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At its 99th meeting, the Radio Regulations Board (RRB) considered the general practice of the Radiocommunication Bureau in relation to the current rules of procedure. As a result, the Board agreed on the schedule for the approval of draft new and modified rules of procedure contained in [Document RRB25-3/1](https://www.itu.int/md/R25-RRB25.3-C-0001/en). Accordingly, the Bureau prepared draft modified rules of procedure annexed to this Circular Letter:

– **Annex 1:** Modification to existing rules of procedure concerning the Receivability of forms of notice generally applicable to all notified assignments submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of the Radio Regulatory Procedures.

In accordance with No. **13.17** of the Radio Regulations, these draft rules of procedure are made available to administrations for comments before being submitted to RRB pursuant to No. **13.14**. As indicated in No. **13.12A d)** of the Radio Regulations, any comments that you may wish to submit should reach the Bureau no later than **13 October 2025**, **1600 UTC** in order to be considered at the 100th RRB meeting, scheduled for 10 – 14 November 2025. Comments should be sent by e-mail to [rrb@itu.int](mailto:rrb@itu.int).

In addition, the Bureau compiled the decisions of WRC-23 which did not appear in the Conference's Final Acts but were reflected in the minutes of WRC-23 plenary meetings and may, as decisions with the status of an authentic interpretation of the Radio Regulations, be included in the Rules of Procedure.

At its 99th meeting, the Board endorsed the list of such decisions and instructed the Bureau to circulate WRC-23 plenary meeting decisions to the administrations, indicating the intention to add these decisions as notes to the relevant parts of the Rules of Procedure (see Annex 2). Since these decisions have been adopted by WRC-23 and, as such, have a higher status than the Rules of Procedure, the text of these decisions will be added in the relevant parts of the Rules of Procedure without any modification. Consequently, Annex 2 is included in this Circular Letter for convenience of administrations and for information only (see also Circular Letter [CR/504](https://www.itu.int/md/R00-CR-CIR-0504/en) dated 17 April 2024).

The Radiocommunication Bureau remains at the disposal of your Administration for any clarification you may require.

Mario Maniewicz

Director

**Annexes: 2**

Distribution:   
- Administrations of Member States of ITU  
- Members of the Radio Regulations Board

**Annex 1**

Modification of existing rules of procedure concerning Receivability of forms of notice generally applicable to all notified assignments submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of the Radio Regulatory Procedures

**Rules concerning the Receivability of forms of notice generally applicable to all notified assignments submitted to the Radiocommunication Bureau in application of the Radio Regulatory Procedures[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**MOD**

…

**4 Other non-receivable submissions**

There are, in addition to the above case of incomplete notice, other circumstances when a notice is not receivable. These cases are described in the following non-exhaustive paragraphs.

**4.1 NOC**

**4.2 Not used**

**4.3** The Radio Regulations prescribe, in some cases, the application of multiple procedures, which have to be applied, for the same stations or satellite network, one after another. In such cases, a notice for a particular procedure is receivable only if the previously applicable procedure has been effected.

**4.3.1** A notification under Article **11** is not receivable if the coordination request, where applicable, was not received for the satellite network (No. **9.6** refers) and shall be returned to the notifying administration.

**4.3.2** A notification under Article **11** is not receivable if the advance publication information under Sub-Section IA of Article **9**, where applicable, was not received for the satellite network and shall be returned to the notifying administration.

**4.3.3** A notification of frequency assignments of an earth station under Article **11** is not receivable if the advance publication information or coordination request, as appropriate, was not received for the associated space station. If the frequency assignments notified under Article **11** for the associated space station are not received nor recorded in the MIFR within the regulatory time-limit, the frequency assignments notified for the earth station shall be suppressed from the MIFR.

**4.3.4** For frequency assignments to inter-satellite links, a notification under Article **11** is not receivable if the corresponding advance publication information or coordination request, as appropriate, for the associated satellite network has not been received. Consequently, such frequency assignments shall be returned to the notifying administration.

