions to qualify as a situation of <i>force majeure</i>. Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request from the Administration of France to grant an extension to the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the F-SAT-N5-7W satellite network to 20 September 2022.</p>	
5.6	<p>Submission by the Administration of Bulgaria requesting the extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the BALKANSAT AP30B satellite network RRB21-3/11; RRB21-3/DELAYED/2</p>	<p>The Board considered in detail the submission from the Administration of Bulgaria as presented in Document RRB21-3/11 and also considered Document RRB21-3/DELAYED/2 for information. The Board noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration of Bulgaria invoked a case of <i>force majeure</i> due to the impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic; • while Ariane 6 had experienced a number of delays as a result of the global COVID-19 pandemic that could be considered as <i>force majeure</i>, the submission from the Administration of Bulgaria did not provide sufficient information to consider the request as a case of <i>force majeure</i>; • the requested extension by 12 months of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the BALKANSAT-AP30B satellite network was not justified by the information in the submission; • the Administration of Bulgaria provided no information on any efforts to procure a new replacement satellite for the in-orbit satellite or information on the long-term plan for the continuous use of the frequency assignments to the BALKANSAT AP30B satellite network; • the intent of the FSS Plan in Appendix 30B was to grant equitable access to spectrum and orbital resources via national allotments with no expiry date or regulatory deadline; • the provision §1.2 of Article 1 to Appendix 30B indicated that the Appendix 30B procedures should “in no way prevent the 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to continue taking into account the BALKANSAT AP30B satellite network while processing other satellite networks and to maintain in the List the frequency assignments to the BALKANSAT-AP30B satellite network.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>implementation of assignments in conformity with the national allotments of the Plan”;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the conversion of a national allotment into frequency assignments in conformity with the Plan allotment required no coordination with other administrations; • should frequency assignments that were in conformity with the Plan allotment not be brought into use before the regulatory time-limit specified in Articles 6 and 8 to Appendix 30B, then the allotment would have to be reinstated, which would have no impact on other administrations, but would place additional administrative burdens on the notifying administration and on the Bureau. <p>Consequently, the Board concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there was insufficient information to determine whether the request from the Administration of Bulgaria met all the conditions required to be considered as a case of <i>force majeure</i>; • applying a regulatory time-limit to bring into use frequency assignments that were in conformity with the allotment in the Plan from which they had been derived was inconsistent with the purpose of Appendix 30B. <p>The Board therefore decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that it was not in a position to accede to the request from the Administration of Bulgaria on the basis of <i>force majeure</i> due to the global COVID-19 pandemic; • to instruct the Bureau to continue taking into account the BALKANSAT AP30B satellite network while processing other satellite networks and to maintain in the List the frequency assignments to the BALKANSAT-AP30B satellite network; 	

