



**Revision 1 to
Document RRB24-1/14-E
12 March 2024
Original: English**

**SUMMARY OF DECISIONS
OF THE
95TH MEETING OF THE RADIO REGULATIONS BOARD**

4 – 8 March 2024

Present:

Members, RRB

Mr Y. HENRI, Chair
Mr A. LINHARES DE SOUZA FILHO, Vice-Chair
Mr E. AZZOUZ, Mr A. ALKAHTANI, Ms C. BEAUMIER, Mr J. CHENG,
Mr M. DI CRESCENZO, Mr E.Y. FIANKO, Ms S. HASANOVA, Ms R. MANNEPALLI,
Mr R. NURSHABEKOV, Mr H. TALIB

Executive Secretary, RRB

Mr M. MANIEWICZ, Director, BR

Précis-writers

Ms C. RAMAGE and Mr P. METHVEN

Also present:

Ms J. WILSON, Deputy Director, BR, and Chief, IAP
Mr A. VALLET, Chief, SSD
Mr C. LOO, Head, SSD/SPR
Mr J. CICCROSSI, acting Head, SSD/SSC
Mr J. WANG, Head, SSD/SNP
Mr A. KLYUCHAREV, SSD/SNP
Mr B. BA, Head, acting Chief TSD and TSD/TPR
Mr K. BOGENS, Head, TSD/FMD
Ms I. GHAZI, Head, TSD/BCD
Mr D. BOTHA, SGD
Ms K. GOZAL, Administrative Secretary

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
1	Opening of the meeting	<p>The Chair, Mr Y. HENRI, welcomed the members of the Board to the 95th meeting, thanked the members for their efforts during WRC-23 and indicated that he counted on their cooperation to ensure the meeting's successful outcome. He congratulated Mr A. LINHARES DE SOUZA FILHO on serving as Vice-Chair of the Board and Ms S. HASANOVA on serving as Chair of the Working Group on Rules of Procedure during 2024.</p> <p>The Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau, Mr M. MANIEWICZ, speaking also on behalf of the Secretary-General, Ms D. BOGDAN-MARTIN, likewise welcomed the members of the Board and congratulated Mr Y. HENRI on serving as the Chair of the Board during 2024. He also congratulated the Board on the results of WRC-23 that were relevant to its activities and wished the Board successful outcomes for the next cycle.</p>	-
2	Adoption of the agenda RRB24-1/OJ/1(Rev.1)	The draft agenda was adopted as amended in Document RRB24-1/OJ/1(Rev.1). The Board decided to note Documents RRB24-1/DELAYED/1 and RRB24-1/DELAYED/2 for information under agenda items 3 and 7.1, respectively.	-
3	Report by the Director, BR RRB24-1/8 ; RRB24-1/DELAYED/1 ; RRB24-1/8(Add.1) ; RRB24-1/8(Add.2) ; RRB24-1/8(Add.3) ; RRB24-1/8(Add.4) ; RRB24-1/8(Add.5)	The Board considered in detail the Report of the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau, as contained in Document RRB24-1/8 and its Addenda 1 to 5, and thanked the Bureau for the extensive and detailed information provided.	-
		a) The Board noted § 1 of Document RRB24-1/8, on actions arising from the decisions of the 94 th Board meeting. Under the actions related to agenda item 5.5 of the 94 th Board meeting, the Board noted for information Document RRB24-1/DELAYED/1, in which the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran withdrew its request for extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to the IRANSAT-43.5E satellite network as a result of having brought back into use the frequency assignments concerned before the regulatory time-limit	-