**4.4 NOC**

**4.5 NOC**

***Reasons****: This modification clarifies that, in the case of inter-satellite links, a notification under Article* ***11*** *is not receivable unless the associated satellite network has at least initiated the relevant procedures under Article* ***9****. This ensures that the frequency bands used by the inter-satellite links are covered by the associated satellite network notices. The change reflects the current practice followed by the Bureau.*

*Effective date of application of this Rule: Immediately after approval*

**Annex 2**

**Rules concerning**

**ARTICLE 4 of the RR**

**MOD**

**4.4**

**1. NOC**

**2. NOC**

**3. Recording of frequency assignments to satellite networks and systems under No. 4.4**

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision on recording of frequency assignments to satellite networks and systems under No. **4.4**, see item 13.20 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

*“WRC-23 discussed the use of RR No.* ***4.4*** *raised in section 4.14 of the Report “Recording of frequency assignments to satellite networks and systems under No.* ***4.4****” and confirmed “that frequency assignments recorded under RR No.* ***4.4*** *are not entitled to protection from harmful interference from other frequency assignments recorded under RR No.* ***4.4****”.*

*The international rights and obligations of administrations in respect of their own frequency assignments and other administrations frequency assignments are defined in Article* ***8*** *as well as other provisions of the RR. See also Article* ***8*** *of the RR.*

*In order to increase the transparency, WRC-23 instructs the Bureau to insert the indication of the frequency assignment submission under RR No.* ***4.4*** *at the Summary Table of the Special Section or Part. In addition, to facilitate information sharing, WRC-23 instructs the Radiocommunication Bureau (BR) to make any information it may have regarding notification and bringing into use of frequency assignments under RR No.* ***4.4*** *available in an easily accessible format, such as publishing it in BR’s website and implementing a new filter option in the ITU Space Explorer Data Analytics tool. The shared information could include a list of filings that are using RR No.* ***4.4*** *as well as historical data, including the date of receipt of these assignments. In addition, BR is also instructed to periodically inform administrations on the updated information regarding notification and bringing into use of frequency assignments under RR No.* ***4.4*** *made available by BR in its website and to invite the notifying administrations to take steps to cancel the RR No.* ***4.4*** *assignments if no longer in use.*

*WRC-23 urges administrations when using frequency assignments under RR No.* ***4.4*** *to fully comply with the objectives and purpose of this provision, including the RoP related to RR No.* ***4.4****.”*

**Rules concerning**

**ARTICLE 5 of the RR**

**ADD**

**5.434 and 5.435B**

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision related to Nos. **5.434** and **5.435B [5.36A12]** for the frequency band 3 600-3 800 MHz, see item 18.1 of the Minutes of the 8th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/523](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0523/en):

*“In the application of footnotes RR Nos.* ***5.434*** *and* ***5.36A12****, the term “neighbouring countries” includes those countries of Region 1 which are neighbouring Region 2.”*

**ADD**

**5.429D and 5.429G**

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision related to Nos. **5.429D** and **5.429G [5.A12]**, see item 2.1 of the Minutes of the 12th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/527](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0527/en):

*“In the application of footnotes RR Nos.* ***5.A12****,* ***5.429D****, RR No.* ***4.8*** *applies. The radiolocation service operating in the countries of Region 1, which are neighbouring to Region 2, has the same regulatory status in relation to the mobile service of Region 2 as the radiolocation service in Region 2. The term “neighbouring countries” mentioned in footnote RR No.* ***5.429D*** *includes those countries of Region 1 which are neighbouring Region 2.”*

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

**MOD**

(…) [*No change is proposed to the current text, except the addition of the following note at the end*]

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision on situations of *force majeure* related to the extension of time-limits for bringing into use or bringing back into use a frequency assignment, see item 13.4 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

***Issues related to the extension of time-limits for bringing into use or bringing back into use a frequency assignment***

*“WRC-23 confirms that, while each case is considered on its merits, providing the following information facilitates the consideration of a request for extension of the regulatory time-limit due to force majeure by the Board:*

*– a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency bands;*

*– the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date;*

*– the status of the satellite construction before the force majeure event, including the date it began and whether it was expected to be completed prior to the initial launch window;*

*– the name of the launch service provider and the contract signature date;*

*– the efforts and measures taken or envisaged to avoid missing the deadline, to overcome the difficulties faced and to reduce the project timelines, if possible, with supporting evidence by the satellite manufacturer and/or launch service provider as appropriate;*

*– detailed rationale and assessment against all four conditions of force majeure:*

*1 the event must be beyond the control of the obligor;*

*2 the event constituting force majeure must be unforeseen or, if it was foreseeable, must be inevitable or irresistible;*

*3 the event must make it impossible for the obligor to perform its obligation;*

*4 a causal effective connection must exist between the event constituting force majeure and the failure by the obligator to fulfil the obligation.*

*– the initial and revised project milestones for the construction, launch window, launch and orbit raising of the satellite, as well as relocation and in-orbit testing timelines when the satellite is not directly launched in its nominal orbital position or its non-geostationary satellite orbit;*