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to include the inconsistency related to the conversion of an allotment into assignment(s) without any modification or with modification within the envelope of the characteristics of an allotment in Appendix 30B and any possible modifications to Articles 6, 7 and 8 of this Appendix in its Report on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) to WRC-23. 	
6	<p>Submission by the Administration of Qatar (State of) requesting a change of the notifying administration for the ESHAILSAT-26E-2 satellite network from QAT/ARB to QAT RRB21-3/9</p>	<p>The Board carefully considered the submission from the Administration of Qatar as contained in Document RRB21-3/9. The Board noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a similar request had previously been received at its 76th meeting, during which the Board did not accede to the request on the basis of the Radio Regulations and the Rules of Procedure in force in 2017; the Administration of Qatar had provided a signed letter from the Arab Satellite Communications Organization, which agreed with no conditions to the change of the notifying administration for the ESHAILSAT-26E-2 satellite network from QAT/ARB to QAT. <p>Consequently, the Board concluded that the request from the Administration of Qatar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> was consistent with the decisions of WRC-19; satisfied all the requirements of Case 2-5 of the rules of procedure related to satellite systems submitted by an administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations. <p>The Board therefore decided to accede to the request from the Administration of Qatar and instructed the Bureau to change the symbol of the notifying administration for the ESHAILSAT-26E-2 satellite network from QAT/ARB to QAT.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the administration concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to change the symbol of the notifying administration for the ESHAILSAT-26E-2 satellite network from QAT/ARB to QAT.</p>
7	<p>Submission by the Administration of China requesting recognition of the bringing into use of the frequency assignments to the satellite networks at orbital positions 163°E</p>	<p>The Board carefully considered the submission from the Administration of China as contained in Document RRB21-3/8. The Board noted that:</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate these decisions to the</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
	<p>and 125°E RRB21-3/8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the submission of the notification filings for the CHINASAT-D-163E, CHINASAT-D-125E and CHINASAT-E-125E satellite networks occurred after the satellites used to bring into use the frequency assignments to these networks had left the orbital positions; an in-orbit malfunction had occurred requiring the APSTAR-6 satellite to be deorbited a few months before the notification information was submitted; the satellite networks at orbital positions 163°E and 125°E constituted real projects and the construction of two replacement satellites was under way; the Administration of China had successfully completed coordination requirements with a number of administrations; the reasons provided did not justify or explain the fact that the notification filings had not been submitted before the satellites that had been used to bring into use the frequency assignments were relocated or deorbited; the Chinasat-17 and Chinasat-19A satellites had been used to bring into use or maintain in use frequency assignments to several satellite networks at different orbital positions within a short period of time, which can be perceived as spectrum warehousing; as per RR No. 8.1, the rights to use and claim protection to frequency assignments were derived from their recording in the MIFR, which was only achieved by the completion of the coordination and notification procedures; administrations had been informed in CR/343, CCRR/49 and CCRR/52 about the link between the 90-period for the bringing into use of frequency assignments and the notification procedure, and the matter had been discussed extensively within the relevant study groups, the RRB and at WRC-15. 	<p>administration concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to suppress the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-163E and CHINASAT-D-125E satellite networks from the MIFR, except for the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-163E satellite network in the frequency bands 3 400 – 4 200 MHz, 5 850 – 6 725 MHz, 12 250 – 12 750 MHz and 14 000 – 14 500 MHz for which the suppression was to be deferred until the end of WRC-23, and except for the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-125E satellite network in the frequency bands as given in Table 1.</p> <p>The Board also instructed the Bureau not to recognize the bringing into use of the frequency assignments</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up																		
		<p>The Board considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Bureau had acted correctly in the application of RR Nos. 11.44, 11.44B and 11.44B.2; the administration had not acted in conformity with RR No. 11.44B.2; the reinstatement of frequency assignments that did not comply with RR No. 11.44B.2 would be contrary to the WRC-15 decision and the provisions of the Radio Regulations. <p>Consequently, the Board concluded that it could not accede to the request from the Administration of China and instructed the Bureau to suppress the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-163E and CHINASAT-D-125E satellite networks from the MIFR, except for the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-163E satellite network in the frequency bands 3 400 – 4 200 MHz, 5 850 – 6 725 MHz, 12 250 – 12 750 MHz and 14 000 – 14 500 MHz, for which the suppression was to be deferred until the end of WRC-23, and except for the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-D-125E satellite network in the frequency bands indicated in Table 1.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Table 1</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="786 995 1662 1412"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 980 – 2 010 MHz</td> <td>2 170 – 2 200 MHz</td> <td>3 400 – 3 700 MHz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 700 – 4 200 MHz</td> <td>5 850 – 5 925 MHz</td> <td>5 925 – 6 425 MHz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 425 – 6 725 MHz</td> <td>10 950 – 11 200 MHz</td> <td>11 450 – 11 700 MHz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 200 – 12 250 MHz</td> <td>12 250 – 12 290 MHz</td> <td>12 290 – 12 750 MHz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13 750 – 14 000 MHz</td> <td>14 000 – 14 040 MHz</td> <td>14 040 – 14 500 MHz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 700 – 20 200 MHz</td> <td>27 500 – 30 000 MHz</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1 980 – 2 010 MHz	2 170 – 2 200 MHz	3 400 – 3 700 MHz	3 700 – 4 200 MHz	5 850 – 5 925 MHz	5 925 – 6 425 MHz	6 425 – 6 725 MHz	10 950 – 11 200 MHz	11 450 – 11 700 MHz	12 200 – 12 250 MHz	12 250 – 12 290 MHz	12 290 – 12 750 MHz	13 750 – 14 000 MHz	14 000 – 14 040 MHz	14 040 – 14 500 MHz	17 700 – 20 200 MHz	27 500 – 30 000 MHz		<p>to the CHINASAT-E-125E in the frequency bands 13.4 – 13.65 GHz, 14.5 – 14.8 GHz, 37.5 – 43.5 GHz and 47.2 – 50.2 GHz.</p> <p>Board to include this issue in the Report on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) to WRC-23.</p>
1 980 – 2 010 MHz	2 170 – 2 200 MHz	3 400 – 3 700 MHz																			
3 700 – 4 200 MHz	5 850 – 5 925 MHz	5 925 – 6 425 MHz																			
6 425 – 6 725 MHz	10 950 – 11 200 MHz	11 450 – 11 700 MHz																			
12 200 – 12 250 MHz	12 250 – 12 290 MHz	12 290 – 12 750 MHz																			
13 750 – 14 000 MHz	14 000 – 14 040 MHz	14 040 – 14 500 MHz																			
17 700 – 20 200 MHz	27 500 – 30 000 MHz																				