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>in October 2023 and thanked the administration for providing the information.</p> <p>In response to information provided by the Bureau, the Board also noted under agenda item 5.6 of the 94th Board meeting that the Administration of Italy had informed the Bureau in February 2024 that the frequency assignments to the SICRAL 2A and SICRAL 3A satellite networks had been brought into use at the end of January 2024 and consequently there was no need to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring back into use the frequency assignments to those satellite networks.</p>	
		b) The Board noted § 2 of Document RRB24-1/8, on the processing of filings for terrestrial and space systems, and encouraged the Bureau to continue to make all efforts to process the filings within the regulatory time-limits.	-
		c) The Board noted §§ 3.1 and 3.2 of Document RRB24-1/8, on late payments and Council activities, respectively, relating to the implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings.	-
		d) The Board noted § 4 of Document RRB24-1/8, containing statistics on harmful interference and infringements of the Radio Regulations.	-
		<p>e) The Board considered in detail § 4.1 of, and Addenda 1, 2, 3 and 5 to Document RRB24-1/8, on harmful interference to broadcasting stations in the VHF/UHF bands between Italy and its neighbouring countries. The Board noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a number of meetings had been convened between the Administration of Italy and its neighbours and further such meetings had been scheduled; the use of the digital audio broadcasting (DAB) frequency block 12C between the Administrations of Italy and Malta and the case of 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administrations concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue providing assistance to those administrations;

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>harmful interference to one FM broadcasting station between the Administrations of Italy and Montenegro had been resolved;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there was a strong commitment by the Administration of Italy to only use DAB blocks 7C and 7D on a temporary basis with the objective of immediately resolving some interference cases. <p>While the Board thanked the administrations that had reported on the status of the situation, it noted with grave concern the reports received of a large number of additional cases of harmful interference. Furthermore, the Board continued to express its profound disappointment at the extremely slow progress towards resolving cases of harmful interference to FM sound broadcasting stations. The Board continued to strongly urge the Administration of Italy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fully commit to implementing all the recommendations resulting from the June 2023 multilateral coordination meeting; take all necessary measures to eliminate harmful interference to the FM sound broadcasting stations of its neighbouring countries, focusing on the priority list of FM sound broadcasting stations and particularly on the priority FM sound broadcasting station of the Administrations of Croatia and Slovenia as identified at the multilateral coordination meeting in 2023; cease the operation of all uncoordinated FM sound broadcasting stations and DAB stations not contained in the Plans of the GE84 and GE06 Agreements, respectively. <p>The Board continued to encourage the Administration of Italy to consider the migration of FM stations to DAB as an opportunity to assist in resolving the long-standing cases of harmful interference to FM broadcasting stations of its neighbouring countries; however, such migration efforts should not detract from other direct efforts to resolve harmful interference to FM broadcasting stations. Furthermore, the Board urged all administrations to continue their coordination efforts in goodwill and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue reporting on progress on the matter to future Board meetings and to report to the 96th Board meeting on the outcome of the multilateral coordination meeting scheduled for May 2024.