*– a detailed rationale for the length of the extension requested, including a breakdown of the nature and extent of the delay experienced so far, the additional delay projected by the manufacturer and launch service provider, and any planned contingency;*

*– any other relevant information and documentation.*

*WRC-23 also confirms the Board’s approach with respect to contingency periods in the determination of the length of an extension in cases of force majeure.*

*WRC-23 also noted that the Board is now examining how all four conditions of force majeure are met on a case-by-case basis when the COVID-19 pandemic is invoked as the force majeure event.*

*WRC-23 instructs the Board to reflect the above-confirmations in the RoP concerning the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use satellite assignments.”*

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision on situations of co-passenger delay related to the extension of time-limits for bringing into use or bringing back into use a frequency assignment, see item 13.6 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

*“WRC-23 confirms that the WRC-19 decision for the provision of information as required when dealing with a request for extension of regulatory time-limits due to co-passenger delay should be revised as shown below:*

*– a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency bands;*

*– the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date;*

*– the status of the satellite construction, including the date it began and whether it was expected to be completed prior to the initial launch window;*

*– the name of the launch service provider and the contract signature date;*

*– the initial and revised project milestones for the launch window, launch and orbit raising of the satellite, as well as relocation and in-orbit testing timelines when the satellite is not directly launched in its nominal orbital position or its non-geostationary satellite orbit;*

*– sufficient detail to justify that the request for extension is due to co-passenger delay (e.g. a letter from the launch service provider indicating that the launch is delayed because of a delay affecting the co-passenger satellite);*

*- a detailed rationale for the length of the extension requested, including a breakdown of the nature and extent of the delay experienced so far, the additional delay projected by the launch service provider, and any planned contingency, and*

*– any other relevant information and documentation.*

*WRC-23 instructs the Board to reflect the above-confirmation in the RoP concerning the extension of the regulatory time-limit for bringing into use satellite assignments.”*

**Rules concerning**

**ARTICLE 21 of the RR**

**MOD**

**21.16**

**Application of power flux-density (pfd) limits to steerable beams**

**1. NOC**

**2. NOC**

**3. NOC**

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision for the application of Article **21** of the Radio Regulations, in regard to the pfd scaling factor to be applied to non-GSO FSS constellations with 1 000 or more space stations operating in the 17.7-19.3 GHz frequency band, see item 14.2 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

*“WRC-23 revised RR No.* ***21.16.6*** *and instructs the Bureau to issue qualified favourable findings under RR Nos.* ***9.35****/****11.31*** *when examining compliance of frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems with RR Article* ***21*** *pfd limits applicable in the frequency band 17.7-19.3 GHz if the notifying administration requested it to do so. WRC-23 determined that this practice would also apply to non-GSO FSS satellite systems for which coordination requests have been received from 16 December 2023 until the entry into force of the Final Acts of WRC-23. WRC-23 also instructs the Bureau to review these findings, as well as those issued from 23 November 2019 until the last day of WRC-23, once the pfd examination software incorporates the decision of WRC-23 on No.* ***21.16.6****. See also Document 420.”*

**Rules concerning**

**APPENDIX 30 to the RR**

(Rules are arranged by paragraph numbers of Appendix **30**)

**Art. 4**

**Procedures for modifications to the Region 2 Plan  
or for additional uses in Regions 1 and 3**

**ADD**

**4.1.10c**

**Note**: WRC-23 took the following decision on delays in fulfilling the application of assistance procedures under Appendices **30**/**30A** or Appendix **30B** due to communication difficulties with some administrations, see item 15.1 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

***Delays in fulfilling the application of assistance procedures under Appendices 30/30A or Appendix 30B due to communication difficulties with some administrations***

*“WRC‑23 instructs the Bureau to apply the same course of action as adopted for Topic H of Agenda Item 7 by WRC-23 with regard to the “officially unreachable” administrations referred to in section 3.2.4.2 of Addendum 2 to Document 4 (Part II of Report of the Director to WRC-23).”*

*“With regard to administrations with affected assignments in the Appendices* ***30*** *and* ***30A*** *Plan and/or affected allotments in the Appendix* ***30B*** *Plan that have not replied to the second reminder of the Bureau referred to in § 4.1.10c of Appendices* ***30*** *and* ***30A*** *and/or § 6.14bis of Appendix* ***30B****, as appropriate, WRC-23 urges the notifying administrations of Part B submissions, with the assistance of the Bureau, to exercise their utmost effort to avoid degrading the reference situation of the assignments/allotments concerned in the Appendices* ***30*** *and* ***30A*** *Plans and Appendix* ***30B*** *Plan by modifying technical characteristics at the Part B stage.”*

**Rules concerning**

**APPENDIX 30A to the RR**

(Rules are arranged by paragraph numbers of Appendix **30A**)

**MOD**

**Art. 4**

**Procedures for modifications to the Region 2 feeder-link Plan  
or for additional uses in Regions 1 and 3[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**ADD**

**4.1.10c**

See the Rules of Procedure concerning § 4.1.10c of Article 4 of Appendix **30**.

