



Radiocommunication Bureau (BR)

Circular Letter
CR/350

27 May 2013

To Administrations of Member States of the ITU

Subject: **Minutes of the 62nd meeting of the Radio Regulations Board**

Pursuant to the provisions of Nos. 13.18 of the Radio Regulations and in accordance with §1.10 of Part C of the Rules of Procedure, please find attached the approved minutes of the 62nd meeting of the Radio Regulations Board (18 – 22 March 2013).

These minutes were approved by the Members of the Radio Regulations Board by electronic means and are available on the RRB pages of the ITU web site.

François Rancy
Director

Annex : Minutes of the 62nd meeting of the Radio Regulations Board

Distribution :

- Administration of Member States of the ITU
- Members of the Radio Regulations Board

Annex

Radio Regulations Board
Geneva, 18-22 March 2013



Document RRB13-1/8-E
8 April 2013
Original: English

MINUTES*
OF THE
62nd MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD
18-22 March 2013

Present:

Members, RRB

Mr P.K. GARG, Chairman
Mr S.K. KIBE, Vice-Chairman
Mr M. BESSI; Mr A.R. EBADI; Mr Y. ITO;
Mr S. KOFFI; Mr A. MAGENTA; Mr B. NURMATOV;
Mr V. STRELETS; Mr R. L. TERÁN;
Mr M. ŽILINSKAS; Ms J. N. ZOLLER

Executive Secretary, RRB

Mr F. LEITE, Deputy-Director, BR and Chief, IAP, on behalf of Director, BR

Précis-Writers

Mr T. ELDRIDGE and Ms A. HADEN

Also present:

Mr H. ZHAO, ITU Deputy Secretary-General
Mr Y. HENRI, Chief, SSD
Mr A. MENDEZ, Chief, TSD
Mr A. MATAS, SSD/SPR
Mr S. VENKATASUBRAMANIAN, SSD/SSC
Mr N. VENKATESH, SGD
Mr V. TIMOFEEV, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General
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 62nd meeting of the Board. The official decisions of the 62nd meeting of the Radio Regulations Board can be found in Document RRB13-1/7.

	Subjects discussed	Documents
1	Opening of the meeting	-
2	Late contributions and adoption of the agenda	-
3	Approval of the minutes of the 61st meeting	RRB12-3/13
4	Report by the Director of BR	RRB13-1/1 + Add.1+2
5	Consideration of draft rules of procedure	CCRR/46 + CCRR/47; RRB13-1/2
6	Submission by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates concerning harmful interference to the operations of the YAHSAT-1A satellite at 52.5° E	RRB13-1/3 + Add.1
7	Submission by the Administration of France concerning cases of deliberate and harmful interference to satellites operated by EUTELSAT	RRB13-1/4
8	Submission by the Administrations of the Netherlands, Norway, France, Spain and Luxembourg regarding additional cost recovery charges imposed on submissions containing the frequency band 21.4-22 GHz	RRB13-1/5
9	Cancellation from the MIFR of frequency assignments to the PRESAT satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	RRB13-1/6
10	Report of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure	RRB12-1/4(Rev.5))
11	Dates of the next and subsequent meetings	-
12	International monitoring facilities	-
13	Approval of the summary of decisions	RRB13-1/7
14	Closure of the meeting	-

1 Opening of the meeting

1.1 The **Chairman** opened the meeting at 1400 hours on Monday, 18 March 2013, and welcomed participants. He said that he looked forward to working with everyone on the basis of cooperation and consensus, led by the example set by the Board and its chairmen over past years. He noted that the Director was unable to attend the present meeting because he was recovering from surgery; on behalf of the entire Board, he wished the Director a full and speedy recovery. The Director's role as Executive Secretary of the Board would be assumed by the Deputy-Director at the present meeting.

1.2 The **Deputy Secretary-General** said that in the absence of the Secretary-General he was pleased to attend the Board's first meeting of 2013, which was also the first under the chairmanship of Mr Garg, to whom he wished every success in his functions. He too wished the Director a full and speedy recovery. The Board's agenda contained both old and new subjects which would require careful consideration by the members. He was pleased to announce that the Secretary-General had sent letters to administrations on certain matters where requested by the Board to do so; some progress was being made on those difficult issues. In regard to certain cases of harmful interference, successful negotiations had been held between the parties concerned, and he encouraged Board members to do what they could at both bilateral and multilateral level in order to avoid the need for cases to be brought before the Board. Noting that preparations were already well under way for WRC-15, he urged the Board not to hesitate either to share their ideas on ways to improve preparations or to request the help of the Secretary-General or himself in that regard.

1.2 bis The Chairman thanked the Deputy Secretary General for his kind words and for this assurance of continued support for the work of the Board.

1.3 **Mr Magenta** thanked the Deputy Secretary-General for his presence, availability and support.

1.4 The **Deputy-Director** congratulated the Chairman on his election, and assured him of the Bureau's full support for the Board and its work.

1.5 Several Board members congratulated the Chairman upon his election and assured him of their confidence and support for him in his functions throughout the year.

2 Late contributions and adoption of the agenda

2.1 The **Chairman** said that five late contributions had been received from administrations.

2.2 It was **agreed** that the late contributions would be taken up for information purposes under the agenda items to which they related.

2.3 **Chief SSD** said that the letter from the French Administration contained in its late contribution to the Board's 61st meeting (RRB12-3/DELAYED/6) would normally have been taken up at the present meeting, but had been superseded by Document RRB13-1/4, which had been submitted on time to the present meeting.

2.4 **Mr Magenta** observed that the matters addressed in the Director's report were brought to the meeting's attention for information purposes, and presumably were not to be dealt with as substantive matters unless they were the subject of submissions made on time by administrations. Thus, if a late submission related to a matter in the Director's report not otherwise identified in the agenda for substantive discussion, surely its consideration should be deferred to the following meeting.

2.5 **Mr Bessi** said that Mr Magenta had raised a valid point. If substantive discussion on matters in the Director's report was opened based on late submissions accepted for information purposes, the Board might find itself required to address numerous subjects not on its agenda.

2.6 **Mr Strelets** said that the Board would look carefully at all the matters addressed in the Director's report, not only those on which administrations had made submissions. In particular, the Board would review subjects on which it had taken decisions in the past. To the extent that late contributions from administrations might provide useful information on matters addressed in the Director's report, they should be taken into consideration at the meeting. **Mr Žilinskas, Mr Koffi, Mr Kibe, Mr Ito and Mr Terán** agreed.

2.7 **Mr Bessi** said that he saw no objection to that approach, but that late contributions should be decided upon on a case-by-case basis. He noted that the Board was not required to take action on late contributions in the same manner as submissions made on time.

2.8 The **Chairman** proposed that, following its consideration of the Director's report, the Board should consider first the draft new and revised rules of procedure and subsequently submissions from administrations, for the reason he had given at the Board's 61st meeting (§ 13.11 of Document RRB12-3/13 – Minutes of the 61st meeting of the Board). The Board should adopt its agenda on that basis.

2.9 It was so **agreed**.

2.10 The **Chairman** said that a text prepared by Ms Zoller relating to Part C of the Rules of Procedure, dealing with the Board's handling of restricted material, would be taken up by the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure.

2.11 It was so **agreed**.

3 Approval of the minutes of the 61st meeting (Document RRB12-3/13)

3.1 The minutes of the 61st meeting (Document RRB12-3/13) were **approved** without modification.

3.2 **Mr Strelets** stressed that the decisions it had taken at its 61st meeting should be borne in mind by the Board when it came to consider the same matters at its present meeting (for example, its decision on the harmful interference caused by Italy to its neighbouring countries, and its appeal for France and the Islamic Republic of Iran to exercise the utmost goodwill and cooperation in settling their problems of harmful interference).

3.3 The **Chairman** agreed, and took the opportunity to congratulate Mr Strelets for his very able chairmanship of the Board throughout 2012.

4 Report by the Director of BR (Document RRB13-1/1 and Addenda 1 and 2)

4.1 The **Deputy-Director** said that the Director's report in Document RRB13-1/1 and Addenda 1 and 2 was in the usual format, and that Chief SSD and Chief TSD would present the sections related to space and terrestrial systems, respectively.

4.2 **Mr Strelets**, referring to § 4.33 of Document RRB12-3/13 (Minutes of the 61st meeting), asked whether there had been any reactions from the Administrations of France and the Islamic Republic of Iran in regard to the Board's decision relating to interference to certain EUTELSAT satellite networks.

4.3 **Chief SSD** noted that § 4.3 of the Director's report (Document RRB13-1/1) dealt with the harmful interference affecting transmissions on EUTELSAT satellites at 7° E and 13° E notified by the Administration of France as the notifying administration for the intergovernmental satellite organization EUTELSAT. The matter would be discussed under a separate agenda item. As reported in § 4.4, and as instructed by the Board, the Bureau had proposed possible dates for a one-day meeting to be organized under the auspices of the Bureau prior to the present meeting of the Board. The meeting had not yet taken place because no response had been received from the Administration of France. He drew attention to § 2 of the Director's report, and in particular to Annex 3, on the current situation in respect of the processing of space notices. Circulating updated statistics that included February 2013, he was pleased to report that all treatment times were back within the regulatory deadlines. Where there were no regulatory deadlines, the Bureau made every effort to continuously improve treatment times. Referring to § 3 of the report, which dealt with the implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings (late payments), he said that Annex 4 contained a list of satellite network filings for which payment had been received after the due date but prior to the BR IFIC meeting that would have cancelled those filings, and that continued to be taken into account. Annex 4 also contained a list of satellite network filings that had been cancelled as a result of non-payment of invoices. Reports of harmful interference or infringements of the Radio Regulations were covered in § 4 of the report. In § 5 of the report, there were tables indicating the suppression of coordination request special sections, and of submissions under Article 4 of Appendices 30/30A and Article 6 of Appendix 30B for the reporting period, and in particular the impact of Bureau's action in the implementation of No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations.

4.4 **Ms Zoller** congratulated the Bureau on bringing the processing time for space system filings back within the regulatory deadlines.

4.5 **Chief TSD**, referring to § 2 of the Director's report, and to Annex 2, said that the Bureau's processing of filings for terrestrial systems was up to date.

4.6 The **Deputy-Director** drew attention to Annex 1 to the Director's report, which contained a summary of actions arising from the 61st meeting of the Board. Despite a heavy workload, the Bureau was within the regulatory deadlines for processing of all filings. That satisfactory performance depended on the availability of resources, and he hoped that the ITU Council would allocate the same level of funds to the Bureau for the coming biennium.

4.7 The **Chairman** thanked the Bureau and the Director for their work, congratulating them in particular on processing all filings in accordance with the regulatory deadlines. He also welcomed the Bureau's efforts to convene a meeting between the Administration of France and the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Stressing the vital importance of the Bureau's activities in managing the radio spectrum, he expressed the hope that the Council would allocate adequate resources to the Bureau in order to ensure that such essential activities could continue satisfactorily.

4.8 **Mr Strelets** said that the Deputy-Director had raised an important point concerning the Bureau's resources. The number of harmful interference cases was growing, and there were huge numbers of terrestrial notices to be processed. It was in the interests of all administrations that the Bureau work efficiently and have sufficient resources to enable it to carry out its tasks. Perhaps a representative of the Board should attend the Council session and urge the Council to allocate adequate resources to the Radiocommunication Sector.

4.9 **Ms Zoller** said that, in her view, it was not within the Board's mandate to send a representative of the Board to the Council. Moreover, such a step would create additional expense for the Union. If absolutely necessary, the Board could send a contribution to the Council. In general, the Board received instructions from the Council, WRC or plenipotentiary conference, rather than the reverse.

Cooperation to resolve cases of harmful interference to satellite transmissions

4.10 **Chief SSD** said that there had been an increase in the number of harmful interference cases for which the Bureau's assistance was requested. The types of action that the Bureau was taking to help resolve such cases were listed in § 6 of the Director's report (Document RRB13-1/1). In particular, as noted in § 6.2, the Bureau was in the process of drawing up memoranda of cooperation with administrations that had the capacity to monitor the use of spectrum allocated to satellite services in order to assist the Bureau in performing measurements related to cases of harmful interference for which an administration was seeking BR assistance. A memorandum of cooperation had already been signed by ITU and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) regarding cases of interference involving the global navigation satellite system (GNSS) on board civil aircraft. Additional contacts had also been initiated with organizations including the Satellite Industry Association (SIA), the European Satellite Operators' Association (ESOA), and the Global VSAT Forum (GVF) for assistance in providing satellite monitoring information and helping to determine sources of harmful interference. As explained in § 6.3 of the report, that approach should provide the Bureau with independent sources of information on the origin of harmful interference, facilitating regulatory actions foreseen under Article 15 of the Radio Regulations. The response from administrations and organizations had been positive, and the actions foreseen were in line with ITU's Constitution and Convention.