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>to sign coordination and migration agreements of broadcasting stations as soon as such agreements were reached.</p> <p>The Board reiterated its request to the Administration of Italy to provide a detailed action plan for implementing the FM Working Group's recommendations, with clearly defined milestones and timelines, to make a firm commitment to the plan's implementation and to report to the 96th Board meeting on progress in that regard.</p> <p>The Board thanked the Bureau for the support provided to the administrations concerned and kindly instructed the Bureau to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue providing assistance to those administrations; • continue reporting on progress on the matter to future Board meetings and to report to the 96th Board meeting on the outcome of the multilateral coordination meeting scheduled for May 2024. 	
		f) The Board noted § 5 of Document RRB24-1/8, on the implementation of Nos. 9.38.1, 11.44.1, 11.47, 11.48, 11.49, 13.6 and Resolution 49 (Rev.WRC-19) of the Radio Regulations.	-
		g) The Board noted § 6 of Document RRB24-1/8, on the review of findings to frequency assignments to non-GSO FSS satellite systems under Resolution 85 (WRC-03) .	-
		h) The Board noted § 7 of Document RRB24-1/8, on progress towards implementation of Resolution 35 (WRC-19) .	-
		i) With regard to § 8 of Document RRB24-1/8, dealing with the resubmission of notified frequency assignments to the GW satellite network of the Administration of China, the Board noted the actions taken by the Bureau in accepting the late resubmission of the frequency assignments to the satellite network under No. 11.46 .	Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
4	Decisions relating to Rules of Procedure		
4.1	List of rules of procedure RRB24-1/1 ;	<p>Following a meeting of the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure, under the leadership of Ms S. HASANOVA, the Board revised and approved the list of proposed rules of procedure contained in Document RRB24-1/1, taking into account the proposals by the Bureau for the revision of certain rules of procedure and the proposals for new rules of procedure as contained in Addendum 4 to Document RRB24-1/8, and instructed the Bureau to publish the revised version of the document on the website.</p> <p>The Board also considered aspects relating to the modification of the rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97) and gave guidance to the Bureau on preparing preliminary draft modifications to those rules of procedure to be provided to the 96th Board meeting for further consideration.</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to publish the revised list of proposed rules of procedure on the website.</p> <p>Bureau to provide preliminary draft modifications to the rules of procedure on Resolution 1 (Rev.WRC-97) to the 96th Board meeting.</p>
4.2	Draft rules of procedure CCRR/71	<p>The Board discussed the draft rules of procedure circulated to administrations in Circular Letter CCRR/71, along with the comments received from an administration, as contained in Document RRB24-1/9. Regarding the proposed draft modified rules of procedure on Nos. 9.21 and 9.36, the Board noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intention of the draft modifications to the rules of procedure on Nos. 9.21 and 9.36 was not to exclude typical earth stations, since frequency assignments to such specific or typical earth stations having been notified separately as earth stations in accordance with Nos. 11.2 and 11.9, and in accordance with No. 11.17, could still form the basis of objections. Concerning the 3 400 – 3 700 MHz range, the protection of typical stations was specifically afforded by the application of the pfd hard limit of –154.5 dB(W/m² 4 kHz) at the border of countries, as provided in Nos. 5.430A, 5.431A, 5.432B, 5.431B and 5.434, while No. 9.21 was an agreement-seeking procedure with respect to both the fixed and 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate the decisions to the administration having provided comments.</p> <p>Executive Secretary to update and publish the Rules of Procedure accordingly.</p>
4.3	Comments from Administrations RRB24-1/9		