**Rules concerning**

**APPENDIX 30B to the RR**

(Rules are arranged by paragraph numbers of Appendix **30B**)

**MOD**

**Art. 6**

**Procedures for the conversion of an allotment into an assignment**

**for the introduction of an additional system or for**

**the modification of an assignment in the List [[3]](#footnote-3)±**

**ADD**

**6.14*bis***

See the Rules of Procedure concerning § 4.1.10c of Article 4 of Appendix **30**.

**MOD**

**Art. 7**

**Procedure for the addition of a new allotment to the Plan**

**for a new Member State of the Union[[4]](#footnote-4)3**

**ADD**

**Rules concerning**

**RESOLUTION 559 (WRC-19)**

**Additional temporary regulatory measures following the deletion   
of part of Annex 7 to Appendix** **30 (Rev.WRC-15) by WRC-19**

**Note:** WRC-23 took the following decision on issues related to the implementation of Resolution **559 (WRC-19)**, see item 13.2 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

*“In considering section 4.2 of the Report “Issues related to the implementation of Resolution* ***559 (WRC 19)****”, WRC-23 considered also Document 87(Add.26)(Add.2). In addition to endorsing all of the additional measures proposed by the Board for implementing Resolution* ***559 (WRC-19)****, this document contained additional proposed measures to be endorsed by this WRC to help resolve remaining coordination cases as follows:*

*1 With respect to the remaining coordination cases under § 4.1.1 b) of RR Appendix* ***30****, WRC 23 approved the following measures:*

*a) the notifying administration of an additional use (i.e. assignments in the List and/or pending Article 4 networks) to accept possible interference produced to its test-points located within −3 dB antenna gain contour of the Resolution* ***559******(WRC‑19)*** *submission concerned due to the fact that the ellipse is already the minimum one validated by the Bureau;*

*b) the notifying administration of an additional use (i.e. assignments in the List and/or pending Article 4 networks) to accept possible interference produced to its test-points located beyond −20 dB antenna gain contour of the Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submission concerned;*

*c) if the equivalent protection margin (EPM) of a test-point of an additional use network is less than −10 dB at the time of examination by the Bureau of Part A of Resolution* ***559 (WRC 19)*** *submissions, that test-point should not be considered by the Bureau in reviewing the findings of the Resolution* ***559 (WRC 19)*** *submission concerned;*

*d) a coordination is deemed to be completed if the nominal orbital separation between a Resolution* ***559*** *submission and an additional use network is equal to or greater than 6 degrees.*

*2 With respect to the remaining coordination cases under § 4.1.1 e) of RR Appendix****30****, WRC‑23 approved the following measures:*

*a) a coordination is deemed to be completed if the nominal orbital separation between a Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submission and satellite network in non-planned bands concerned is equal to or greater than 6 degrees;*

*b) the service area of a satellite network in non-planned bands to be considered shall be on land and located within −3 dB antenna gain contour of that satellite network in non-planned bands instead of the submitted service area which may include the area with very low relative antenna gain contour. It is noted that the satellite network in non-planned bands only protects a Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submission in a service area on land and situated within its −3 dB antenna gain contour;*

*c) if an administration agrees not to protect the area, situated inside its national territory, in which the power flux-density (pfd) limit is exceeded, that part of the service area shall not be considered by the Bureau in reviewing the remaining coordination requirements of a Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submission;*

*d) the notifying administration of a satellite network in non-planned bands to accept possible interference produced to its service area located beyond −20 dB antenna gains contour of the Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submission concerned.*

*3 With respect to the remaining coordination cases under No. 4.1.1 b) of RR Appendix****30A****, WRC‑23 approved that the remaining coordination cases are deemed to be completed due to the fact that:*

*a) the Article 4 satellite networks have very large coverage with very high receiving sensitivity over the national territory of the Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *administration concerned;*

*b) the coverage areas of those Article 4 satellite networks extend far beyond the national territory of the notifying administrations whereas feeder-link earth stations of the Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submission concerned are only located inside the national territory and that cannot be further reduced;*