4.11 The **Chairman** was pleased to see the steps that the Bureau was taking to facilitate the rapid identification of sources of harmful interference.

4.12 **Ms Zoller** recalled that the Board, in its report to WRC-12 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07), had expressed the view that monitoring results obtained by recognized international monitoring stations using measurement techniques and technologies documented in the *ITU-R Handbook on Spectrum Monitoring* were a valuable resource for addressing harmful interference. Also in its report to WRC-12 under Resolution 80, the Board had noted that monitoring would require substantial resources. She asked about the content of the memoranda of cooperation, and what financial arrangements were in place.

4.13 **Chief SSD** said that all administrations with international monitoring stations would be invited to consider concluding memoranda of cooperation with ITU. The type of cooperation and the details of how to register monitoring stations were covered in Recommendation ITU-R SM.1139. The aim of a memorandum of cooperation was to help the Bureau ensuring efficient management of the orbit/spectrum resources, including the elimination of harmful interference. The financial aspects were still open for discussion.

4.14 The **Deputy-Director** added that, according to *instructs the Council 1b*) of Resolution 100 (Minneapolis, 1998), the involvement of the Secretary-General as depositary for any memorandum of understanding was on the basis of cost recovery. The Bureau was still considering how monitoring through memoranda of cooperation would be financed.

4.15 **Mr Bessi** said that he had no concerns about the legal aspects of the memoranda of cooperation but, if necessary, the Council could approve their validity. He welcomed the approach and encouraged the Bureau to continue to cooperate with administrations in order to strengthen international monitoring. Before taking a decision, the Bureau should use several sources of information (not just a single source) in order to locate the origin of harmful interference.

4.16 **Mr Strelets** said that the Bureau's technically complex work required the cooperation of administrations and operators. He supported the approach being taken to resolve problems of harmful interference but, referring to § 6.2 of the Director's report, asked why the memorandum of cooperation with ICAO was limited to the global navigation satellite system (GNSS).

4.17 **Chief SSD** explained that the memorandum of cooperation with ICAO was the first to be signed by ITU, that GNSS signals were critical to safety of life, and that there had been a case of harmful interference to those signals. ITU hoped to learn from the experience of that first memorandum of cooperation, not only to conclude memoranda of cooperation with other organizations, but also to review and extend cooperation with ICAO. He offered to provide Board members with copies of the memorandum of cooperation with ICAO and of draft memoranda of cooperation currently being discussed.

4.18 The **Chairman** said that it would be helpful for the Board to see those texts.

4.19 **Mr Koffi** congratulated the Bureau on moving ahead with establishing memoranda of cooperation with various entities and said that the Board should encourage the Bureau to continue with that approach.

4.20 **Mr Ebadi** said he had no problem with the concept of monitoring. Indeed, the Board had brought that idea to the attention of WRC-12. He stressed, however, that information must be available from two or three monitoring sources. No decision could be taken on the basis of information from a single source.

4.21 The **Chairman** agreed that at least two sources of monitoring information were needed to ensure that results were fair and impartial.

4.22 **Mr Strelets** said that, in order to ensure the validity of monitoring results, monitoring systems should employ generally accepted measurement techniques and technologies. He was in favour of using monitoring to resolve problems of harmful interference, and agreed that several sources of information were needed on which to base decisions. But to extend the use of monitoring to support the implementation of, say, No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations would have long-term consequences and therefore should be carefully considered.

4.23 **Ms Zoller** said that she understood § 6 of the Director's report to refer to monitoring to resolve cases of harmful interference. She did not believe that the Bureau planned to use such monitoring to support the implementation of No. 13.6 or other provisions. Mr Strelets had, however, raised an important point. Use of monitoring other than to resolve cases of harmful interference would need to be fully discussed before any decision could be taken.

4.24 The **Deputy-Director** confirmed that § 6 of the Director's report referred solely to monitoring in the context of resolving problems of harmful interference.

4.25 **Mr Magenta** suggested that results from two monitoring systems could be accepted as being sufficient to ensure impartiality, given the costs involved and the few entities having the capacity to provide monitoring services.

4.26 The Board **approved** its conclusion regarding § 6 of the Director's report as follows:

“With respect to §6 of the Director's Report, the Board recalled that in its Report to WRC-12 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07), the RRB considered that monitoring results obtained by recognized international monitoring stations using measurement techniques and technologies documented in the *ITU-R Handbook on Spectrum Monitoring* to be a valuable resource for addressing harmful interference and noted with satisfaction the Bureau's activities in this area. The Board deemed that the procedures for the use of recognized monitoring stations to assist the Bureau to perform measurements related to cases of harmful interference for which an administration is seeking the assistance of the Bureau would require careful consideration and that measurements from more than one source would be desirable. The Board also noted the need for Council to assess the possible implications (e.g., financial) of entering into memoranda of cooperation with administrations having such monitoring capabilities.”

Specific cases of harmful interference – Cuba and United States

4.27 **Chief TSD** said that § 4.2.1 of the Director's report (Document RRB13-1/1) referred to the cases of harmful interference from the United States to the VHF/UHF broadcasting (sound and television) service of Cuba. Further information was to be found in Addendum 2 to Document RRB13-1/1, which contained a copy of a communication from the Administration of Cuba seeking the application of No. 140 of the ITU Convention and emphasizing the need to take due account of the decision of the 9th plenary meeting of WRC-07 in regard to a broadcasting station operating on board an aircraft and transmitting solely to the territory of another administration without its agreement. The Secretary-General of ITU had addressed a letter to the President of the United States on 13 February 2013 urging the Government of the United States to consider the matter, with a view to its timely resolution.

4.28 **Mr Žilinskas** expressed satisfaction that the Secretary-General had sent a letter to the President of the United States. He hoped that an answer would be forthcoming. There did not appear to be anything else that the Board could do at the present stage.

4.29 The **Chairman** said that he was sure that all Board members would like to convey their appreciation to the Secretary-General for the step that he had taken. He was optimistic that the letter would achieve a positive result.

4.30 The Board **approved** its conclusions regarding the Cuba/United States case of harmful interference as follows:

“With respect to §4.2.1 of the Report by the Director and Addendum 2 to the Director's Report, the Board noted with satisfaction that, as requested at the 60th meeting of the Board, a letter had been sent by the ITU Secretary-General to the President of the United States of America in February 2013. The Board also noted with regret that the harmful interference to some of the broadcasting services of Cuba was still continuing. The Board invited the Administration of the United States of America and the Administration of Cuba to continue to resolve the matter.”

Specific cases of harmful interference – Italy and neighbouring countries

4.31 **Mr Strelets**, referring to § 4.33 of Document RRB12-3/13 (Minutes of the 61st meeting), asked how the Administration of Italy had reacted to the Board's decision at its 61st meeting.

4.32 **Chief TSD** said that harmful interference caused by Italy to neighbouring countries was the subject of § 4.2.2 of the Director's report (Document RRB13-1/1), and that Document RRB13-1/DELAYED/1 from the Administration of Croatia provided an update on the situation in regard to Croatia, which it categorized as “becoming more and more critical”. The Bureau had also received a letter from the Administration of Malta with reference to publicly available information on the current and foreseen use of certain channels by Italy, and expressing concerns about resolving problems of harmful interference.

4.33 **Mr Žilinskas** regretted that no response had been received from the Administration of Italy, despite the promise that Italy had made at WRC-12 to provide a roadmap for the actions that would be undertaken to eliminate the interference.

4.34 **Mr Strelets** said that the harmful interference caused by Italy, while not deliberate, was having a negative economic effect on neighbouring countries. Perhaps those countries could seek damages via an economic tribunal. The Board had taken a constructive decision at its 61st meeting but there had not been any response from Italy. As a minimum, the Board should set a deadline for Italy to provide a roadmap for its future actions.

4.35 The **Chairman** suggested that the Director should take appropriate actions to help resolve the matter, including implementing again the decision taken by the Board at its 61st meeting and perhaps holding meetings with all the administrations concerned.

4.36 **Mr Ebadi** said that the Director had made repeated efforts to endeavour to resolve the matter. The Board might request the Secretary-General to raise the problem in the Council.

4.37 **Mr Bessi** agreed with the Chairman and Mr Strelets. He proposed that the ITU Legal Adviser should be asked to explore any legal options that could be employed to deal with an administration that, by virtue of being situated within the planning area of the GE06 Regional Agreement, exercised its rights but did not respect its obligations under that agreement. The results of that study should be made available to the Board's 63rd meeting.

4.38 **Ms Zoller** recalled that the Board had requested a similar study prior to WRC-12 and had included the results in its report to the conference under Resolution 80. Ultimately, the Board had concluded that, under the current provisions of the Radio Regulations, Constitution and Convention, it was outside the Board's or the Bureau's powers to suspend the processing of assignments belonging to an administration that claimed its right to international recognition and protection from harmful interference but did not fulfil its obligations.

4.39 **Mr Žilinskas** supported Ms Zoller. The case of harmful interference by Italy to neighbouring countries dated back many years. According to information previously presented to the Board, Italy had ratified neither the GE06 nor the GE84 Agreement and therefore had no obligation to comply with those agreements. He favoured the approach suggested by Mr Strelets, which seemed to be the only way open to the Board. The Secretary-General had, at the Board's request, written to the Italian Government and had even met government representatives. The feedback had been positive, but Italy had not delivered the promised results. The Board should reiterate its previous decision and get a response from Italy. The matter could be raised in the Council, but he was less optimistic than the Chairman of that being a productive approach. According to the letter from Croatia in Document RRB13-1/DELAYED/1, Italy was causing harmful interference to Croatian broadcasting stations. Italy had provided some explanation in regard to television broadcasting, but absolutely nothing in regard to FM broadcasting, raising no hopes of improvement.

4.40 **Chief TSD** observed that Italy exercised its rights under the GE06 and GE84 Agreements, and reacted to the publication of modifications by neighbouring countries.

4.41 **Mr Strelets** warned that the problem of continuing harmful interference caused by Italy to neighbouring countries in spite of all the efforts of the Board and WRC-12 might undermine administrations' trust in ITU and the Board. So far, Italy had provided nothing but promises not supported by any concrete activities. The matter had been raised at WRC-12 but Italy had not implemented the decision of the conference. The problem should be brought to the attention of the Council and, if necessary, WRC-15.

4.42 **Mr Bessi** recalled that the focus of the legal advice contained in Annex 6 to Document RRB09-2/4 (Director's report to the 51st meeting) had been on rules of procedure concerning non-respect of regional agreements. In preparing for WRC-12, the Board's conclusion had been that there was no basis in the Radio Regulations for freezing the treatment of an administration's filings. The present case did not relate to a rule of procedure. The question was how to make Italy respect the rights of other administrations under the Constitution, Convention and regional agreements, while it insisted on its own rights under those instruments.

4.43 The **Chairman** informed the Board that the Legal Adviser had been contacted by the Deputy-Director and was ready to provide a legal opinion, on the understanding that the Board formulated a precise question.

4.44 **Mr Nurmatov** recalled that, at the Board's 61st meeting, the involvement of the European Union had been mentioned. Perhaps now was the time to activate that approach.

4.45 The **Chairman** observed that, if the Board instructed the Director to take appropriate actions, then the Director could contact the European Union if he saw fit to do so.

4.46 **Mr Bessi** suggested that the question for the Legal Adviser should be included in the Board's decision.

4.47 Responding to a query from **Mr Žilinskas**, **Chief TSD** confirmed that all reports from administrations affected by harmful interference from Italy were posted on the dedicated website.

4.48 The **Deputy-Director** announced that he had just been informed that the Secretary-General had received a letter from the Italian Ministry of Economic Development, indicating that work was proceeding on the interference issue as a priority, and that legal innovations had recently been introduced in Italy that were conducive to achieving a mutually satisfactory situation with Slovenia.

4.49 The Board **approved** its conclusions regarding the interference caused by Italy to neighbouring countries as follows:

“Regarding § 4.2.2 of the Report by the Director and taking into account the information provided in Document RRB13-1/DELAYED/1, the Board noted with regret that the harmful interference to sound and television broadcasting services caused by Italy to its neighbours was continuing. In this regard, the Board recalled its decision at the 61st meeting which instructed the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau:

- “a) to write a letter to the Administration of Italy requesting a detailed description of the actions undertaken by that Administration since WRC-12 and to provide a roadmap for the future actions that will be undertaken to eliminate this interference;
- b) to send the response from the Administration of Italy to the administrations affected, asking them for their views;
- c) to present a summary of all relevant documents, provided by the Administration of Italy and the responses from the affected administrations, to the next RRB meeting in order for the Board to decide on the future course of action.”