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>the fixed-satellite services and No. 9.18 was used for the coordination of those terrestrial stations with earth stations, including those having technical characteristics exceeding the parameters used by WRC-07 to determine the hard limit, where such coordination was required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The value of the coordination trigger pfd used to compute the coordination distance in application of No. 9.21 had been chosen to be the same as the pfd hard limit, namely $-154.5 \text{ dB(W/m}^2 \text{ 4 kHz)}$, as a matter of consistency of the Rules of Procedure with the above-mentioned provisions of Article 5 of the Radio Regulations. <p>Consequently, the Board approved the rules of procedure with modifications, as contained in the Annex to the summary of decisions.</p>	
5	Request for the cancellation of the frequency assignments to satellite networks under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations		
5.1	Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board to cancel the frequency assignment to the BRITE satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations RRB24-1/3	The Board considered the request by the Bureau as contained in Document RRB24-1/3 for a decision on the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the BRITE satellite network under No. 13.6 that had a period of validity until 25 February 2023. The Board further considered that the Bureau had acted in accordance with No. 13.6 and had requested the Administration of Austria to provide evidence of continuous operation of the BRITE satellite network and to identify the actual satellite which was currently in operation, followed by two reminders, to which no response had been received. Consequently, the Board instructed the Bureau to cancel the frequency assignments to the BRITE satellite network in the Master International Frequency Register (MIFR).	Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.
5.2	Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board to cancel the frequency assignments to the KOSPAS satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations	The Board considered the request by the Bureau as contained in Document RRB24-1/4 for a decision on the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the KOSPAS satellite network under No. 13.6 that had been recorded in the MIFR without a period of validity. The Board further considered that the Bureau had acted in accordance with No. 13.6 and had requested the Administration of the Russian Federation to provide	Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
	RRB24-1/4	evidence of continuous operation of the KOSPAS satellite network and to identify the actual satellite which was currently in operation, followed by two reminders, to which no response had been received. Consequently, the Board instructed the Bureau to cancel the frequency assignments to the KOSPAS satellite network in the MIFR.	
5.3	Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board to cancel the frequency assignments to the MESBAH satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations RRB24-1/5	The Board considered the request by the Bureau as contained in Document RRB24-1/5 for a decision on the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the MESBAH satellite network under No. 13.6 that had been recorded in the MIFR without a period of validity. The Board further considered that the Bureau had acted in accordance with No. 13.6 and had requested the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran to provide evidence of continuous operation of the MESBAH satellite network and to identify the actual satellite which was currently in operation, followed by two reminders, to which no response had been received. Consequently, the Board instructed the Bureau to cancel the frequency assignments to the MESBAH satellite network in the MIFR.	Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.
5.4	Request for a decision by the Radio Regulations Board to cancel the frequency assignments to the SJ-9 satellite network under No. 13.6 of the Radio Regulations RRB24-1/7	The Board considered the request by the Bureau as contained in Document RRB24-1/7 for a decision on the cancellation of the frequency assignments to the SJ-9 satellite network under No. 13.6 that had a period of validity until 14 October 2022. The Board further considered that the Bureau had acted in accordance with No. 13.6 and had requested the Administration of China to provide evidence of continuous operation of the SJ-9 satellite network and to identify the actual satellite which was currently in operation, followed by two reminders, to which no response had been received. Consequently, the Board instructed the Bureau to cancel the frequency assignments to the SJ-9 satellite network in the MIFR.	Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.
6	Requests to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring/bring back into use the frequency assignments to satellite networks		

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
6.1	<p>Submission by the Administration of Solomon Islands requesting an extension of the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the SI-SAT-BILIKIKI satellite system</p> <p>RRB24-1/12</p>	<p>With regard to the submission from the Administration of Solomon Islands as contained in Document RRB24-1/12, the Board thanked the administration for the comprehensive answers provided to the Board's questions from its 94th meeting. From the information provided, the Board noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Dreamcatcher payload had been manufactured in-house by the satellite operator with the capability to bring into use the notified frequency assignments of the SI-SAT-BILIKIKI satellite system. • Evidence had been provided of a contract between the hosted payload provider and the parent company of the satellite operator. • Confirmation had been received of successful testing during the payload integration and flight acceptance phases of the project. • The hosted payload, along with the host spacecraft, had failed to eject from the dispenser and had been destroyed during re-entry into the Earth's atmosphere. • In the absence of information on the orbital characteristics of the host spacecraft Guardian Alpha, it was unclear whether the Dreamcatcher hosted payload would have reached one of the notified orbital planes of the SI-SAT-BILIKIKI satellite system, but the filing provided numerous low altitude orbital options. • The administration had requested that the regulatory time-limit of the SI-SAT-BILIKIKI satellite system be extended by 36 months to 30 June 2026. <p>The Board considered that the information provided constituted substantive evidence that all four conditions had been met for the situation to qualify as a case of <i>force majeure</i> due to a launch failure.</p> <p>Regarding the length of the extension required to procure a replacement satellite, the Board noted that:</p>	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> access to funding did not allow the operator to start the procurement programme for the SI-SAT-BILIKIKI satellite system replacement until the requested extension was granted by the Board; according to the <i>ITU Handbook on Small Satellites</i> (Edition 2023, page 173), “small satellites can be built and launched quickly, in as little as 18 months”; the 16 months planned for the delivery of the payload to the host up until the launch was not fully justified. <p>Taking the above into account, and also the Board’s concerns about the inclusion of additional margins or contingencies, the Board concluded that the extension should not exceed 27 months. The Board was of the view that the length of the extension requested should not be justified based on the time required to obtain a decision from the Board. Efforts to bring into use the frequency assignments should not be held in abeyance pending the Board’s decision.</p> <p>Consequently, the Board decided to accede to the request from the Administration of Solomon Islands to extend the regulatory time-limit to bring into use the frequency assignments to the SI-SAT-BILIKIKI satellite network to 30 September 2025.</p>	
7	Issues regarding the provision of Starlink satellite services in the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran		
7.1	Submission by the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding the provision of Starlink satellite services in its territory RRB24-1/10 ; RRB24-1/DELAYED/2	The Board carefully considered Document RRB24-1/10 from the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Document RRB24-1/11 from the Administration of Norway and Document RRB24-1/13 from the Administration of the United States of America, on the provision of Starlink satellite services in Iranian territory. The Board also noted Document RRB24-1/DELAYED/2 provided by the Administration of the Islamic	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administrations concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to invite the Administrations of Norway and the United States to provide further clarification</p>
7.2	Submission by the Administration of Norway regarding the provision of Starlink		