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>The Board also instructed the Bureau not to recognize the bringing into use of the frequency assignments to the CHINASAT-E-125E in the frequency bands 13.4 – 13.65 GHz, 14.5 – 14.8 GHz, 37.5 – 43.5 GHz and 47.2 – 50.2 GHz.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Board decided to include this issue in the Report on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) to WRC-23.</p>	
8	Election of the Vice-Chairman for 2022	<p>Having regard to No. 144 of the ITU Convention, and given the special circumstances, the Board agreed that Dr E. AZZOUZ, who should normally serve as its Chairman in 2022, should serve as Vice-Chairman of the Board for 2022.</p> <p>The Board agreed to elect Mr T. ALAMRI as its Chairman for 2022.</p>	-
9	Confirmation of the date of the next meeting and indicative dates for future meetings	<p>The Board confirmed the dates for the 89th meeting as 14–18 March 2022 in Room L.</p> <p>The Board further tentatively confirmed the dates for its subsequent meetings in 2022 and 2023 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90th meeting: 27 June–1 July 2022 (Room CCV Genève, if Room L is not available); • 91st meeting: 31 October–4 November 2022 (Room CCV Genève, if Room L is not available); • 92nd meeting: 20–24 March 2023 (Room CCV Genève); • 93rd meeting: 26 June–4 July 2023 (Room CCV Genève); • 94th meeting: 16–20 October 2023 (Room CCV Genève). 	-
10	Any other business	<p>Under the chairmanship of Ms C. BEAUMIER of the Working Group on the Report on Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07) to WRC-23, the Board established the draft list of issues to be included in the Report and identified elements to be included in the Report for each of these issues.</p>	-

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
11	Approval of the summary of decisions	The Board approved the summary of decisions as contained in Document RRB21-3/12.	-
12	Closure of the meeting	The meeting closed at 1147 hours on 15 October 2021.	

