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# 1 Reports by the Chairmen of Committees 2, 5 and 6 (Documents 307(Rev.3), 398, 437, 438, 439, 445)

1.1The **Chairman of Committee 2**, introducing Document 307(Rev.3), said that, since his previous report to the plenary, the committee had received one original transfer of powers document and three original credentials documents, all of which had been found to be in order. That brought to a total of 143 the number of Member States that had deposited original credentials documents out of a total of 161 represented at the conference. Authorized members of delegations whose credentials had been found to be in order as per the latest version of Document 307 were entitled to sign the final acts of the conference in advance of the signing ceremony.

1.2 Document 307(Rev.3) was **noted**.

1.3 The **Chairman of Committee 5** recalled that the plenary had dealt with Document 398 at its eighth meeting and, while agreeing to delete the section on application of the concept described in § 6*d*i) of Appendix 5 to the Radio Regulations, had requested the committee to reconsider the proposal in the section on RNSS systems in the 1 164-1 215 MHz frequency band. That subject was covered in Document 416, which had already been approved by the plenary. It was now proposed that the proposal relating to RNSS systems in the 1 164-1 215 MHz frequency band should be pursued no further.

1.4 It was so **agreed**.

1.5 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that Document 437 contained a draft consolidated list of texts incorporated by reference in the Radio Regulations. The list, set out in Annex 1, reflected the conclusions of Committees 4 and 5, as well as those of Committee 6, on amendments to the existing list. She invited the plenary to continue to update the list in accordance with decisions made at subsequent meetings. There were square brackets around two of the references because they were still at issue pending the conclusion of discussions on agenda item 1.12.

1.6 On the understanding that the list of ITU-R Recommendations to be included in Volume 4 of the next edition of the Radio Regulations would be completed taking into account subsequent relevant decisions of the conference, Document 437 was **approved**.

1.7 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that Document 438 contained a draft consolidated text on entry into force and provisional application of the Radio Regulations, including a revised version of Article 59 and a draft new resolution modelled on Resolution 98 (WRC-12). The relevant conclusions of Committees 4 and 5, as well as those of Committee 6, had been incorporated into the document, which would need to be updated at the end of the conference when final decisions were made.

1.8 The **delegate of the** **United Kingdom** said that, if the draft new resolution on earth stations in motion in the 29.5-30.0 GHz band was adopted by the conference, footnote 5.5X would come into force as of 28 November 2015. He therefore proposed that footnote 5.5X be added to the *resolves* part of the draft new resolution in Document 438.

1.9 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that that change could be incorporated later if the conference decided to adopt the draft new resolution on earth stations in motion.

1.10 The **Chairman** took it that the plenary could approve Document 438, subject to subsequent updates.

1.11 It was so **agreed**.

1.12 The **Chairman of Committee 6** read out the following statement regarding Document 438 on behalf of the delegation of Luxembourg:

“When discussing entry into force of provisions of the Radio Regulations developed in Committee 5, concerns were expressed regarding the new allocation for the fixed-satellite service (space-to-Earth) in the frequency range 13.4-13.65 GHz.

This new allocation will enter into force on the nominal date to be agreed by WRC-15, which is tentatively 1 January 2017. However, the Bureau’s current practice is to allow the submission of coordination requests specifying a new FSS band prior to the entry into force of a new FSS allocation. In order to ensure that all administrations have the same opportunities to access the band 13.4-13.65 GHz it was suggested that the Conference instructs the Bureau to not take into account any coordination request in the band 13.4-13.65 GHz until 1 January 2017. This approach was supported by two countries who suggested to work with the interested parties to develop the appropriate text offline.”

1.13 The **delegate of Qatar** expressed support for the approach put forward by Luxembourg. It was particularly important for developing countries to have time to apply for new networks. Furthermore, the frequency band of the feeder link for the downlink, if approved, should have the same date of entry into force so that administrations, in particular those from developing countries, had time to become familiar with any modifications made by ITU to the existing tools.

1.14 The **delegates of China**, **Egypt** and **Thailand** expressed support for Luxembourg’s proposal.

1.15 The **delegate of** **the Russian Federation**, speakingon behalf of RCC, also expressed support for Luxembourg’s proposal, which would give all administrations equal rights to access the new orbital frequency resource.

