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# Introduction

The Correspondence Group on the ITU-R Strategic Plan was established by 18th meeting of the RAG. Its terms of reference as laid out in Circular-letter CA/199 (Annex 4) call for it “view to review and clarify, as appropriate:

– the strategic objectives of ITU-R;

– the respective roles of BR and other bodies of ITU-R;

– the ITU-R activities, their inputs and outputs;

– the links between the objectives and the strategic goals of ITU-R and those of ITU.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

The CG is to “to report on the matter to the nineteenth meeting of Radiocommunication Advisory Group in 2012. Should RAG at its 2012 meeting agreed to the draft supplementary document, it may advise the Director to implement the ITU-R Strategic Plan using the above-mentioned approved supplement.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **Discussion**

The following revisions have been proposed in “Activities of the ITU-R V2” to the RAG Correspondence Group on the ITU-R Strategic Plan:

1. “To ensure interference-free operations of radiocommunication systems
2. To establish global standards and associated materials to ensure the necessary required performance , interoperability and quality for operating radiocommunication systems”[[3]](#footnote-3)

The United States questions whether the proposed revisions provide an improvement over the existing text. The existing text explains exactly what the ITU-R does, i.e. implementing the Radio Regulations, establishing Recommendations. The proposed revisions make the work of the ITU-R more ambiguous.

In the first goal, how exactly would the ITU-R ‘ensure interference free operations’ if not through the implementation of the Radio Regulations? Are new mechanisms to ensure interference operation being suggested or implied?

In the second goal, there are numerous cases where the ITU-R recommends standards developed by external Standards Development Organizations (SDOs). To say that the ITU-R ‘establishes’ standards would frequently confuse the work of the ITU-R with the work of those SDOs. Further in the second goal, the United States has concerns with the addition of the word “required”, since in most cases ITU Recommendations do not establish requirements.

Finally in the second goal, the United States is concerned with the addition of “interoperability”. ITU-R Recommendations are of a voluntary nature and in most cases do not provide system specifications or their associated test suites that would be required to ensure interoperability.

As can be seen from this discussion, the proposed revisions could potentially create a host of problems; while the original text as approved in Resolution 71 (Guadalajara, 2010) do not have those problems.

**Proposal**

The United States endorses the Strategic Plan of the ITU-R as approved in Resolution 71 (Guadalajara, 2010) and would not support the revisions proposed in “Activities of the ITU-R V2” to the Correspondence Group.

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