ATTACHMENT

Annex 1

Modification of the existing rules of procedure on Nos **5.418C, 5.485, 11.31**
due to the suppression of Resolution **33 (Rev.WRC-15)**

Rules concerning

ARTICLE 5 of the RR

MOD

5.418C

1 In accordance with provision No. **5.418C**, modified by WRC-03, the use of the band 2 630-2 655 MHz by geostationary-satellite networks is subject to the application of the provisions of No. **9.13** with respect to non-GSO satellite systems in the BSS (sound) pursuant to No. **5.418**, as of 3 June 2000. ~~Resolution **33 (Rev.WRC-15)*** resolves that for satellite networks for which the API has been received by the Bureau prior to 1 January 1999, only the procedure in Sections A to C in Resolution **33 (Rev.WRC-15)*** shall be applied.~~

(...) [Editor's note: No changes are proposed to the other sections of the Rules on No. **5.418C**.]

MOD

5.485

1 The wording of this provision raised the following basic question: "Is the band 11.7-12.2 GHz in Region 2 allocated to the broadcasting-satellite service?" The Board considered the following:

- a) that the provision is not titled an "*additional allocation*". Some provisions do not have such a title and the Board considered them additional allocations. However, in this case, it is not clear that the intent was to permit an additional allocation;
- b) the provision states that "*transponders on space stations in the fixed-satellite service may be used additionally ... in the broadcasting-satellite service*": the use of the word "*additionally*", together with the last sentence saying that "*this band shall be used principally for the fixed-satellite service*", leads to the understanding that the use by the broadcasting-satellite service is not of the same nature as would be the use of a given band by a service to which the band is allocated;
- c) the provision refers to transponders, which are to be considered transmitting stations. As the procedures of Articles ~~**9 and 11 and Resolution 33 (Rev.WRC-15)**~~* apply to each assignment, each transponder shall be considered independently from the others. Consequently the provision may be interpreted in either of the following two ways:

* ~~Note by the Secretariat: This Resolution was abrogated by WRC-19.~~

* ~~Note by the Secretariat: This Resolution was abrogated by WRC-19.~~

- a first interpretation consists in considering that some transponders will be used for the FSS and others for the BSS, and this is equivalent to a sharing of the band between two services which raises a question about the word “*principally*”: how many transponders would be allowed for each of the two services?
- a second interpretation consists in considering that a given transponder of the FSS may be used in a given period of time for broadcasting (this is not to be confused with the use of the FSS for the transport of a video signal between two fixed points). If in such a case the provision was to be considered an additional allocation, a question arises in relation to the procedure to be applied: Should it be the relevant provisions in ~~that of~~ Articles 9 and 11 for the FSS or for the BSS or that of Resolution 33 (Rev.WRC-15)*?

2 Keeping in mind the above comments, the Board concluded that the band 11.7-12.2 GHz is not allocated in Region 2 to the broadcasting-satellite service. Those transponders of the fixed-satellite service which are used for broadcasting-satellite purposes will be treated in accordance with the relevant provisions in Articles 9 and 11 for the FSS (and Appendix 30 if required to define inter-regional sharing). When such a use is indicated in the notice, the Bureau will assume that the coordination of the network was made on the basis that for the period during which a transponder is used for broadcasting, the e.i.r.p. will not exceed the e.i.r.p. notified for the fixed-satellite service. Considering that the fixed-satellite service uses relatively low e.i.r.p., the Bureau will consider the value of 53 dBW to be a limit not to be exceeded.

Rules concerning

ARTICLE 11 of the RR

MOD

11.31

1 Provision No. 11.31.2 requires that the “*other provisions*” mentioned in No. 11.31 should be identified and included in the Rules of Procedure. This chapter intends to answer the above problem.

The regulatory examination under No. 11.31 includes the following⁵:

- conformity with the Table of Frequency Allocations, including its footnotes and any Resolution or Recommendation which is referred to in such a footnote;
- the successful application of No. 9.21, when mention is made of that provision in a footnote (see also Rules of Procedure relating to Nos. 9.21 and 11.37);
- all “*other*” mandatory provisions that are contained in Articles 21 to 57, in Appendices to the Radio Regulations and/or in Resolutions that are relevant to the service in the frequency band in which a station of that service operates.