The Board noted that the Director had followed up on these decisions. However, there has been no response from the Administration of Italy regarding item (a) above. This matter is of serious concern to the Board.

The Board decided to instruct the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to take appropriate actions to help resolve the matter, including implementing again the decisions of the Board at its 61st meeting and, if appropriate, holding meetings with the concerned authorities of all administrations involved.

The Board also instructed the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau to request a special study by the legal advisor of the ITU to identify any legal options for addressing the situation whereby an administration, by virtue of being situated within the planning area of the GE06 Regional Agreement, exercises its rights but does not respect its obligations under this agreement. The results of this study should be available to the 63rd meeting of the Board.”

Specific cases of harmful interference – Interference reported by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

4.50 **Chief TSD** said that a new case of harmful interference was being brought to the attention of the Board in § 4.2.3 of the Director's report (Document RRB13-1/1), concerning harmful interference to the VHF television broadcasting service of the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

reported harmful interference to its television broadcasting service on 186 MHz, 194 MHz, 210 MHz and 218 MHz caused by high-powered analogue television stations located in the Republic of Korea. The Bureau had transmitted the information to the Administration of the Republic of Korea and had not received any written acknowledgement of the receipt of that information. However, about a month prior to the present meeting of the Board, a representative of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea had come to the Bureau to discuss the case and had asked for that presence to be considered as an acknowledgement of receipt of the information. Addendum 1 to Document RRB13-1/1 noted the request from the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that the case be submitted to the Board, and contained a summary of the case and an analysis by the Bureau of the available information. The Bureau had concluded that none of the assignments recorded for the Administration of the Republic of Korea corresponded to the location of the reported sources of harmful interference. The Bureau had performed a hypothetical calculation to estimate the radiated power necessary to produce the reported interfering signal level, and had concluded that the radiated power of the interfering emissions would appear to be orders of magnitude higher than the normal radiated power of television stations. He noted that the Republic of Korea had switched over to digital television broadcasting before the end of 2012, and there was no longer any analogue television broadcasting in that country.

4.51 **Mr Bessi** said that it was questionable whether the Board had enough information to deal with the case.

4.52 **Mr Žilinskas**, referring to Addendum 1 to Document RRB13-1/1, said that the results calculated by the Bureau appeared incredible. He did not know of any television antenna that could transmit at such high powers (90 dBW) and asked whether there could be a seasonal effect on propagation conditions.

4.53 The **Chairman** said that a ducting effect occurred at certain times of the year, and television signals could travel much longer distances than normally expected.

4.54 **Chief TSD** said that the Bureau had not taken propagation conditions and, in particular, ducting effects into account, although in exceptional cases they might make the signal much stronger than expected. The Bureau's calculations had been based solely on information provided by the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the assignments recorded in the MIFR. Making the assumptions listed in § 3.2 of Addendum 1 to Document RRB13-1/1, the Bureau had calculated the hypothetical signals that would have had to be emitted to create the interference reported by the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. As Mr Žilinskas had pointed out, the calculated values were extremely high. In theory, the Republic of Korea no longer implemented analogue television broadcasting.

4.55 **Mr Ebadi** noted that the stations involved were recorded in the MIFR. He said that Article 45 of the Constitution should be observed, and that the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations should be applied, in particular No. 15.2, which stated that "transmitting stations shall radiate only as much power as is necessary to ensure a satisfactory service", and No. 13.2, which referred to assistance in resolving cases of harmful interference. He noted that the Board had received no information from the Administration of the Republic of Korea.

4.56 **Mr Magenta** said that he had never come across such high powered emissions from a television broadcasting antenna as those indicated in the Bureau's calculations. Perhaps a directional antenna might transmit at such a power, but the Bureau had not considered that case. The lack of information made it impossible to understand what was happening.

4.57 **Mr Žilinskas** supported Mr Ebadi. Several questions remained to be answered. Was the interference continuous or sporadic? Did it occur at times when a ducting effect was likely? Was the harmful interference deliberate? The information that had been presented was contradictory; the Republic of Korea had switched to digital broadcasting but the Administration of the Democratic

People's Republic of Korea reported harmful interference from analogue signals. According to the information extracted from the MIFR, the assignments registered by the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea used lower power than those registered by the Administration of the Republic of Korea.

4.58 **Mr Bessi** observed that the frequencies registered by both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea were in the non-planned bands and therefore were governed by Article 8 of the Radio Regulations. Hence, according to No. 8.3, the frequency assignments recorded in the MIFR with a favourable finding had the right to international recognition, and other administrations had to take those assignments into account in order to avoid harmful interference. According to the information extracted from the MIFR, the date of notification of the assignments registered by the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was 1991, whereas the date of notification of some of the assignments registered by the Administration of the Republic of Korea was as early as 1989. No date was given for several of the assignments registered by the Administration of the Republic of Korea. He suggested that the Bureau should clarify which assignments had the right to be protected from harmful interference.

4.59 **Chief TSD** said that any dates left blank were prior to 1989. The database had been computerized in 1989, and earlier dates had not been included. The date of notification recorded in the MIFR did not establish precedence, although existing assignments had to be taken into account at the time of notification. The assignments of both administrations benefited from international recognition and should be protected from harmful interference. The Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had complained that the level of signal from the Republic of Korea was affecting its assignments, but had not referred to precedence arising from date of recording in the MIFR.

4.60 **Mr Strelets** supported Mr Ebadi. Emissions from the Republic of Korea should not cause harmful interference to stations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations. The interference had apparently been going on for a long time, and the Board should be consistent in its approach and treat the case as it treated other such.

4.61 **Mr Žilinskas** suggested adding a reference to No. 23.3 of the Radio Regulations if the Board adopted a decision based on the comments made by Mr Ebadi, as that provision stated that broadcasting stations "shall not employ power exceeding that necessary to maintain economically an effective national service of good quality within the frontiers of the country concerned."

4.62 **Mr Ito** said that, given the delicate relations between the two countries, the Board should not draw conclusions on the basis of information from just one side. The Bureau should help in investigating the matter, and the two administrations should display mutual goodwill and cooperate to resolve the matter.

4.63 **Mr Bessi** agreed that the matter was delicate. The case was being brought to the Board's attention for the first time, and the Board should await a reply from the other side before taking a decision.

4.64 **Mr Magenta** supported Mr Bessi. The Board did not have sufficient information as a basis for taking a decision.

4.65 **Mr Ito** also supported Mr Bessi. The Board's decision had to be based on facts, and the Bureau should seek a response from the Republic of Korea.

4.66 **Mr Terán** supported both Mr Ito and Mr Bessi. If the problem dated back some 15 years, he wondered why it had first been reported in 2011 and was only now being brought to the attention of the Board.

4.67 **Mr Strelets** said that the Bureau had acted correctly but that its efforts had led nowhere because the Administration of the Republic of Korea had not responded. Probably for that reason, the Administration of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had asked for the case to be brought to the Board.

4.68 **Chief TSD** informed the Board that the Bureau had sent five letters to the Administration of the Republic of Korea, mentioning the relevant provisions but not reply was received to any of these letters.

4.69 The **Chairman** invited Mr Ebadi to draft the Board's conclusions on the case. **Mr Ebadi** said that, in so doing, he would consult the Board members who had expressed opinions on the matter.

4.70 **Chief TSD** said that the Bureau would work to clarify the technical data, in particular the power output and the geographical location of the stations causing the interference.

4.71 On that understanding, the Board **approved** its conclusions as follows:

"The Board considered in detail §4.2.3 of the Report by the Director, Document RRB13-1/1, and Addendum 1 to Document RRB13-1/1 regarding the request for assistance from the Administration of Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Board was informed that:

- The Administration of Democratic People's Republic of Korea reported harmful interference to its television broadcasting stations on 186 MHz, 194 MHz, 210 MHz, and 218 MHz from high-powered analogue television stations located in the Republic of Korea and requested assistance from the Bureau;
- The analogue television broadcasting stations of the Administration of Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 186 MHz, 194 MHz, 210 MHz, and 218 MHz are duly recorded in the ITU MIFR with favorable findings and hence, in accordance with No. 8.3 of the ITU Radio Regulations, have the right to international recognition in order to avoid harmful interference;
- The Bureau had forwarded all the reports of harmful interference to the Administration of the Republic of Korea, but had not received any reply. However a representative from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea had visited the Bureau, acknowledging the receipt of the reports of harmful interference.
- The provisions of Nos. 23.3 and 15.2 of the Radio Regulations are applicable in this case.

The Board instructed the Bureau to continue to support the administrations involved in investigating the matter and urged the Administrations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Republic of Korea to display mutual goodwill and to cooperate in resolving this issue as a matter of high priority."

4.72 Document RRB13-1/1, along with Addenda 1 and 2, was **noted**.

5 Consideration of draft rules of procedure (Circular Letters CCRR/46 and CCRR/47; Document RRB13-1/2)

Draft rules on the working methods of the Radio Regulations Board (Part C of the Rules of Procedure) (Circular Letter CCRR/46; Document RRB 13-1/2)

5.1 The **Deputy Director** introduced the draft revised rules of procedure in Circular Letter CCRR/46, along with the comments received from the Administrations of Armenia, Uzbekistan and the Islamic Republic of Iran in Annexes 1, 3 and 7, respectively, to Document RRB13-1/2. The changes proposed in Circular Letter CCRR/46 were essentially intended to reflect the new process

being put in place for the Board to approve its minutes in between meetings, as discussed at the Board's 60th meeting, in order to make the procedure compliant with the requirements of Article 13 of the Radio Regulations. The new procedure had been implemented on a trial basis following the Board's 60th meeting, and its successful implementation depended to a large extent on there being a sufficient gap between meetings. Armenia supported the changes proposed, Uzbekistan proposed a few editorial amendments, and the Islamic Republic of Iran proposed more substantive modifications.

5.2 The **Chairman** observed that the changes proposed by the Bureau reflected the conclusions reached by the Board following long discussions at its 60th meeting.

5.3 The **Deputy Director** said that the first change proposed in Circular Letter CCRR/46, based on the new procedure, was to delete § 1.4 *a*) of Part C, with the subsequent subparagraphs renumbered in consequence, thereby making "approval of the minutes of the previous Board meeting" no longer a standing item on the Board's agenda.

5.4 **Mr Strelets** said that the proposal by the Islamic Republic of Iran to retain § 1.4 *a*) rather begged the question as to whether the minutes approved by the Board in between meetings were to be considered approved on a provisional or final basis. At all events, the Iranian proposal to retain § 1.4 *a*) contradicted the Iranian proposals regarding § 1.10. In his view, § 1.4 *a*) should be deleted.

5.5 **Mr Ebadi** said that the Board's discussions at its 60th meeting had been based essentially on the need for the Board to comply with No. 13.18 of the Radio Regulations, the most important element of which was the requirement for the "approved minutes" of a meeting to "normally be circulated at least one month before the start of the following meeting to administrations by means of a circular letter...". It was of secondary importance to him whether those approved minutes were "final" or "provisional".

5.6 The **Chairman** noted that No. 13.18 referred to "approved minutes" and not to "provisionally approved minutes".

5.7 **Mr Bessi** considered that the modifications proposed in Circular Letter CCRR/46 reflected the outcome of the Board's discussions at its 60th meeting. He feared that Mr Ebadi's approach to the matter might constitute a return to the practice the Board was seeking to discontinue.

5.8 **Mr Ebadi** said that his approach to the matter did not mean a return to past practice. The most important point was that the minutes be circulated one month before the following meeting, but that did not mean that final approval could not take place at that meeting. The word "normally" in No. 13.18 gave the Board whatever flexibility it might require.

5.9 **Mr Strelets** said that the Iranian proposal to retain § 1.4 *a*) was incompatible with the new procedure endorsed by the Board at its 60th meeting. The new procedure had not yet been implemented fully, given that the revised rule of procedure was not yet in force. The minutes were produced for information purposes and had no legal weight, as the decisions taken by the Board were presented in a separate document, the summary of decisions. The minutes provided a faithful reflection of what transpired at meetings, the views of Board members and how those views might evolve as the meeting progressed, and how decisions were reached. They were not open to comment by administrations, and that possibility had consciously been excluded by the decisions taken by the Board at its 60th meeting. They were open to comment and amendment by members, although members normally should not seek to alter other members' interventions but only their own. The minutes could be approved only once, i.e. prior to circulation to administrations. Thus, the deletion of § 1.4 *a*) was justified, and only one administration had expressed any doubt in that regard.