*c) the objective of Resolution****2 (Rev.WRC‑03)*** *and Topic F of WRC‑23 Agenda Item 7.*

*4 With respect to the remaining coordination cases under RR No. 4.1.1 a) of Appendices****30*** *and****30A****, WRC‑23 approved the following measures:*

*a) for multi-beam Plan assignments, if downlink single-entry C/I values are above 21 dB except for one test-point where single-entry C/I is greater than 18 dB, Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submissions and the corresponding Regions 1 and 3 Plan frequency assignments are considered compatible. In order to preserve the same level of protection for such compatible cases of those Regions 1 and 3 Plan frequency assignments from incoming Article 4 submissions, the reference situation of those Regions 1 and 3 Plan frequency assignments shall not be updated when the Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *frequency assignments in the List are included in the Plans;*

*b) for multi-beam Plan assignments, if feeder-link single-entry C/I values are above 27 dB, Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *submissions and the corresponding Regions 1 and 3 Plan frequency assignments are considered compatible. In order to preserve the same level of protection for such compatible cases of those Regions 1 and 3 Plan frequency assignments from incoming Article 4 submissions, the reference situation of those Regions 1 and 3 Plan frequency assignments shall not be updated when the Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)*** *frequency assignments in the List are included in the Plans.*

*5 The Bureau is instructed to:*

*a) review the status of all the remaining coordination cases taking into account all the above-mentioned proposals including those of the RRB and BR. In this connection, for the remaining coordination cases under RR No. 4.1.1 b) of Appendix****30****, if after taking into account all the above-mentioned proposals, there is only one remaining test-point potentially affected, the coordination is deemed to be completed in respect of affected assignments entered in the List on or after 1 January 2017;*

*b) apply all the measures endorsed by WRC‑23 to the Resolution****559*** *submissions of the Administrations of AFG, GNE, MLT and SEY and to the future applications of § RR Nos. 4.1.26 or 4.1.27 of Article 4 of Appendices****30*** *and****30A****, which have the same nature as Resolution****559 (WRC‑19)****.”*

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

1. **Note:** WRC-15 took the decision related to the rule of procedure on the Receivability of forms of notice during the 8th Plenary, Par. 1.39 to 1.42 of Doc. CMR15/505, with the approval of Doc. CMR15/416 in relation to Section 3.2.2.4.1 of Doc. 4 (Add2) (Rev1), as follows:

   *“For the submission of a request for coordination under No. 9.30 related to a non-GSO satellite network or system, the notice will be receivable only in the cases described below:*

   *i) satellite systems with one (or more than one) set(s) of orbital characteristics and inclination value(s) with all frequency assignments to be operated simultaneously; and,*

   *ii) satellite systems with more than one set of orbital characteristics and inclination values with, however, a clear indication that the different sub-sets of orbital characteristics would be mutually exclusive; in other terms, frequency assignments to the satellite system would be operated on one of the sub-sets of orbital parameters to be determined at the notification and recording stage of the satellite system at the latest.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. **Note:** WRC-23 took the following decision on implementation of modifications to Appendix **30A** and Appendix **30B** in relation to Topic 7F, see item 15.1 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

   *“WRC-23 instructs the Bureau, when receiving a request for assistance from the notifying administrations of national or regional systems in relation to frequency coordination with affected administrations:*

   *– to assist in preparation of necessary material including but not limited to C/I calculations, interference analysis and link budget calculations;*

   *– to participate in such coordination meetings in order to provide support and facilitate technical discussions/negotiations.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ± **Note:** WRC-23 took the following decision on implementation of modifications to Appendix **30A** and Appendix **30B** in relation to Topic 7F, see item 15.1 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

   *“WRC-23 instructs the Bureau, when receiving a request for assistance from the notifying administrations of national or regional systems in relation to frequency coordination with affected administrations:*

   *– to assist in preparation of necessary material including but not limited to C/I calculations, interference analysis and link budget calculations;*

   *– to participate in such coordination meetings in order to provide support and facilitate technical discussions/negotiations.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 3 **Note:** WRC-23 took the following decision on issues related to the Article 7 procedure of Appendix **30B**, see item 13.10 of the Minutes of the 13th Plenary meeting, Doc. [CMR23/528](https://www.itu.int/md/R23-WRC23-C-0528/en):

   *“WRC-23 urges administrations with Appendix* ***30B*** *Part A submissions received before 12 March 2020 to make all efforts to accommodate Article 7 submissions of other administrations and to take into account the results of the analyses of the Bureau and the measures to avoid further degradation of the C/I levels when preparing their Part B submissions.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)