1.16 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that equal treatment of all administrations was important. However, the plenary should not rush to make a decision. The Director of BR should be consulted on past practice in such cases with a view to drafting a precise text as a basis for discussion.

1.17 The **delegate of France**,supported by the **delegates of Japan** and **Turkey**, concurred with the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It was his understanding that the usual procedures would be followed with regard to the entry into force of the new allocation on 1 January 2017, on the basis of the texts normally used for such allocations.

1.18 The **delegate of Luxembourg** said that he would be happy to work with all delegations that had expressed interest in the topic and also with the Radiocommunication Bureau in order to develop a text for consideration at a future plenary meeting.

1.19 The **delegate of Sweden**, expressing support for the views expressed by the delegate of France, said that more time was needed to consider the issue. Discussions should be held offline and with the Radiocommunication Bureau so as to ensure that both existing practice and the question of accessibility for different countries to the orbital positions were taken into account.

1.20 The **delegate of Israel** agreed with previous speakers on the need to adhere to previous practice. With regard to the question of giving all administrations equal rights and opportunities, she failed to understand why the approach in the current case should be different from that applied for the past 23 years for new frequency allocations following all previous WRCs.

1.21 The **delegate of Norway** said that, whileit was important to adhere to established practice, the issue of equitable access should also be borne in mind. He supported Luxembourg’s proposal and said that his delegation would like to be included in the offline discussions on the topic.

1.22 The **Director of BR** said that the Bureau would certainly help the interested delegations to resolve the issue in offline discussions, as requested.

1.23 The **Chairman** said he took it that the plenary wished to proceed in the manner indicated. The Chairman of Committee 6 would coordinate informal discussions and report back to the plenary.

1.24 It was so **agreed**.

1.25 The **Chairman of Committee 6**, introducing Document 439, said that, on the issue of excessive satellite network filings, the plenary was requested to consider and approve the following Committee 6 conclusions:

“The administrations who support ARB/25A22/3 – Draft new Resolution [ARB-B10] (WRC-15) on Regulatory arrangements to reduce excessive satellite network filings issue – continue to have concerns about, as reported in CPM-15 Report 5/7/9 Issue I – Possible method to mitigate excessive satellite network, excessive filing issue in particular “CR/C filings” that may have a negative impact on later submitted filings networks. These administrations believe that such actions may negatively impact later filed networks. Accordingly, these administrations highlight that the issue of excessive filings may need to be further addressed by a future WRC under agenda item 7, as appropriate.”

With regard to regulatory procedures for coordination and notification of nanosatellites and picosatellites, the plenary was requested to consider and approve the following Committee 6 conclusions:

“The administrations of AFS, AGL, BOT, COD, LSO, MAU, MDG, MOZ, MWI, NMB, SEY, SWZ, TZA, ZMB and ZWE in Document 130(Add.25) acknowledge the output of Committee 5 to the Plenary as contained in Document 194, referencing RA-15 Resolution ITU-R 68 on improving the dissemination of knowledge concerning the applicable regulatory procedures for small satellites, including nanosatellites and picosatellites. However this resolution did not include any consideration of possible changes to the regulatory procedures for coordination and notification of nanosatellites and picosatellites.

These administrations support Committee 5’s conclusion that consideration of the regulatory procedures for coordination and notification of nanosatellites and picosatellites could be undertaken and that this should be conducted under the standing agenda item of WRCs (agenda item 7).

As a consequence of concerted deliberations these administrations resolved that the successful and timely development and operation of nanosatellites and picosatellites may require regulatory procedures which will take into account the short development cycle, the short lifetimes and the typical missions of such satellites. The administrations therefore request ITU-R to consider possible modifications to the existing regulatory procedures for notifying satellite networks to facilitate the deployment and operation of nanosatellites and picosatellites, and to take the appropriate actions within the framework of agenda item 7.”