5.10 **Mr Bessi** said that according to the understanding reached at the 60th meeting, the flexibility provided by the word "normally" in No. 13.18 related only to the period of one month

that was to be respected, and not to the requirement for the Board to circulate its approved minutes prior to the following Board meeting, which was always an obligation. The Islamic Republic of Iran was basing its comments on the practices employed by other ITU bodies when approving their minutes by electronic means. Such practices were not, however, set down in any basic text of the Union, and the Board had clear instructions in the ITU Convention to develop and update its own working methods. Thus the Board had full latitude to do so as it deemed most appropriate. The Board's minutes were used by administrations to understand how the Board reached its decisions, and it was therefore useful for administrations to be able to consult them when preparing their submissions to the following meeting. For the Board to approve its minutes by correspondence and make them available before the following meeting was therefore best for administrations, and was not in infringement of any basic ITU texts.

5.11 **Mr Magenta** warned that the Board was repeating the discussions that had taken place at its 60th meeting. There was no reason for the Board to adopt the same practices as any other ITU bodies (e.g. the study groups), especially since No. 13.18 contained specific instructions for the Board's minutes to be made available to administrations one month before the following meeting. He agreed that the minutes were an information document with no legal weight, and that had been made clear by the note recently added by the Board to the cover page of its minutes, which also specified that the Board's official decisions were to be found in its summary of decisions.

5.12 The **Chairman** proposed, in the light of the comments made, that the Board approve MOD § 1.4, thus deleting § 1.4 a).

5.13 It was so **agreed**.

5.14 Based on Uzbekistan's comments in Annex 3 to Document RRB13-1/2, it was **agreed** to replace the word "submissions" by "documents" in § 1.6 and wherever else relevant in Part C, and to replace "RRB website" by "RRB pages of the ITU website" throughout Part C.

5.15 MOD § 1.6, as amended, was **approved**, subject to retention of the word "normally" and replacement of "may" by "could" as proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

5.16 Regarding MOD § 1.9, **Mr Magenta** noted that the provision itself provided the procedure to be followed in the case of the Board taking a vote. The **Deputy-Director** observed that the Board was sovereign to decide its own method if it had recourse to a vote.

5.17 **Mr Bessi** questioned whether the Board would ever need to vote. It adopted its decisions based on the views expressed and consensus reached, and it was sufficient for the minutes to indicate (as would the summary of decisions) whether a decision was taken unanimously or by majority.

5.18 **Ms Zoller** said that the Convention (in particular CV146) and General Rules of conferences, assemblies and meetings of the Union provided the Board with sufficient guidance on how to hold a vote. Voting was extremely rare for the Board, and had not occurred in the six years she had been a member.

5.19 **Mr Ebadi** and **Mr Žilinskas** saw no need to incorporate the Iranian proposal to refer to decisions taken by "qualified majority voting rule" in the last sentence of § 1.9.

5.20 **Mr Strelets**, supported by **Mr Žilinskas**, **Mr Koffi** and **Mr Bessi**, proposed that the last sentence of § 1.9 read simply: "The minutes should clearly indicate if a decision is taken by a vote (at least two-thirds of the members of the Board)."

5.21 Subject to that amendment, MOD § 1.9 was **approved**.

5.22 Regarding MOD § 1.10, the **Deputy-Director** said that the procedure described therein reflected the new practice discussed and approved by the Board at its 60th meeting, ensuring full compliance with No. 13.18 of the Radio Regulations.

5.23 **Ms Zoller** said that the Iranian proposal to include in the fourth sentence of MOD § 1.10 the word “provisionally” in regard to the approved minutes to be circulated to administrations could not be accepted in view of the agreed deletion of § 1.4 a). She nevertheless suggested that the Board agree to the Iranian proposal to delete the reference to “and the necessary staff of the Bureau” in the third sentence.

5.24 It was so **agreed**.

5.25 MOD § 1.10, as amended, was **approved**.

5.26 MOD § 1.11 was **approved**, subject to incorporation of the Iranian proposals to replace “reflected” by “contained” and “will” by “shall”.

5.27 MOD § 1.12 was **approved**.

5.28 The **Chairman** said that as the Board had made only minor amendments to the modifications proposed in Circular Letter CRR/46, it would not be necessary to recirculate the draft revised rules to administrations for further comment.

5.29 The modifications made by the Board to Part C of the Rules of Procedure were **approved** as a whole for immediate application.

Draft rules concerning Articles 9 and 11 of the Radio Regulations, Resolution 51 and the Regional Agreement GE89 (Circular Letter CRR/47; Document RRB13-1/2)

5.30 The **Chairman** invited **Chief TSD** to introduce the draft rules of procedure relating to terrestrial services, and Mr Matas (SSD/SPR) to introduce those relating to space services.

Rules concerning Article 9 – ADD Rules concerning the late payment of cost recovery fees and cancellation of satellite network filings due to non-payment of cost recovery fees in accordance with Council Decision 482

5.31 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)**, introducing the draft new rules, said that according to Council Decision 482, if payment was not received within six months of the invoice being issued, the Bureau was to cancel the publication. Because of administrative delays, the Bureau’s decision regarding late payment or non-payment was normally taken by a BR IFIC meeting taking place no more than six weeks after the six-month deadline. The Board had decided that satellite network filings for which payment had been received after the six-month deadline but prior to the BR IFIC meeting at which the cancellation decision was taken would continue to be taken into account. Any satellite network filing for which payment was received after the BR IFIC meeting where a decision to cancel that filing for non-payment had been taken would no longer be taken into account, and the matter would be reported to a meeting of the Board for consideration if the administration concerned so wished.

5.32 **Chief SSD** recalled that the Board had asked the Bureau to prepare rules of procedure reflecting its practice. He confirmed that the proposed rules contained nothing new, but simply reflected the Bureau’s long-standing practice, which had been set out in Document RRB04-2/1 submitted to the Board’s 34th meeting. The Administration of France had, in its comments in Annex 6 to Document RRB13-1/2, suggested an editorial improvement that made § 2 of the proposed rules easier to understand.

5.33 **Mr Strelets** and **Ms Zoller** said that the text should be amended as proposed by the Administration of France.

5.34 It was so **agreed**.

5.35 **Ms Zoller** drew attention to § 3 of the comments by the Administration of China contained in Annex 9 to Document RRB13-1/2, which she understood as suggesting that, instead of orienting the rule of procedure around the BR IFIC meeting at which cancellation of a satellite network filing due to non-payment would be considered, administrations facing late payment situations should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. She suggested the following amendments. In § 3 of the proposed rules, it would be prudent to say “ ... BR IFIC meeting which normally takes place no more than six weeks ...” in case the period was longer, for example because of holidays. In § 5, she proposed deleting “if the concerned administration so wishes”, because it was useful for the Board to know how often filings were being cancelled where payment was received after the BR IFIC meeting that took the decision to cancel them.

5.36 The **Chairman**, noting that the Bureau had no difficulty with those changes, suggested that the amendments proposed by Ms Zoller be approved.

5.37 It was so **agreed**.

5.38 **Mr Strelets** sought clarification of the comment by the Administration of China. Did it mean that all cases should be considered on a case-by-case basis? In his view, if the Board approved the proposed rules, then surely they would apply to all cases.

5.39 The **Chairman** stated that, once approved, the rules would indeed apply equally to all cases.

5.40 **Chief SSD** confirmed the Chairman’s statement. All payments received after the six-month deadline were examined on a case-by-case basis by the Bureau. At a BR IFIC meeting held normally not later than six weeks after the deadline, the Bureau considered and decided on the filings to be cancelled. The conclusions reached by the Bureau were reported to the Board, affording administrations an opportunity to contest cancellation. It was then up to the Board to take a final decision on the requests by administrations, on a case-by-case basis. He understood the comment by China to call for a case-by-case consideration of all filings for which payment was received beyond the six-month deadline.

5.41 **Mr Strelets** said that, in his understanding, the Administration of China did not want an extra six weeks to be automatically granted to administrations over and above the six-month period for payment.

5.42 **Mr Bessi** said that the proposed rules formalized the Bureau’s current practice and were easier to apply than the approach suggested by the Administration of China.

5.43 **Mr Ito** supported Chief SSD and the Bureau’s current practice. Specifying the case-by-case consideration of the cancellation of any filing for which payment had not been received within the 6-month deadline might encourage an administration to request an extended payment period.

5.44 **Chief SSD** said that the proposed rules had been applied since cost recovery had been introduced a decade ago and did not give rise to any difficulty or create any problems either internally or with administrations notifying satellite network filings. Informing administrations that a decision on cancellation would be taken at a BR IFIC meeting normally held not later than six weeks after the six-month deadline created more certainty and transparency than simply indicating a case-by-case consideration.. Few administrations asked the Board for the payment deadline to be extended, and the percentage of invoices paid was over 99 per cent.. Council Decision 482 stated that networks should be cancelled if payment was not received within six month time limit but, as explained in § 3 of the proposed rules, there could be administrative delays related mainly to the confirmation of payment by financial institutions and to internal validation between the Bureau and the ITU General Secretariat’s Financial Resources Management Department. The decisions taken

by the Bureau would, as previously, be reported to the Board in an annex to the Director's report, for final decision by the Board. Any administration could request an extension of the payment deadline, on the basis of supporting information.

5.45 **Mr Bessi** said that the six-week period was needed to allow for the delay in the payment confirmation being received by the Bureau from the Financial Resources Management Department.

5.46 **Mr Ebadi** agreed with Mr Bessi. According to No. 13.12A of the Radio Regulations, the practices of the Bureau were to be reflected in rules of procedure. The Board should approve the proposed rules.

5.47 **Mr Žilinskas** supported the proposed rules of procedure, as amended by Ms Zoller. As explained by Chief SSD, the six-week period was needed.

5.48 The draft new rules of procedure concerning the late payment of cost recovery fees and cancellation of satellite network filings due to non-payment of cost recovery fees in accordance with Council Decision 482, as amended, were **approved**, with immediate entry into force.

Rules concerning Article 11 – ADD Consolidation of frequency assignments of different GSO networks submitted by an administration at the same orbital position into frequency assignments of a single satellite network

5.49 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)** introduced the draft new rules concerning Article 11, as proposed by the Bureau in Circular Letter CCR/47. Comments on those rules had been received from three administrations and were reproduced in Document RRB13-1/2. The Administration of China (Annex 9) called for "careful consideration" of cost recovery fees arising from the merging of satellite networks, since the intention of merging the networks was to improve ITU management and was neither initiated nor requested by operators. The Administration of the United States (Annex 5) suggested editorial amendments but had no difficulty in approving the proposed rules. The Administration of Viet Nam (Annex 8) considered that "the consolidation of satellite networks shall be applied based only on the request of a notifying administration" and that the filing fee applied only to the notifying administration having the consolidated networks, not all the administrations on whose behalf it was acting.

5.50 **Ms Zoller** said that those rules of procedure needed careful scrutiny because there were several areas in which they could go awry. For example, in regard to orbital information, § 2.2 of the proposed rules required "identical orbital characteristics" but also referred to "different values for the longitudinal tolerance and inclination excursion", which might lead to confusion as to which networks could be consolidated. With regard to cost recovery, § 4 of the draft rules envisaged that charges for consolidating networks would be established by the Council under its Decision 482. But it would be difficult to establish cost recovery charges when the number of assignments and networks to be consolidated was not known.

5.51 **Mr Strelets** supported Ms Zoller. He also stressed that the unique network identifiers for each group of frequency assignments had to be preserved when networks were consolidated. The Bureau had informed WRC-12 that it was implementing the practice of consolidating networks, but the practice had nowhere been discussed. It was important that the process be carried out only at the request of administrations. The financial aspects were outside the Board's mandate, but he recalled that the WRC-12 Budget Control Committee had concluded that the procedure did not have any financial implications for the Union. The administrations had already paid for the processing of filings that were simply being consolidated mechanically. The Board could not anticipate the Council's decision, so § 4 of the draft rules would need to be revised.

5.52 **Mr Ito** agreed that networks should be consolidated only at the request of administrations. The cost aspects were confusing. Administrations might well think that the cost recovery fee should be reduced for consolidated networks, yet the proposed rules envisaged an additional charge.

5.53 **Mr Bessi** supported Mr Ito, noting that the draft rules stated that the cost recovery charge would be established by the Council. He supported the amendments proposed by the Administration of the United States to § 2.3 and § 2.4 of the draft rules, which ensured that the original identifiers of groups of frequency assignments would be retained.