(...) [*Editor’s note: No changes are proposed to the other sections of the Rules on No. 11.31.*]

⁵ With respect to the application of this provision to assignments of the BSS, submitted under Resolution 33 (Rev.WRC-15)*—see comments under Rules of Procedure concerning Nos. 23.13B and 23.13C.

* Note by the Secretariat: This Resolution was abrogated by WRC-19.

Reasons: *WRC-19 decided to abrogate Resolution 33 (Rev.WRC-15), which is referenced in the Rules related to the above three provisions, which are therefore proposed to be modified as shown above in order to reflect this suppression.*

Effective date of application of this Rule: immediately after approval.

Annex 2

Modification of the existing rules of procedure on receivability of forms of notice

Rules concerning

Receivability of forms of notice generally applicable to all notified assignments submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of the Radio Regulatory Procedures*

(...) [*Editor's note: No changes are proposed to the four existing sections of the Rules on receivability.*]

ADD

5 Submission of notification information of a non-geostationary satellite system before the publication of the coordination request of that system

When Administrations submit modifications to coordination requests of non-geostationary satellite systems towards the end of the 7-year regulatory period in order to better reflect the actual operations of their systems, these modifications are often submitted as additions of a mutually exclusive configuration to the existing coordination request, since it keeps the other published configurations of the non-geostationary satellite system unaffected by the modification, notably in the event of an unfavourable finding of the Bureau. However, depending on the date of submission of such modifications, the end of the 7-year regulatory period may occur before the publication of the latest modified coordination request.

In such a case, the Administration may face uncertainties as to whether the latest modification complies with No. **11.31** and therefore can be subsequently notified successfully. In order to alleviate this uncertainty while maintaining the requirement to notify before the end of the 7-year period (see No. **11.44.1**), the Board decided that the Bureau shall adopt the following course of actions:

1. The notifying administration may submit in the notification files two (and only two) mutually exclusive configurations:
 - a. one identified as the preferred configuration and associated with the technical parameters contained in the latest modified coordination request, which is not yet published; and
 - b. one (and only one) identified as the fallback configuration and associated with one of the mutually exclusive configurations that is already published.
2. The Bureau shall make available such notification submissions as received on the Bureau's website, as for any other submissions.
3. Considering that the Bureau is ultimately going to only examine one of the configurations, the Bureau shall first examine and publish the latest modified coordination request before proceeding with the publication of the Part I-S associated to the notification submission. The Bureau shall inform the notifying administration of this course of action.
4. If the modified coordination request associated with the preferred configuration only contains favourable findings (and, in the case where this modified coordination request contains a request to maintain the same date of protection as the original coordination request, the date is maintained in application of the Rules of Procedure on No. **9.27**), then the Bureau shall process the preferred configuration contained in the notification without further request to the notifying administration. In the case where this modified coordination request contains some

unfavourable findings or the date of protection is not maintained as in the original coordination request despite a request from the notifying administration to do so, the Bureau shall consult the notifying administration to know which of the two configurations this administration wants to notify.

5. The Bureau shall then publish the Part I-S of this notification submission with only one configuration as explained in item 4 and start the examination procedure that will lead to the publication of Part II-S/III-S, as appropriate.

Reasons: *To explain the possible course of action for an administration submitting the notification information of a non-GSO system for which mutually exclusive configurations exist before a late modification to the coordination request of that system has been processed and published by the Bureau.*

Effective date of application of this Rule: immediately after approval.

Annex 3
Modification of the existing rules of procedure on No. **9.11A**

Rules concerning

ARTICLE 9 of the RR*

9.11A

MOD

TABLE 9.11A-1

Applicability of the provisions of Nos. 9.11A-9.14 to stations of space services

1	2	3		4		5	6	7
Frequency band (GHz)	Footnote No. in Article 5	Space services mentioned in a footnote referring to Nos. 9.11A , 9.12 , 9.12A , 9.13 or 9.14 , as appropriate		Other space services or systems to which Nos. 9.12 to 9.14 provisions(s) apply equally, as appropriate		Applicable Nos. 9.12 to 9.14 provision(s), as appropriate	Terrestrial services in respect of which No. 9.14 apply equally	Notes
(...)								
11.7-12.2	5.488 and Res. 142 (WRC-03)*	FIXED-SATELLITE (Region 2)	(GSO)	↓	---	9.14	FIXED (except in United States of America and Mexico (see No. 5.486), in the band 11.7-12.1 GHz FIXED (Regions 1 and 3) and in Peru, (see No. 5.489), in the band 12.1-12.2 GHz MOBILE except aeronautical mobile (Regions 1 and 3)	
(...)								