1.26 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that small satellites, including nanosatellites and picosatellites, fell into two categories. The first category was those used by universities, research institutes and other researchers in the field of telecommunications. Plenipotentiary conferences had adopted resolutions encouraging academia to participate in research in that area. It would be regrettable if discussions under agenda item 7 had the effect of discouraging research by increasing the regulatory burden on institutes and universities and making cost recovery more onerous. Such research contributed to technological development in all countries, particularly developing countries. The second category was satellites used for commercial purposes that might create interference with scientific satellites and other satellites. It would be important, when Working Party 4A or any ITU-R study groups dealt with the matter, to distinguish between those two categories of satellite. Care should also be taken to ensure that the first category of satellite was not misappropriated. Commercial satellites should be appropriately regulated in a manner that did not create additional work for the Radiocommunication Bureau.

1.27 The **Chairman** took it that the plenary wished to note the report and approve the conclusions contained in Document 439, bearing in mind the comments just made by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

1.28 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting was suspended at 1450 hours and resumed at 1535 hours.**

1.29 The **Chairman of Committee 6**, introducing Document 445 (ninth report from Committee 6 to plenary), said that the committee had approved the resolutions and titles of 11 of the 19 topics for the WRC-19 agenda, and had submitted them to the Editorial Committee. It had approved a draft resolution on the preliminary agenda for WRC-23, which it had also forwarded, along with the titles of three agenda items and their accompanying resolutions, to the Editorial Committee. Under agenda item 6, Committee 6 had approved three topics for which studies were urgently required and had submitted a resolution thereon to the Editorial Committee. Lastly, under agenda item 10, the committee had selected two topics for consideration under agenda item 7 at WRC-19. With regard to the issues on which Committee 6 had been unable to reach consensus, she said that a framework resolution for the WRC-19 agenda had been agreed, and was contained in Annex 1 to the report. Agenda item titles that Committee 6 had agreed had been included, in full, in the draft agenda, and those that still required further discussion were in square brackets. Annexes 2 to 7 contained the texts of the draft resolutions that required further consideration. Once approved, those items could be added to the agenda in Annex 1 and the relevant square brackets removed. An alternative “version B” for the text in Annex 7 – the outcome of successful offline discussions – had been presented to the committee quite late in its proceedings and was included in the document; although the committee had been close to reaching a consensus on that text, it had not had sufficient time to do so. One delegation wished to propose an amendment to agenda item 9.2, a standing item on the agenda of WRCs.

1.30 The **delegate of** **the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that agenda item 9.2 referred to the report of the Director of BR on any difficulties or inconsistencies encountered in the application of the Radio Regulations. During the current conference, issues had been proposed for discussion under that item that did not strictly come within its scope. In a spirit of flexibility and to assist the conference, those issues had been taken up. In order to avoid similar occurrences in future, however, he wished to propose that a footnote be added to agenda item 9.2, which would read: “This agenda item is strictly limited to the Report of the Director on any difficulties or inconsistencies encountered in the application of the Radio Regulations and the comments from administrations”.

1.31 It was so **agreed**.

1.32 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that in his view the committee had not been close to reaching agreement on the “version B” text in Annex 7. His delegation considered that the band 5 850-5 925 MHz should not be included in studies.

1.33 The **Chairman** said it would be difficult to resolve the outstanding issues contained in Annexes 2 to 7 in a plenary meeting of the conference, and therefore suggested that they should be taken up at the informal group meeting, to be attended by regional representatives.

1.34 The **delegate of the United States** said that for some of the issues at hand, offline consultations had continued since the end of the Committee 6 meeting, and in some cases parties had come close to reaching agreement. Those developments should be taken into consideration by the informal group.

1.35 The **Chairman** said that all of the pending issues would be taken up by the informal group, and asked the Chairman of Committee 6 to inform the group about the outcome of the offline consultations and any advances towards consensus.

1.36 The **delegate of Switzerland** said that the views of individual delegations, not just regional groups, should be adequately represented in the discussions of the informal group.

1.37 The **Chairman** said that the informal group would base its conclusions on the contributions received from the various regions. Delegations that wished to ensure that their views were taken into account should consult with their regional representatives. When the work of the informal group had been completed, it would be presented to the plenary, to ensure that it was acceptable to all delegations. The plenary would then be tasked with resolving any issues on which the informal group had been unable to reach an agreement. On that understanding, he took it that the Conference wished to refer Document 445 to the informal group.

1.38 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting rose at 1615 hours.**
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