5.54 **Chief SSD** said that Board members had raised important points. In § 2.2, requiring that “the smallest values shall be used” in the case of different values for the longitudinal tolerance or inclination excursion should meet the concerns expressed regarding the no-change for the orbital position. He recalled that WRC-12 had required rules of procedure on the Bureau’s practices with respect to consolidating frequency assignments of different GSO networks submitted by an administration at the same orbital position. As indicated in § 1 of the draft rules, consolidation was only possible for frequency assignments already recorded in the MIFR (with favourable or unfavourable findings). With regard to § 4 of the draft rules, the possibility of cost recovery had been discussed at WRC-12 but he did not recall any decision by the Budget Control Committee. The activities associated with consolidation added to the Bureau’s workload, and a decision by the Council would be necessary to enable the Bureau to charge for that work. With regard to the comments by the Administration of China, he confirmed that consolidation took place only at the request of the notifying administration, not on the basis of a decision by the Bureau or any other entity.

5.55 **Mr Strelets**, supported by **Mr Ebadi** and **Mr Bessi**, proposed the deletion of §4 of the draft rules. **Ms Zoller** also supported that proposal because the text on cost recovery was not necessary to the rules of procedure.

5.56 It was so **agreed**.

5.57 **Ms Zoller** suggested that if the Bureau expected to incur additional costs, it should inform the Council accordingly.

5.58 **Chief SSD** said that if the Board approved the new rules for immediate application, as suggested in Circular Letter CRR/47, then the Bureau’s response to a request for satellite network consolidation by a notifying administration would take place in an environment of financial uncertainty. He therefore suggested that the effective date of application of the new rules should be 1 July 2013, after the next session of the Council.

5.59 It was so **agreed**.

5.60 **Mr Ebadi** said that, as it stood, § 2.2 of the draft rules could pose problems for operational satellites.

5.61 **Chief SSD** recalled that Section III of Article 22 of the Radio Regulations gave some flexibility to operational satellites in regard to their characteristics as recorded in the MIFR, but noted that satellite operations shall not cause unacceptable interference to any other satellite operating within $\pm 0.1^\circ$ of the longitude of their nominal positions.

5.62 **Mr Ito** said he did not have a problem with § 2.2 of the draft rules. The consolidation of networks depended on the wish of administrations, and it would be difficult for an administration with a cluster of satellites to treat them as a single filing.

5.63 **Mr Bessi** understood from the explanation given by Chief SSD that the Bureau would record the consolidated networks with minimum values and that administrations would give a commitment to operate with minimum values. In his view, if satellites were already operating, it would be unrealistic to expect administrations to give such a commitment.

5.64 **Chief SSD** said that the commitment should be included in the rules of procedure to ensure that consolidated networks did not cause unacceptable interference to neighbouring networks. Satellites might in practice be located at some fraction of a degree away from their recorded orbital

position, but administrations undertook to limit the impact of interference to the level tolerated in terms of the recorded location and characteristics.

5.65 The draft new rules of procedure on consolidation of frequency assignments of different GSO networks submitted by an administration at the same orbital position into frequency assignments of a single satellite network, amended to take into account the comments by the Board, were **approved**, effective as from 1 July 2013.

MOD rules on No. 11.31

5.66 **Chief TSD** said that the amendment proposed by the Bureau in Circular Letter CCRR/47 was to add references to the table in § 2.4 of the rule to reflect provisions introduced by WRC-12, as follows: under “Power limits”, to add Nos. 52.265 and 52.266; and under “Class of emission”, to add No. 52.264. The Administration of France had commented, in Annex 6 to Document RRB13-1/2, that No. 52.264 was non-binding, and suggested that the rule might be clarified in regard to Nos. 52.265 and 52.266. The Bureau had contacted the Administration of France to discuss those comments, and the outcome was that the Administration of France insisted that No. 52.264 should not be added but could agree to leave references to Nos. 52.265 and 52.266 in the table, as proposed by the Bureau.

5.67 **Mr Ebadi**, noting that provisions Nos. 52.265 and 52.266 both referred to No. 52.264, asked what would happen if the reference to No. 52.264 was omitted.

5.68 **Mr Bessi** said that the table in § 2.4 of the rule listed obligations for recording in the MIFR. As the Administration of France stated, No. 52.264 was not an obligation. He could therefore agree not to retain a reference to that provision. Provisions Nos. 52.265 and 52.266, however, contained obligations, so references to them should be included in the table.

5.69 **Chief TSD** agreed with Mr Bessi. He explained that the Bureau would check the power limits for stations in accordance with Nos. 52.265 and 52.266. The table was clear with the addition only of Nos. 52.265 and 52.266.

5.70 The draft modifications to the rules on No. 11.31, with the deletion of the reference to No. 52.264, were **approved**, with immediate entry into force.

SUP rules concerning Resolution 51 (Rev.WRC-2000)

5.71 The **Chairman** noted that WRC-07 had abrogated Resolution 51 and that the rules were no longer needed.

5.72 The suppression of the rules concerning Resolution 51 (Rev.WRC-2000) was **approved**, with immediate entry into force.

Rules concerning Part A6 – MOD § 4 Examination of notices related to the non-planned services in the bands governed by the Regional Agreement GE89

5.73 **Chief TSD** noted that no comments had been received from administrations in regard to the modifications proposed by the Bureau.

5.74 The **Chairman** observed that the proposed modifications were a consequence of changes made by WRC-12.

5.75 The modifications proposed were **approved**, with immediate entry into force.

5.76 The Board **approved** its conclusions regarding the draft new and revised rules of procedure in Circular Letters CCRR/46 and CCRR/47 as follows:

“The Board considered the draft Rules of Procedure circulated to Administrations in Circular-Letters CCRR/46 and CCRR/47, along with comments received from Administrations (Document RRB13-1/2). The Board decided to approve these draft Rules of Procedure with changes, taking into account the comments received and the approved Rules of Procedure are contained in the Annex to the Summary of Decisions (Document RRB13-1/7).”

5.77 The **Chairman** drew attention to the comments by the Administration of Belarus in Annex 2 to Document RRB13-1/2, in regard to Circular Letter CCRR/47. The Administration of Belarus had no comments to make regarding the proposed rules of procedure but raised the question of which provisions of the Radio Regulations should guide administrations in implementing the following decision of WRC-12 taken at the 13th plenary meeting: “WRC-12 recognizes that an administration can bring into use, or continue the use of, frequency assignments for one of its satellite networks by using a space station which is under the responsibility of another administration or intergovernmental organization, provided that this latter administration or intergovernmental organization, after having been informed, does not object, within 90 days from the date of receipt of information, to the use of this space station for such purposes. This requirement shall not be applied retroactively and applies to assignments brought into use after the end of WRC-12.”

5.78 **Chief SSD** said that the WRC-12 decision referred to by the Administration of Belarus concerned relations of bilateral nature between administrations. No action was foreseen nor required on the part of the Bureau. While the decision was not included in the Radio Regulations, it was implicitly accepted by all administrations that had signed the Final Acts and, like all decisions taken in WRC plenary meetings, that such decision would guide the Bureau in implementing the Radio Regulations.

5.79 **Mr Strelets** said that there was no problem in implementing the decision and therefore no requirement for the Board to establish a rule of procedure. Nevertheless, the decision would have a long-term effect and administrations needed to be aware of it, which was why the Administration of Belarus had suggested that the practice should be reflected in a rule of procedure.

5.80 **Mr Bessi, Mr Ito and Mr Žilinskas** considered that reflecting the decision in a rule of procedure would be helpful to administrations.

5.81 **Chief SSD** recalled that the Bureau had sent out Circular Letter CR/333 on 2 May 2012 containing the decisions taken by WRC-12 included in the minutes of its plenary meetings relating to space service procedures that includes the decision referred to by the Administration of Belarus.

5.82 The **Chairman** said that the important decision referred to by the Administration of Belarus would have important implications regarding bringing into use, and he was concerned that administrations might forget about it.

5.83 **Mr Ebadi** pointed out that, according to No. 13.0.1 of the Radio Regulations, the conference was against having rules of procedure unless there were difficulties in implementing provisions, which was not the case here.

5.84 The **Deputy-Director** suggested that it would be preferable to work on a possible modification of the Radio Regulations to reflect that plenary decision, and submit the proposed text to the next WRC, as envisaged in No. 13.0.2.

5.85 **Mr Strelets** supported the approach suggested by the Deputy-Director. There was no need to develop a rule of procedure because there were no difficulties in implementing the WRC decision. Nevertheless, the decision was important and it would be useful to have it reflected in the Radio Regulations. He proposed that the Bureau should develop suitable text for inclusion in the Radio Regulations, to be submitted to WRC-15 in the Director’s report to the conference.

5.86 It was so agreed.

6 Submission by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates concerning harmful interference to the operations of the YAHSAT-1A satellite at 52.5° E (Document RRB13-1/3 and Addendum 1)

6.1 **Mr Venkatasubramanian (SSD/SSC)** introduced Document RRB13-1/3 containing a submission from the Administration of the United Arab Emirates regarding harmful interference to the operations of the YAHSAT-1A satellite at 52.5° E. Additional information was contained in Addendum 1 to Document RRB13-1/3, comprising submissions from the Administration of China (Attachments 1 and 2) and a related communication from the Bureau (Attachment 3). He also drew attention to further information submitted by the Administration of China in Document RRB13-1/DELAYED/3 and by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates in Document RRB13-1/DELAYED/4.

6.2 In essence, the Administration of the United Arab Emirates had complained about harmful interference to the YAHSAT-1A satellite (EMARSAT-1G satellite network) at 52.5° E from CHINASAT-5D (ex APSTAR-1A) and CHINASAT-15A (aka CHINASAT-12) satellites at 51.5° E. It requested the Board to confirm the status of the EMARSAT-1G satellite network, and urge China to act in accordance with No. 11.42 of the Radio Regulations and not to cause any further interference to YAHSAT-1A until an agreement had been reached between the two operators. The Administration of China stated that it had positioned the CHINASAT-15A satellite at 51.5° E to take over the services offered by the CHINASAT-5D satellite and during the operation had temporarily suspended the service of CHINASAT-5D, eliminating the adverse effect on the YAHSAT-1A satellite, but CHINASAT-15A was receiving harmful interference from YAHSAT-1A. The Administration of China furthermore questioned the bringing into use of the EMARSAT-1G satellite network.

6.3 **Mr Ebadi** asked which administration had priority, what the coordination status was, and whether there was provisional operation under No. 11.41.

6.4 **Chief SSD** said that, from the Bureau's point of view, the EMARSAT-1G satellite network at 52.5° E and China's networks at 51.5° E had been submitted, recorded and brought into use in conformity with the Radio Regulations, and thus were all valid. The EMARSAT-1G satellite network at 52.5° E was recorded in the MIFR under No. 11.41 with respect to previous satellite networks of China, and the CHINASAT-51.5E satellite network was recorded under No. 11.41 with respect to the EMARSAT-1G satellite network. The GSO around 50° E was, however, much in demand, and under No. 13.6 the Bureau had asked the Administration of the United Arab Emirates for information concerning evidence of continuous operation of certain frequencies in the C-band and Ku-band for the EMARSAT-1G satellite network and was waiting for a response. That query had not been prompted by the request from the Administration of China. With regard to coordination status, he recalled that for the EMARSAT-1G satellite network the coordination request dated back to 1996, at which time the coordination requirements had been based on $\Delta T/T$, resulting in 22 administrations with which agreements for the C-band frequencies were required. Of those, the Administration of the United Arab Emirates had achieved coordination agreements with 14, and was operating under No. 11.41 in regard to eight administrations (including China). For the CHINASAT-51.5E satellite network, the coordination request dated from 2005 and was based on the coordination arc, which had identified ten administrations with which coordination was required. Two of those agreements had been reached (with the same operator), and China was operating under No. 11.41 with regard to the remaining eight administrations. He observed that beyond the number of coordination agreements, the quality of each of them was more important

6.5 **Mr Ebadi** understood that there was no requirement for the EMARSAT-1G satellite network to coordinate with the CHINASAT-51.5E satellite network.

6.6 The **Chairman** noted that Chief SSD confirmed that understanding.

6.7 **Mr Ito** said that, according to the chronology of the data recorded in the MIFR, the EMARSAT-1G satellite network had been brought into use within five years, in other words within the seven-year deadline. In May 2009, the Bureau had sent out Circular Letter CR/301 to remind Member States to reduce their filings to those in actual use. In August 2009, use of the EMARSAT-1G satellite network had been suspended, being brought back into use in June 2011. Meanwhile, in September 2010, the APSTAR-1A satellite had been moved to 51.5° E and the CHINASAT-51.5E satellite network had been brought into use. That would clarify the status of both satellites as described by the Bureau.