Reasons: WRC-15 decided to abrogate Resolution 142 (WRC-03).

Effective date of application of this Rule: immediately after approval.

* This Rule of Procedure refers to Articles **9**, **11**, to Articles 4 and 5 of Appendices **30** and **30A**, and to Articles 6 and 8 of Appendix **30B** of the Radio Regulations.

~~* Note by the Secretariat: This Resolution was abrogated by WRC-15.~~

Annex 4
Suppression of the part of the existing rules of procedure on Annex 2 to Appendix 4
related to *resolves* 1.4 of Resolution **156 (WRC-15)**

Rules concerning

APPENDIX 4 to the RR

An. 2

SUP

Commitment regarding the implementation or *resolves* 1.4 of Resolution 156 (WRC-15)

Reasons: WRC-19 added data item A.19.b (“a commitment in accordance with resolves 1.5 of Resolution **156 (WRC-15)** that the administration responsible for the use of the frequency assignment shall implement resolves 1.4 of Resolution **156 (WRC-15)**”) in Annex 2 to Appendix 4. Therefore the part of the Rules of Procedure on Annex 2 to Appendix 4 labelled “Commitment regarding the implementation or resolves 1.4 of Resolution **156 (WRC-15)**”, which was adopted after WRC-15 in order to address the lack of such a data item in Appendix 4, can be suppressed.

Effective date of application of this Rule: immediately after approval.

Annex 5

Addition of new rules of procedure on Resolution **32 (WRC-19)**

Rules concerning

ADD

RESOLUTION 32 (WRC-19)

§ 4 of the Annex to Resolution **32 (WRC-19)** indicate that the notification information relating to non-GSO networks or systems identified as short-duration mission shall be communicated to the Radiocommunication Bureau only after the launch of a satellite in the case of a satellite network or of the first satellite in the case of a system requiring multiple launches, and not later than two months after the date of bringing into use. This provision applies instead of No. **11.25** for frequency assignments to non-GSO networks or systems with short-duration missions.

However, No. **9.1** restricts the date of receipt of notification to be not earlier than four months after the publication of the API special section.

It may therefore occur that notification information relating to non-GSO networks or systems identified as short-duration missions be communicated to the Bureau not later than two months after the date of bringing into use but earlier than four months after the publication of the API special section.

Noting that § 4 of the Annex to Resolution **32 (WRC-19)** relates to the time when the notification information has to be communicated to the Bureau, whereas No. **9.1** concerns the establishment of the formal date of receipt, the Board decided that the Bureau shall publish such notification notices with a date of receipt established in accordance with No. **9.1**, together with a note indicating the date to which the information was communicated to the Radiocommunication Bureau, in order for Administrations to be informed of the compliance of these notices with § 4 of the Annex to Resolution **32 (WRC-19)**.

Reasons: *To clarify the relationship between the time when the notification information has to be communicated to the Bureau under Resolution **32 (WRC-19)** and the establishment of the formal date of receipt of notification notices under RR No. **9.1**.*

Effective date of application of this Rule: 23 November 2019.

Annex 6
Suppression of the rules of procedure on Resolution **49 (Rev.WRC-15)**

Rules concerning

RESOLUTION 49 (Rev.WRC-15)*

SUP

**Administrative due diligence applicable to some
satellite radiocommunication services**

Reasons: *WRC-19 decided to include a reference to No. 9.1A in the resolves of Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-19), which incorporates the substance of the Rule. Consequently, the Rules of Procedure on Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-15) can be suppressed.*

Effective date of application of this Rule: immediately after approval.