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
	satellite services in the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran RRB24-1/11	<p>Republic of Iran in response to the submissions of the Administrations of Norway and the United States, for information.</p> <p>The Board thanked the Administrations of Norway and the United States for providing the information requested at the 94th Board meeting and also thanked the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the additional information provided.</p> <p>The Board noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration of Norway had questioned references to Resolution 25 (Rev.WRC-03), on the grounds that the resolution covered only applications of global mobile personal communications by satellite (GMPCS) in frequency ranges below 3 GHz. • Both the Administrations of Norway and the United States had indicated that they imposed licensing obligations to limit operations of terminals to territories where authorization had been obtained. • Both administrations had indicated that Starlink had contractual and operational limitations preventing individuals within the territory of countries where its services were not authorized from obtaining both network service and terminal equipment, based on the location of the account address and the terminal ID of the earth station. • The Administration of the United States had indicated that it was not practicable for a space station operator to verify the location of every single user terminal that communicated with its space stations. • Although the satellite operator, upon receipt of information of the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran had deleted user accounts from its list of authorized accounts and permanently disabled all terminals identified by the reporting administrations, the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran had indicated that the Starlink Internet service was still accessible within its territory. 	
7.3	Submission by the Administration of the United States of America regarding the provision of Starlink satellite services in the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran RRB24-1/13		

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The satellite system was apparently able to determine the location of transmissions of satellite user terminals as originating from within the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as such Starlink transmission triggered a warning message in English and Persian to the users. <p>The Board further noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>recognizing</i> d) of Resolution 14 (WRC-23) stated that unauthorized use of non-GSO FSS and MSS earth stations was prohibited; according to reliable public information, the space operator had disabled Starlink services over specific areas in the past. <p>The Board concluded that Resolution 25 (Rev.WRC-03) related to the provision of public personal communication by means of fixed, mobile or transportable terminals, without mentioning any specific frequency ranges in its <i>resolves</i> and, consequently, the services provided by the Starlink system were within the scope of the resolution.</p> <p>The Board also concluded that, although the administrations had indicated that it might not be practicable for the space operator to verify all user terminal locations, the warning message in English and Persian to the users seemed to confirm the systematic checking of the user terminal location.</p> <p>Consequently, the Board further reiterated that the provision of transmissions from within any territories where they had not been authorized was in direct contravention of the provisions of Article 18 and of <i>resolves</i> 1 and 2 of Resolution 22 (WRC-19) and the <i>resolves</i> of Resolution 25 (Rev.WRC-03). The Board urged the Administration of Norway, as the notifying administration for the relevant satellite systems providing Starlink services, and the Administration of the United States, as an associated administration to the notifying administration, to comply proactively with those provisions by taking immediate action to disable Starlink terminals operating within the territory of the Administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran.</p>	