6.8 Responding to questions by **Mr Bessi** and **Mr Kibe**, **Chief SSD** explained that, in terms of the application of No. 11.41, the EMARSAT-1G satellite network had priority (based on date of coordination request) in regard to the CHINASAT-51.5E satellite network, but the Administration of the United Arab Emirates had to coordinate with other Chinese networks recorded in the MIFR. Commenting on the chronological data recorded in the MIFR for China at 51.5° E and for the United Arab Emirates at 52.5° E, he recalled that WRC-97 had introduced the concept of bringing into use of any frequency assignments in No. 11.44, replacing the bringing into use of the first assignment under RR 1550 and in its Resolution 49 the concept of due diligence, both entering into force in 1999. Until then, there had been some flexibility available to administrations and the Board in regard to the bringing into use of frequency assignments. After sending out Circular Letter CR/301, the Bureau had started to ask for additional information to confirm bringing into use or continuous use, an approach endorsed by WRC-12. But the Bureau had not investigated on its own behalf on pas cases for continuity of service.

6.9 **Mr Ebadi**, supported by **Mr Žilinskas**, understood that from a regulatory point of view the United Arab Emirates had priority but that it was willing to cooperate. The Board should therefore urge both administrations to make every effort to overcome the difficulties.

6.10 The **Chairman** added that, in general, administrations should be encouraged to complete coordination when notifying under No. 11.41.

6.11 **Mr Bessi** supported Mr Ebadi and the Chairman. The Board might also mention the possibility of the Administrations of China and the United Arab Emirates solving the problem by sharing the C-band, as suggested by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates in Document RRB13-1/DELAYED/4.

6.12 **Mr Koffi** considered that it was up to administrations to conclude sharing arrangements. The Board should simply encourage the two administrations to collaborate to resolve the problem.

6.13 **Mr Kibe** said that, as explained by the Bureau, the network of the United Arab Emirates had priority. The Board's decision should respond to the points raised by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates in its letter dated 25 February 2013, contained in Document RRB13-1/3.

6.14 **Mr Strelets** said that the situation was not simple. Based on the explanation provided by the Bureau, the Board should confirm the status of the EMARSAT-1G satellite network, urge the Administration of China to fulfil its obligations arising from recording under No. 11.41, and urge both administrations to collaborate to resolve the problem.

6.15 **Ms Zoller** added that the Board should urge the Administration of China to act in accordance with No. 11.42, and remind administrations what it meant to notify under No. 11.41. The Board should also urge both the Administration of the United Arab Emirates and the Administration of China to make every effort to achieve mutually acceptable coordination, taking

into account the rule of procedure on No. 9.6 of the Radio Regulations. She expressed concern that so few coordination agreements had been reached, compared with the number required. Perhaps the Board should again raise awareness of the issues related to notification under No. 11.41 as it had done in its report to WRC-12 under Resolution 80.

6.16 **Mr Magenta** agreed with the previous speakers.

6.17 Following further comments by **Mr Ebadi** and **Mr Ito** on the content of the Board's decision, the **Chairman** said that there was clearly a complex problem of coordination between the two administrations and an obligation to eliminate the harmful interference. The Board was willing, through the Bureau, to provide all necessary assistance to the administrations concerned to help resolve the problem. He invited Ms Zoller to draft the Board's decision reflecting the comments made.

6.18 The Board **approved** its conclusions as follows:

"The Board carefully considered the submission from the Administration of the United Arab Emirates in Document RRB13-1/3 and the additional information from the Administration of China in Addendum 1 to Document RRB13-1/3 regarding the harmful interference to the operations of the Yahsat-1A satellite at 52.5°E. The Board also took into account the information provided in Documents RRB13-1/DELAYED/3 and RRB13-1/DELAYED/4 and the provisions of the Radio Regulations pertaining to the recording of the EMARSAT-1G and CHINASAT-51.5E satellite networks notified by the Administration of the United Arab Emirates and the Administration of China respectively.

The Board concluded the following:

1. The EMARSAT-1G satellite network is recorded in the Master International Frequency Register (MIFR) with a favorable finding under No. **11.31** of the Radio Regulations and thus has the right to international recognition under No. **8.3** of the Radio Regulations.

2. The CHINASAT-51.5E satellite network is recorded under No. **11.41** with respect to the Administration of the UAE's EMARSAT-1G satellite network. The provisions of No. **11.42** of the Radio Regulations, which state that "*the administration responsible for the station using the frequency assignment recorded under No. **11.41** shall, upon receipt of a report providing the particulars relating to the harmful interference, immediately eliminate this harmful interference*" apply. Thus, the Board urges the administration of China to act in accordance with No. **11.42** of the Radio Regulations and immediately eliminate the harmful interference to the YAHSAT-1 satellite operating under the EMARSAT-1G satellite network filing and to ensure station-keeping of the relevant satellites is conducted in accordance with the relevant provisions of Section III of Article 22 of the Radio Regulations.

3. The Board urges the Administrations of the United Arab Emirates and China to make every possible mutual effort to overcome the difficulties and achieve coordination in a manner acceptable to the parties concerned, taking into account the Rule of Procedure for No. **9.6** of the Radio Regulations.

4. As indicated in the Board's report to WRC-12 under Resolution 80 (Rev. WRC-07), overcoming any difficulties in achieving coordination requires the good will of the administrations involved and the identification of technical solution(s) to mitigate any predicted interference. Notification under RR No. 11.41 where few of the required coordination agreements have been completed increases the possibility of interference. The Board instructed the Bureau to consider actions to raise awareness of Administrations' rights and responsibilities when notifying under No. 11.41 and to encourage administrations to complete coordination.

The Board instructed the Bureau to communicate this decision to the administrations concerned."

7 Submission by the Administration of France concerning cases of deliberate and harmful interference to satellites operated by EUTELSAT (Document RRB13-1/4)

7.1 **Chief SSD** introduced Document RRB13-1/4, which superseded the late contribution made by France to the Board's 61st meeting (RRB12-3/DELAYED/6); he also drew attention to late contribution RRB13-1/DELAYED/2 from the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran, containing a letter dated 5 March 2013, and to late contribution RRB13-1/DELAYED/5 from the Administration of France, containing a letter dated 15 March 2013, responding to the Iranian late contribution.

7.2 In Document RRB13-1/4, France, as the notifying administration for EUTELSAT, referred to the conclusions reached by the Board at its 61st meeting regarding the deliberate harmful interference caused to EUTELSAT satellites, and provided the technical, operational and regulatory characteristics of the harmful interference caused, in order to assist the Board in a more in-depth assessment of possible remedies to the situation. In particular, France provided explanations of the intentional nature of the harmful interference, its magnitude and increase of the problem, and the use of geolocalization to locate its source, along with reference to No. 16.5 of the Radio Regulations as being implementable by the Bureau (memoranda of cooperation involving monitoring stations of administrations) and the establishment of databases of such events. It referred to harmful interference caused by sources in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic over the past two years, and to the stations and applications affected, in particular television broadcasting stations. It concluded by requesting the Board to reinforce its previous conclusions by reiterating that the transmissions which were the basis of the various interference reports summarized in Annexes 3 and 4 to the document infringed the Radio Regulations, notably the provisions of No. 15.1. France also requested the Iranian and Syrian Administrations to be tasked with taking the necessary actions to stop the infringement, as prescribed by No. 15.21 of the Radio Regulations. It also reiterated the idea of establishing a database to allow the Board to more closely assess the status and evolution of deliberate interference. The annexes to Document RRB13-1/4 summarized in graphic form the harmful interference caused to the EUTELSAT satellites, elaborated on the geolocalization techniques used, and listed the interference reports sent to the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic.

7.3 In its response to Document RRB13-1/4 in RRB13-1/DELAYED/2, the Islamic Republic of Iran *inter alia* pointed to France's lack of goodwill and commitment to collaborate to resolve the matter and to attend meetings for that purpose, and reiterated that the Islamic Republic of Iran had failed to find any trace of a source of the claimed interference in the areas indicated by France and was inadequately equipped to carry out the searches required in the absence of more precise information. It also observed that France had failed to respond to the Islamic Republic of Iran's report of harmful interference caused on IRIB international television and radio channels on a transponder leased on a EUTELSAT satellite at 13° E, and reiterated its commitment to resolving the technical problems through technical negotiations with goodwill and collaboration.

7.4 In RRB13-1/DELAYED/5, France responded to the Iranian late contribution by providing explanations regarding the interference caused to the transponder on a EUTELSAT satellite at 13° E, pointing out that IRIB's use of the transponder was an act of piracy since IRIB no longer had the right to use the transponder. France also reiterated its full endorsement of the Bureau's initiative to establish, under the auspices of ITU, an international monitoring system which would provide impartial verification of the geolocalization of interfering stations.

7.5 The **Chairman** observed that the unauthorized use of the transponder at 13° E was possibly a commercial rather than a regulatory matter, and therefore should perhaps be addressed at the operator and user level rather than that of the Radio Regulations Board. The harmful interference caused to the EUTELSAT satellites had become a long-standing issue.

7.6 **Mr Strelets** agreed that the matter had been before the Board for a number of years now, and the problem had escalated at a staggering rate, making it exceedingly difficult for operators to provide good services under reasonable conditions. The case further illustrated the need for an effective international monitoring system to address the interference caused to operational satellites, lest the problem snowball. The situation was becoming quite tense, and although it involved political aspects today it might well involve economic aspects tomorrow. Serious reflection was needed on how the Bureau and Board could respond to it, and nip the very dangerous emerging trend in the bud.

7.7 **Mr Kibe** expressed appreciation for France's submission in Document RRB13-1/4, which presented interesting ways of dealing with and reducing the number of cases of harmful interference, e.g. through application of No. 16.5, which was being pursued by the Bureau as reflected in the Director's report to the present meeting. Nevertheless, the case before the Board was far from new, and it appeared that France was not making itself available for the meetings recommended by the Board in the decisions it had reached at its 61st meeting. Ways should be explored to persuade France to cooperate better.

7.8 **Mr Ito** said that he also appreciated France's input to the present meeting, which showed clearly the kind of tools now available for dealing with the increasing number of instances of deliberate harmful interference. To show that ways existed to accurately geolocate sources of harmful interference should help dissuade the perpetrators of such interference.

7.9 **Mr Žilinskas** said that France was making it clear that harmful interference had been produced for several years now, of a nature that could only be emitted by very powerful and therefore most probably stationary antennas. The geolocalization tools used by France should allow the transmitters to be geolocated to within about ten kilometres. It should therefore be relatively easy to identify the stations producing the interference. It was far less clear why France continued to fail to attend the negotiations called for by the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Bureau and the Board.

7.10 **Mr Bessi** said that in seeking to resolve the problem of harmful interference, the Board could do no more than what it had adopted as decisions at its 61st meeting, namely urge the administrations concerned to cooperate to find a solution, and he would therefore urge France to participate in the negotiation meetings called for. As to the measures recommended by France as a means to forestall problems of harmful interference, the Board had already requested the Bureau to pursue memoranda of cooperation to build up the international monitoring system to monitor emissions causing interference. Regarding the creation of a database of deliberate harmful interference events, as advocated by France, there would surely be nothing to prevent the Bureau from creating a group of experts to pursue the idea, e.g. through ITU-R working groups perhaps, without requiring directives from the Board to do so.

7.11 **Mr Ebadi** supported Mr Strelets' call for an international monitoring system. He recalled that previously he had asked the Bureau to consider asking a country not involved in the matter to provide an independent assessment of the situation. He wondered whether there had been any contact between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic on the matter.

7.12 **Mr Koffi** welcomed the useful and detailed proposal in France's input document. He noted the Islamic Republic of Iran's statement that the sources of interference could not be found within its territory. He would support calls for further monitoring to be sure where the source of interference was located before the Board took any more steps. France and the Islamic Republic of Iran must come to the negotiating table to resolve the problem.

7.13 **Ms Zoller** shared speakers' concerns at the ongoing situation involving EUTELSAT, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic, and said that action was required to resolve it and indeed prevent it from further escalating. It would be an important step forward to have an internationally recognized monitoring system, and she noted that the Bureau was taking steps to

pursue that possibility. There should be proper discussions on how such a system should be used, and in her view any such system should be used only to resolve cases of harmful interference. The Board should reiterate its past decisions on the case, consider the future use of international monitoring systems and databases, and take positive steps to pursue those ideas.