* *Note by the Secretariat:* This Resolution was revised by WRC-19.

Annex 7

Addition of new rules of procedure due to past WRC decisions involving considerations of the Board on requests from notifying administrations for extensions of regulatory deadlines

Rules concerning

ADD

**Rules concerning the extension of the regulatory time-limit
for bringing into use satellite assignments**

WRC-12 took the following decision related to the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use satellite assignments, see paragraph 3.20 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. CMR12/554:

“3.20 The **Chairman of Committee 5**, introducing Document 525, said that it covered four issues relating to agenda item 7 and one relating to agenda item 8.1.2. The first issue relating to agenda item 7 concerned the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use satellite assignments due to launch delays beyond the control of the administration. Committee 5 had discussed certain proposals to create a new WRC resolution to allow limited and qualified extensions in the case of co-passenger delays and to expand such extensions in the case of *force majeure*. However, recognizing that there were a number of concerns with creating a resolution, and that such cases could be brought to the Radio Regulations Board or to future conferences on a case-by-case basis, the committee had not pursued the discussion. ...”

WRC-15 took the following decision related to the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use satellite assignments, see paragraph 3.19 of the Minutes of the 7th Plenary meeting, Doc. CMR15/504:

“3.19 (...) In considering the issue of satellite launch failure, WRC-15 confirms the decision taken by WRC-12 (at its thirteenth meeting) that the Board may address requests for a time-limit extension based on either a co-passenger issue or force majeure taking into account internationally applicable rules and practices in this regard so long as any extension is “limited and qualified”.”

WRC-19 took the following decision related to the situations of co-passenger delay and the use of electric propulsion, see paragraph 3.16 of the Minutes of the 8th Plenary meeting, Doc. CMR19/569:

“3.16 (...) On section 4.3.4 Situations of co-passenger delay, WRC-19 decided that the Board shall consider the provision of the following information as required when dealing with a request for extension of regulatory deadlines due to co-passenger delay:

- a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency bands;
- the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date;
- the status of the satellite construction, including the date it began and whether it was expected to be completed prior to the initial launch window;
- the name of the launch service provider and the contract signature date;
- the initial and revised launch window;

- sufficient detail to justify that the request for extension is due to co-passenger delay (e.g. a letter from the launch service provider indicating that the launch is delayed because of a delay affecting the co-passenger satellite);
- sufficient detail to justify the length of the requested extension period; and
- any other relevant information and documentation.

When considering requests that qualify as force majeure or co-passenger delay, WRC-19 instructs the RRB to continue to take into account the use of electric propulsion on a case-by-case basis when deciding on the length of the extension, based on the merits of each individual case.”

Reasons: *to include in the Rules of Procedure decisions by WRC-12, WRC-15 and WRC-19 related to the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use satellite assignments.*

Effective date of application of this Rule: immediately after approval.

Annex 8
Modification of the existing rules of procedure on the working methods under
Part C of the Rules of Procedure

Rules concerning

PART C

Internal arrangements and working methods of the Radio Regulations Board

MOD

1.6 All other submissions from Administrations shall be received by the Executive Secretary at least three weeks before the meeting. Any submissions received from Administrations following the three-week deadline will normally not be considered at the same meeting and will be placed on the agenda of the following meeting. However, if so agreed by Board Members, delayed submissions relevant to items on the approved agenda could be considered for information. Submissions that comment on a submission from another administration could only be considered if received at least 10 days before the start of the meeting. Submissions in response to delayed submission will only be considered if received before the start of the meeting. In addition to any of the other five official languages of the Union, delayed submissions shall at least be provided in English. Any submissions received after the start of the Board meeting will not be considered by the Board unless there are exceptional circumstances.

Effective date of application of the rule: immediately after the approval of the rule.