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>The Board instructed the Bureau to invite the Administrations of Norway and the United States to provide further clarification on the following points to the Board's 96th meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the reason for the warning message in English and Persian to users indicating: <i>"Use caution in regions that may be hostile to Starlink usage. Starlink will not provide information about you or your Starlink usage to law enforcement or governments, ... Use a VPN service to help hide the fact that you're using Starlink. ..."</i>? (see Figure 1 of the Attachment to Document RRB23-3/8) • Could the administrations confirm the capability of the space operator to disable Starlink services over a territory? 	
8	<p>Submission by the Administration of the State of Israel requesting that the date of receipt of the original NSL-1 satellite system filing be maintained RRB24-1/2(Rev.1)</p>	<p>Having considered in detail the request of the Administration of Israel as contained in Document RRB24-1/2(Rev.1) to maintain the original date of receipt of 11 September 2017 of the NSL-1 satellite system on the premise that the potential increase in interference from the modified satellite system could be viewed as negligible, the Board noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 1 August 2023, the Administration of Israel had submitted a modification to the original coordination request of the NSL-1 satellite system received on 11 September 2017, supported by results of simulations demonstrating that the potential increase in the aggregate interference-to-noise (I/N), measured in terms of a cumulative distribution function (CDF), was negligible (resulting in an I/N level of -30 dB and a link degradation of less than 0.004 dB). • The Bureau had reported to WRC-23 (§ 3.1.4.11.3 of Addendum 2 to Document CMR23/4), inviting it to consider a range of I/N values where the situations between the original and modified submissions should be compared (e.g. from -20 dB to 0 dB or a larger range if considered more appropriate) for processing of submissions under the rules of procedure on No. 9.27. However, WRC-23 had not provided 	<p>Executive Secretary to communicate this decision to the administration concerned.</p> <p>Bureau to provide the NSL-1 satellite system with a qualified favourable finding and maintain its original date of 11 September 2017 on the condition that the satellite system received favourable findings for all other examinations under the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations and the Rules of Procedure, including the rules of procedure on No. 9.27.</p> <p>Bureau to bring the case to the attention of ITU-R Working Party 4A and to review the</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		<p>any decisions on the matter and had indicated that ITU-R would need to perform further studies on the issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bureau indicated that, while it had not yet conducted its examination under the rules of procedure on No. 9.27, it considered an aggregate I/N value of -30 dB as negligible (resulting in a link degradation of less than 0.004 dB) but needed to confirm that the Administration of Israel had used worst-case scenarios in its calculations. • The modification to the NSL-1 satellite system consisted of several differences in its transmission and orbital characteristics. • There were no provisions in the Radio Regulations or in the Rules of Procedure that limited the extent of modifications to the transmission and orbital characteristics of a satellite system to retain the original date of receipt provided that the operation of a modified satellite system might still be considered as within the envelope of operation of the original satellite system. <p>The Board concluded that an increase in the aggregate I/N level representing a degradation of 0.004 dB of a modified satellite system could be considered as negligible. Consequently, the Board decided to instruct the Bureau to provide the NSL-1 satellite system with a qualified favourable finding and that its original date of 11 September 2017 could be maintained. However, the Board indicated that the qualified favourable finding and the retention of the original date were conditional on the satellite system receiving favourable findings for all other examinations under the relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations and the Rules of Procedure, including the rules of procedure on No. 9.27.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Board instructed the Bureau to bring the case to the attention of ITU-R Working Party 4A and to review the qualified favourable finding of the NSL-1 satellite system filing based on the results of Working</p>	<p>qualified favourable finding of the NSL-1 satellite system filing based on the results of Working Party 4A's studies on determining the acceptable increase in the aggregate I/N level to be considered as negligible.</p>