7.14 **Chief SSD**, responding to Mr Ebadi's comments, said that France had asked for the Bureau's assistance regarding harmful interference caused by a source in the Syrian Arab Republic. The Bureau had therefore written to the Syrian Administration pursuant to Article 15 of the Radio Regulations, but had received no reply so far. Regarding the geolocation of sources of interference, it was the Bureau's goal over the coming months to pursue the establishment of memoranda of cooperation with administrations that had monitoring stations, so that those stations could be used to help identify sources of harmful interference when such interference was caused. The success of such arrangements meant that monitoring would have to be effected when the interference was actually being caused, and would thus call for close cooperation between all involved, in particular the Bureau, the administration receiving the harmful interference, and the administrations helping to monitor it.

7.15 Based on the discussions, the Board **agreed** to conclude as follows:

"The Board examined in detail the submission from the Administration of France (acting on behalf of EUTELSAT satellite organization), regarding harmful interference to EUTELSAT satellite network, taking into account the information provided in Documents RRB13-1/DELAYED/2 and RRB13-1/DELAYED/5 and came to the following conclusions:

"The Board

- appreciated the useful and concise information provided by the Administration of France in their submissions;
- noted that any harmful interference to satellite networks needs to be resolved and eliminated on a priority basis and any such harmful interference continuing for long term is a matter of serious concern;
- considered that international cooperation for monitoring and localization of the sources of such interference is highly desirable;
- encouraged the administrations concerned to meet and discuss the matter with a view to resolving the issue as quickly as possible. In this context, the Board instructed the Bureau to support and provide assistance to the administrations concerned in investigating the matter as well as to convene a meeting of the concerned administrations, if necessary.

The Board instructed the Radiocommunication Bureau to communicate this decision to the administrations concerned.

The Board also noted the suggestions for the Bureau to conduct, in accordance with No. 16.5 of the Radio Regulations, independent monitoring observations to confirm the origin of interfering signals as well as to create a database of events of harmful interference, including intentional ones. The Board instructed the Bureau to study the above proposals and also instructed the Director to consider raising the issue before the Council in the event that their implementation would require the allocation of additional resources beyond those available to the BR."

8 Submission by the Administrations of the Netherlands, Norway, France, Spain and Luxembourg regarding additional cost recovery charges imposed on submissions containing the frequency band 21.4-22 GHz (Document RRB13-1/5)

8.1 **Mr Venkatasubramanian (SSD/SSC)** said that Document RRB13-1/5, submitted by the Administrations of the Netherlands, Norway, France, Spain and Luxembourg, related to cost recovery charges for filings containing the frequency band 21.4-22 GHz. The Administration of France had included comments related to this issue in Annex 6 to Document RRB13-1/2.

8.2 He recalled that WRC-12 had in Resolution 553 (WRC-12) introduced a special procedure for non-planned BSS in the frequency band 21.4-22 GHz, requiring different treatment. The Bureau had informed administrations, in Circular Letter CR/336, that when it received a request from an administration for a special procedure case, it would stop processing all pending networks in that band, and would treat current and future cases by separating coordination requests for the 21.4-22 GHz band from any other frequency assignments for non-planned services submitted along with the 21.4-22 GHz band.

8.3 In Document RRB13-1/5, the Administrations of the Netherlands, Norway, France, Spain and Luxembourg argued that Resolution 553 did not require the Bureau to isolate the 21.4-22 GHz portion of a filing into a separate filing, and that such a separation could inadvertently lead to two cost recovery charges being charged for the notification. Even if the Bureau decided internally to treat the 21.4-22 GHz portion of a submission separately from other portions, the administrations considered that the submitted network should be treated as one network.

8.4 The Bureau considered that its software design and processing methods helped administrations and operators to reproduce coordination requirements for part of a network or a complete network. Even for filings in bands other than 21.4-22 GHz, the splitting and separate processing of coordination requests was sometimes needed to meet the provisions of the Radio Regulations. The special procedure envisaged in Resolution 553 involved many processing differences compared to the treatment of bands and services not covered by the resolution. To ensure efficient and simple processing with a coordination publication within the 4-month regulatory time limit, the Bureau had created a coordination special section (and associated software) that applied exclusively to the 21.4-22 GHz band. That necessitated the splitting of the 21.4-22 GHz band from other bands when administrations submitted them in a single submission.

8.5 In its comments in Annex 6 to Document RRB13-1/2, the Administration of France stated that “Although the Bureau’s decision to split the filing appears to be appropriate for the purposes of implementing Resolution 553 (WRC-12), the reasons for applying Decision 482 twice separately to the filing are not specified clearly. The French Administration therefore requests the Board to rule on the conformity of this implementation of cost recovery within the framework of application of Resolution 553 (WRC-12).”

8.6 **Mr Ebadi** recalled that, prior to WRC-12, the downlink and associated feeder link in the 21.4-22 GHz band had been treated together. WRC-12 had decided on a special procedure for the downlink, whereas – illogically in his opinion – the feeder link had to join the processing queue. Resolution 553 did not say that bands had to be split for processing purposes and did not deal with cost recovery.

8.7 **Mr Bessi** agreed that Resolution 553 did not mention splitting or cost recovery. The Bureau had described in Circular Letter CR/336 the procedure that it would employ to treat the filings, and that procedure might or might not be appropriate. But it was up to the WRC to take the financial consequences of its decisions into account. Dealing with cost recovery was outside the Board’s mandate.

8.8 **Mr Magenta** agreed with Mr Bessi that the Board could not take financial decisions. In general, the WRC instructed the Bureau on the work to be done and the Council provided the budget. He asked whether WRC-12 had considered the cost of introducing the special procedure in the 21.4-22 GHz band.

8.9 **Mr Strelets** said that it was the Board's prerogative to deal with the regulatory aspects of the treatment of filings. There were hundreds of filings to be dealt with through the normal procedure in the 21.4-22 GHz band, but so far only two filings (submitted by the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Administration of Bulgaria) for the special procedure. It would make more sense for cost recovery to apply only to filings subject to the special procedure, but a decision of that nature was outside the Board's mandate. The Board could, however, be blamed for allowing the Bureau to implement an unnecessarily complex procedure.

8.10 **Mr Ito** said that, having listened to the explanation provided by the Bureau, he could accept that it was more efficient to treat the 21.4-22 GHz band separately for all administrations or at least for the filing requesting the special procedure, rather than holding up the Bureau's work while the special procedure was applied to individual cases. The aim should be to handle the special procedure in a simple manner. With regard to cost recovery, if the cost of processing the 21.4-22 GHz band was subtracted from the cost of processing the overall filing, and charged separately, the sum of the invoices might not be very different from the cost of processing the submission as a single filing.

8.11 The **Chairman** asked whether a separate database had been created for processing filings for the 21.4-22 GHz band.

8.12 Responding to the points raised, **Mr Venkatasubramanian (SSD/SSC)** confirmed that Resolution 553 offered priority access only for the downlink. Giving priority to the uplink as well would increase the cost of processing and would probably be a decision to be taken by the next WRC. He did not know of any documents indicating that WRC-12 had considered the cost implications of introducing the special procedure. No separate database had been created, but the Bureau had modified the structure of the existing SNS database by introducing fields related to priority access, and had developed new SpaceCap, SpacePub, SpaceVal and other tools required for processing coordination submissions in the SNS INGRES environment. The difference in cost between processing a filing as a whole or with the 21.4-22 GHz band being treated separately would depend on the size of the filing. The cost difference would be significant for a small filing but perhaps insignificant for a large filing. Resolution 553 had not indicated how the Bureau should process the filings for which the special procedure was requested. If the Bureau had not implemented the procedure described in Circular Letter CR/336, then when the first request for the special procedure had been received, which had happened on 2 May 2012, the Bureau would have had to stop all other processing of coordination requests for reasons of restructuring of database explained before, creating a delay of about 12 months in the Bureau's usual treatment of filings of all coordination requests.

8.13 **Mr Ebadi** suggested that the possibility of also giving priority to the uplink, as well as the need to consider the cost recovery aspects, might be brought to the attention of WRC-15 in the Director's report. Meanwhile, the Bureau might find an interim solution for the two or three filings to which the special procedure was to be applied.

8.14 **Mr Strelets** said that Resolution 553 simply introduced the special procedure. As the Administration of France pointed out, it did not authorize the Bureau to apply Council Decision 482 twice to the same filing. He agreed with the administrations that had submitted Document RRB13-1/5. Why should a couple of requests for application of the special procedure result in an increased financial burden for the many administrations that did not require special treatment?

8.15 The **Chairman** expressed confidence that the Bureau had exercised all due diligence in developing the procedure described in Circular Letter CR/336. The cost-recovery aspects would have to be submitted to the Council for decision.

8.16 **Mr Ebadi** said that Resolution 553 did not deal with all filings in the 21.4-22 GHz band, only those where administrations requested the special procedure. He supported the view expressed by Mr Strelets. In Document RRB13-1/5, the Administrations of the Netherlands, Norway, France, Spain and Luxembourg had raised some very valid points.

8.17 The Board **approved** its conclusions as follows:

“The Board considered carefully the elements relating to the technical and regulatory aspects raised in Document RRB13-1/5 and Annex 6 of Document RRB13-1/2 and also noted Bureau’s explanation on the complexity in implementing Resolution 553 (WRC-12). The Board noted that the Bureau had felt the need for the splitting of satellite network filings containing the 21.4-22 GHz band when these cases were processed, as well as the related arguments provided in BR Circular Letter CR/336 of 17 July 2012. The Bureau also added that in order to ensure an efficient, transparent and simple processing that would avoid a backlog in the coordination publication following WRC-12, the BR developed a procedure that is in line with the current processing environment described in the Preface to the BR IFIC (Space). The Board noted that Resolution 553 is silent on the method to process the filings and does not deal with cost recovery; further study is required and draft RoP may also be necessary. The Board concluded that the issues raised in Document RRB13-1/5 and Annex 6 of Document RRB13-1/2 concerning the application of cost recovery charges to split filings in the band 21.4-22 GHz is a matter to be treated by Council.”

9 Cancellation from the MIFR of frequency assignments to the PRESAT satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations (Document RRB13-1/6)

9.1 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)** introduced Document RRB13-1/6, in which, in application of No. 13.6, the Bureau sought a decision by the Board for cancellation from the MIFR of all the assignments to the PRESAT satellite network. Providing the background to the case, he said that under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations the Bureau had requested the United States Administration to clarify whether the frequency assignments to the PRESAT satellite network continued to be in use in accordance with the notified characteristics recorded in the MIFR. In the absence of a response from the United States, the Bureau had sent reminders on 10 October 2012 and 15 November 2012. There being still no response, on 21 December 2012 the Bureau had informed the Administration of United States that it would proceed with the cancellation of all frequency assignments to the network from the MIFR under No. 13.6. In further application of No. 13.6, the Bureau had taken the decision at the 997th BR IFIC meeting, held on 21 February 2013, to request the Board to cancel from the MIFR all entries concerning the PRESAT satellite network and consequently suppress all related special sections.

9.2 **Mr Ebadi** said that the Bureau appeared to have applied No. 13.6 correctly. The **Chairman** noted that several Board members agreed with that view.

9.3 **Mr Strelets** said that he too considered that the Board had applied the Radio Regulations correctly. He nevertheless asked whether the United States Administration had been informed that the Board was to consider the matter at its present meeting.

9.4 **Mr Matas (SSD/SPR)** reiterated that two reminders had been sent to the United States in 2012, and on 21 December 2012 the Bureau had informed the United States that it would cancel the assignment under No. 13.6. With the new Radio Regulations in force as from 1 January 2013, however, such cancellation had to be decided by the Board. The Bureau had not specifically told the

United States that cancellation of the PRESAT assignments would be considered at the present meeting.

9.5 **Mr Strelets** considered that an administration must be informed in a timely manner when cancellation of its assignments under No. 13.6 was to be considered by the Board at a given meeting, so that the administration had sufficient time to submit material on the matter if it so desired.

9.6 **Mr Magenta** said that the provisions of No. 13.6 were sufficiently clear with regard to the reminders to be sent and the consequences of no response from the administration concerned. There was no requirement for the Bureau to send an administration more than the two reminders referred to in No. 13.6.

9.7 **Mr Bessi** agreed with Mr Magenta. To meet the concerns of Mr Strelets, perhaps in its second reminder under No. 13.6 the Bureau could inform the administration concerned that the case for cancellation would be submitted to the Board for decision, and when.

9.8 **Mr Ito** agreed with Mr Magenta and Mr Bessi, and pointed out that non-response was a right that administrations could select to exercise.

9.9 The **Chairman** said that, like Mr Strelets, he viewed the cancellation of assignments as a very serious matter. In the case under consideration, however, the Bureau had begun the process under No. 13.6 with its first letter in June 2012, followed by two reminders, in October and November 2012, and then further correspondence in December 2012 informing the United States that the PRESAT assignments would be cancelled. No provisions of the Radio Regulations or the Rules of Procedure required the Bureau to send any further correspondence, and submission of the case to the Board for decision was an automatic part of the process. The Bureau had been correct in its application of the Radio Regulations, as applicable in 2012 and subsequently in 2013, as modified.

9.10 **Chief SSD** said that the case before the Board was unique, and would remain unique, in so far as one version of No. 13.6 had been in force when on 21 December 2012 the Bureau had informed the United States of America that the Bureau would proceed with the cancellation of the PRESAT assignments, whereas revised No. 13.6 had come into force by the time of the BR IFIC meeting which had taken the definitive decision on the matter. Henceforth when applying No. 13.6, the Bureau would inform administrations that the case would be submitted to the Board for decision, and at which meeting, allowing them sufficient time to make any submissions if they so wished. He nevertheless considered that the United States had had ample time to make a submission on the matter to the present meeting.

9.11 **Mr Strelets** said that he was reassured by the explanation provided by Chief SSD. According to the WRC's intent, the decision to cancel assignments under No. 13.6 lay with the Board alone, and that decision could not be reduced to a pure formality, as No. 13.6 clearly referred to the Board taking into account "submissions of additional supporting materials from administrations". If administrations wished to make any such submissions, they must be given adequate opportunity to do so.

9.12 The **Chairman** said that all Board members shared Mr Strelets' concern for due diligence to be exercised in cases under No. 13.6, especially given that following a decision by the Board an administration could have recourse only to the WRC if it disagreed with the decision. Nevertheless, the circumstances of the present case were unique, and the Bureau had fully respected the regulations in force at each stage.

9.13 **Mr Ebadi** endorsed Chief SSD's comments, adding that he considered the application of No. 13.6 to be perfectly straightforward. The version in force prior to 1 January 2013 had required the Board to decide whether the Bureau had applied the Radio Regulations correctly when

cancelling assignments; the version in force after that date required the Board itself to decide whether or not to cancel assignments. Furthermore, the implications of non-response on the part of an administration were clear. Only in case of disagreement did the provisions of No. 13.6 really come into play as regards careful investigation by the Board, etc.

9.14 **Mr Magenta** said that he understood Mr Strelets' concerns, but considered that those concerns had been fully met, with the Bureau informing the United States on 21 December 2012 that the case would be submitted to the Board. He endorsed Mr Ebadi's comments, and said that the Bureau could not be faulted for the steps it had taken in implementing No. 13.6 in the present case.

9.15 **Mr Ito** said that it was essential to have a precise understanding of No. 13.6. The Board had encountered a similar situation at WRC-12 in regard to the ZOHREH-1 satellite network, and had indicated that when applying No. 13.6, the provisions of No. 13.6 ceased to be applicable once a reply had been received from an administration. That understanding was essential in the application of No. 13.6.

9.16 **Mr Strelets** agreed with Mr Ito. It was important for the Board to share the same understanding of No. 13.6. According to No. 13.6, in the event of non-response or disagreement by the notifying administration, a decision was required of the Board, and the arguments of all parties involved must be taken into account in line with the last sentence of No. 13.6; such was the intent of the WRC. Prior to 1 January 2013, the Board had been required to confirm or otherwise a decision already taken by the Bureau. With the provisions now in force, an independent decision was required of the Board, thus the situation was different. He reiterated that administrations must have ample time to submit their case to the Board.

9.17 The **Deputy-Director** said that a clear distinction must be drawn between non-response and disagreement.

9.18 **Mr Magenta** said that the Board was faced with the question of how to react to the United States' non-response in the present case, bearing in mind that the United States was fully aware of the provisions of No. 13.6 and had been informed by the Bureau that the case was to be passed on to the Board. The consequence was that the Board had to base its decision on a single input, namely that provided by the Bureau, and thus basically to decide whether or not the Bureau had applied No. 13.6 correctly. In his view, the Bureau had done so.

9.19 The **Chairman** said that the case under consideration was the first under the version of No. 13.6 that had come into force on 1 January 2013, but had actually been dealt with under two different regulatory regimes. In applying the regulations, the Bureau had acted correctly, and the United States had exercised its right of non-response. Taking account of the specific circumstances of the case, he proposed that the following conclusions for approval of the Board:

“The Board considered the issue in detail and concluded that the Radiocommunication Bureau had correctly applied the provisions of No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations. The Board further decided to cancel all frequency assignments of the PRESAT satellite network from the MIFR.”

9.20 It was so **agreed**.

10 Report of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure (Document RRB12-1/4(Rev.5))

10.1 The Board **noted** the following report by its Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, which had met on 21 March, chaired by Mr Ebadi:

“The Working Group on Rules of Procedure (RoPs) considered Document RRB12-1/4(Revision 5) and agreed to update the document to reflect the ROPs approved at the 62nd meeting and to add

RoPs related to the WRC-12 allocation of the band 24.75-25.25 GHz to the fixed-satellite service and the examination under No. 11.31 of the Radio Regulations regarding the requirements of *resolves 6* of Resolution 612 (Rev. WRC-12). The Working Group also agreed to proceed with the draft Rule of Procedure concerning its working methods found in INFO/1. This RoP will also be reflected in the update to Document RRB12-1/4.”

11 Dates of the next and subsequent meetings

11.1 The Board **agreed** to confirm 24-28 June 2013 as the dates of its 63rd meeting.

11.2 The Board **further agreed** to set 25 November to 3 December 2013 as the dates of its 64th meeting. The meeting would definitely commence on 25 November, but its precise duration (either five or seven working days) would depend on the workload.

11.3 **Mr Ebadi** requested the Bureau, when planning possible dates for Board meetings, to take account of other events of potential interest to Board members such as international conferences on satellite matters.

11.4 **Ms Zoller** commented that if three Board meetings were to be held each year, there would presumably be a meeting roughly every four months, which meant that scheduling should be relatively straightforward. It should be possible to ensure a fairly uniform workload with less need for extended meetings. Perhaps in the future it might be possible to plan meetings in February, June and October each year.

12 International monitoring facilities

12.1 **Ms Zoller** said that the Board had agreed on the principle of using international monitoring facilities to resolve cases of harmful interference, as discussed in regard to § 6 of the Director’s report (Document RRB13-1/1). Nevertheless, the draft memoranda of cooperation mentioned in that section went far beyond the resolution of cases of harmful interference and touched also on compliance of technical characteristics of space stations in the geostationary orbit with the characteristics recorded in the MIFR or conformity with a Plan. Such aspects had been discussed by WRC-12 and were at the heart of the application of provisions concerned with the bringing into use of assignments. The Board should discuss carefully any extended use of international monitoring facilities because of the implications on the rights of administrations and on the implementation of frequency assignments. At WRC-12, it had been clear that the changes made to the provisions on bringing into use (requiring a spacecraft having the capability to bring into use the assignment to be on orbit for 90 days at the notified orbital position) had been seen as ample. She was concerned about the draft memoranda of cooperation because the results of such monitoring could ultimately affect the application of the Radio Regulations and the rights of Member States. In addition, there would be financial consequences. The subject should be discussed by the Board and, by the Council, perhaps in the context of Resolution 100 (Minneapolis, 1998) on the “Role of the Secretary-General of ITU as depositary for memoranda of understanding”.

12.2 The **Chairman** suggested that aspects of memoranda of understanding other than the use of international monitoring facilities to resolve cases of harmful interference should be considered by a WRC.

12.3 **Ms Zoller** said that there should be a clear separation of responsibility between ITU-R and the Council. The application of the Radio Regulations should be discussed and decided upon within ITU-R, through the WRC, which would determine the action by the Board or the Bureau. But

entering into memoranda of agreement involved potential financial. Those broader aspects should be dealt with by the Council.

12.4 The **Deputy-Director** said that the Bureau was not asking the Secretary-General to act as depositary for the memoranda of cooperation, therefore reference to Resolution 100 was inappropriate. There were, of course, cost implications, and Ms Zoller had raised both the financial aspects and the possibility that the sovereign rights of Member States could be affected. Resolution 100 did not apply, however, and it was not for the Council to discuss the Bureau's memoranda of cooperation.

12.5 **Mr Ito** said that the memorandum of cooperation between ITU and ICAO appeared to concern only the analysis of harmful interference. The use of international monitoring facilities for the analysis of compliance with provisions on bringing into use might go beyond the actions envisaged by WRC-12 and might have a financial effect on ITU. Taking account of the sensitive nature of such use and the costs involved, the Board might reflect on the matter. If such use was not needed, then the Union need not pay for it. The matter might be outside the Board's mandate. He asked whether or not the memoranda of cooperation were to be discussed by the Council.

12.6 The **Chairman** said that as per his understanding, the technical and regulatory aspects of the memoranda of cooperation were within the mandate of the Board, whereas the financial and other administrative aspects were to be looked at by the Council.

12.7 **Mr Ito** agreed with the Chairman but was unclear whether or not the content of the memoranda of cooperation included the use of technology for investigative purposes other than geolocating sources of harmful interference – for example, assessment of bringing-into-use compliance.

12.8 **Mr Bessi** supported Ms Zoller and Mr Ito. The memoranda of cooperation should be limited to analysis of cases of harmful interference, at the request of the administrations concerned. While Article 16 of the Radio Regulations dealt with international monitoring and allowed the Bureau to use international monitoring facilities to support the implementation of provisions such as those on bringing into use, the practice should be discussed by the Bureau and Board, and a final decision taken by a WRC where administrations could give their opinion. **Mr Magenta** agreed with Mr Bessi.

12.9 **Chief SSD** cautioned that the Board's conclusions on international monitoring should not contradict the Radio Regulations. He recalled that, according to No. 16.1, "administrations agree to continue the development of monitoring facilities and, to the extent practicable, to cooperate in the continued development of the international monitoring system" to both "help ensure efficient and economical use of the radio-frequency spectrum and to help in the prompt elimination of harmful interference". He also drew attention to No. 16.5, which stated that "Administrations shall, as far as they consider practicable, conduct such monitoring as may be requested of them by other administrations or by the Bureau." The Bureau's recording of monitoring data was dealt with in No. 16.7, while No. 16.8 referred to conformity with the Radio Regulations. Furthermore, No. 13.6 set out actions to be taken by the Bureau "whenever it appears from reliable information available that a recorded assignment has not been brought into use, or is no longer in use, or continues to be in use but not in accordance with the notified required characteristics".

12.10 **Mr Strelets** endorsed the importance of the points raised by Ms Zoller and said that the use of international monitoring facilities for purposes beyond the resolution of cases of harmful interference should be carefully considered because of its serious implications.

12.11 The **Chairman** reiterated that the Board agreed on the use of international monitoring facilities to resolve cases of harmful interference, as discussed in regard to the memoranda of cooperation mentioned in § 6 of the Director's report (Document RRB13-1/1). Using international

monitoring facilities for other purposes was, however, a delicate subject because of the implications, and so the Bureau and Board needed to examine all aspects of the matter. **Mr Strelets**, **Mr Žilinskas** and **Mr Koffi** supported that conclusion.

12.12 **Ms Zoller** said that the minutes of the present meeting would alert administrations to the possibilities being discussed. Looking at the draft memoranda of cooperation and seeing text referring to the verification of conformity with the characteristics recorded in the MIFR had prompted her to raise the matter, which she felt the Board should address. The present discussion had shown that Board members were in favour of using international monitoring facilities only to resolve cases of harmful interference. A matter as serious as extending the use of those monitoring facilities to verify compliance with the MIFR should be dealt with by a WRC because it had fundamental implications on how assignments were kept in the MIFR.

13 Approval of the summary of decisions (Document RRB13-1/7)

13.1 The summary of decisions (Document RRB13-1/7) was **approved**.

14 Closure of the meeting

14.1 **Mr Magenta** commended the Chairman on his very able handling of his first meeting as Chairman of the Board, following and further enhancing the examples set by previous chairmen.

14.2 The **Chairman** thanked Mr Magenta for his kind words, and also thanked everyone who had contributed to the success of the meeting. He closed the meeting at 1230 hours on Friday, 22 March 2013.

The acting Executive Secretary:
F. LEITE

The Chairman:
P.K. GARG