Item No.	Subject	Action/decision and reasons	Follow-up
		Party 4A's studies on determining the acceptable increase in the aggregate I/N level to be considered as negligible.	
9	Confirmation of the next meeting for 2024 and indicative dates for future meetings	<p>The Board confirmed the dates for the 96th meeting as 24–28 June 2024 (Room L).</p> <p>The Board further tentatively confirmed the dates for its subsequent meeting in 2024, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 97th meeting: 11–19 November 2024 (Room L); <p>in 2025, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 98th meeting: 17–21 March 2025 (Room L); 99th meeting: 14–18 July 2025 (Room L); 100th meeting: 3–7 November 2025 (Room L); <p>and in 2026, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 101st meeting: 9–13 March 2026 (CCV Room Genève); 102nd meeting: 29 June–3 July 2026 (CCV Room Genève); 103rd meeting: 26–30 October 2026 (CCV Room Genève). 	-
10	Other business	-	-
11	Approval of the summary of decisions	The Board approved the summary of decisions contained in Document RRB24-1/14.	-
12	Closure of the meeting	The meeting closed at 1218 hours on 8 March 2024.	-

Rules concerning

ARTICLE 9 of the RR

...

MOD

9.21

1 **NOC**

2 **NOC**

3 **NOC**

4 Frequency assignments upon which disagreement is based

The frequency assignments that could serve as a basis for objection in the application of No. 9.52 are listed in § 2 of Appendix 5. In particular, the associated earth stations of frequency assignments to satellite networks or systems cannot serve as a basis of disagreement under No. 9.52, except for those stations which were separately notified in accordance with Nos. 11.2 or 11.9. Those frequency assignments can be submitted to the Bureau in the form of specific or typical stations (see also No. 11.17). See also the Rules of Procedure under No. 9.36.

MOD

9.36

1 Under this provision, the Bureau “*shall identify any administrations with which coordination may need to be effected*”. In applying Appendix 5 with respect to No. 9.21, the Bureau uses the following calculation methods and criteria⁶:

– space network vs. space network: Appendix 8;

⁶ For cases not covered under this paragraph, the Bureau, in collaboration with the appropriate Radiocommunication Study Groups, continue to develop applicable calculation methods and criteria in the form of Rules of Procedure to be submitted to the Board for approval.

- earth station^{6bis} vs. terrestrial stations and *vice versa*, and earth station vs. other earth stations^{6bis} operating in the opposite direction of transmission: Appendix 7;
- transmitting terrestrial stations vs. receiving space stations: criteria of Article 21;
- transmitting space stations vs. terrestrial services⁷;
 - power flux-density (pfd) limits defined in Article 21 (where such limits are not applicable as hard limits to the service which is subject to No. 9.21); or
 - coordination threshold pfd values applicable to other services in the same frequency band (e.g. pfd values in Table 5-2 of Annex 1 to Appendix 5); or
 - frequency overlap with recorded terrestrial stations when no applicable pfd value mentioned above is available;
- receiving space stations vs. transmitting terrestrial stations: frequency overlap within the visibility area of the satellite network;
- between stations of terrestrial services in some specific frequency bands: Rules of Procedure B4, B5 and B6 as appropriate.

Reasons: *These modifications to the Rules of Procedure clarify the validity of objections in the application of the agreement-seeking procedure of No. 9.21 when No. 9.52 is invoked. The associated earth stations of frequency assignments to satellite networks or systems, except for those stations which were separately notified in the form of specific or typical stations, in accordance with Nos. 11.2 or 11.9 are not considered as a valid basis for objection when coordinating a terrestrial station under No. 9.21. This is similar to the application of Nos. 9.17A and 9.18, where the frequency assignments to associated earth stations would also not be considered a valid basis for objection since they are not coordinated vis-à-vis terrestrial services.*

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

^{6bis} Associated earth stations of frequency assignments to satellite networks or systems are not taken into account in the agreement-seeking procedure under No. 9.21 nor in the coordination requirements under Nos. 9.17A and 9.18, except for those stations which were separately notified in accordance with Nos. 11.2 or 11.9.

⁷ Cases relevant to this indent are shown in the Annex to this Rule.