**International Telecommunication Union**

**19 February 2010**

## SEVENTEENTH MEETING OF THE
## RADIOCOMMUNICATION ADVISORY GROUP

Geneva, 17-19 February 2010

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

**Preamble by Director, BR**

Part A of this Summary of Conclusions covers items discussed on 17 and 18 February 2010 and which was approved by the RAG on 19 February 2010.

Part B covers items discussed on 19 February 2010 and records the conclusions as understood by the Secretariat.

**Part A – Summary of conclusions of discussions held 17 and 18 February 2010**

**1        Agenda item 3: Council and plenipotentiary issues**

**1.1        Agenda item 3.2: Other Council and plenipotentiary issues**

**1.1.1        Concerning Documents 16 §2.5 (USA) and 19 (USA):** RAG, having considered Document 19 (USA) concerning the rights and obligations of Sector Members in ITU-R, also took note of the information available from the Summary Report of the January 2010 meeting of the Council Group on the Financial Regulations. Group FINREGS considered the financial implications of a) the admission of academia, universities and their associated research establishments in the work of the ITU, and b) the admission of Sector Members from developing countries in the work of ITU. RAG noted that the matter will be further discussed at the Council session in April 2010 and invited those with an interest in the subjects to prepare contributions to that meeting.

**1.1.2        Concerning Documents 20 (USA) and 27 (Brazil):** On the subject of free on-line access to ITU-R Recommendations and the Radio Regulations, RAG concluded the following:

–        free on-line access to ITU-R Recommendations and Radio Regulations will have a positive effect towards developing and promoting the main goals of the Radiocommunication Sector;

–        final decisions should be taken by Council in April 2010 and at PP-10;

–        some administrations are in favour of continuing further studies in the light of the financial implications of eventual decisions.

**1.1.3      Concerning Document 23 §5:** RAG noted that Resolution 112 (Marrakesh, 2002) applies.


**2        Agenda item 4: Study Group activities**

**2.1      Agenda item 4.1: Working methods and activities on the ITU-R Study Groups**

**2.1.1      Concerning Documents 2 (V-Ch, SG 6) and 5 (Italy):** RAG noted the documents and, with the exception of §4 of Document 5, advised that they be brought to the attention the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Study Groups either directly, or via a future meeting of the CVC.

In connection with Document 5 §1, the following information from relevant ITU-R Resolutions was noted:

- *Concerning Questions*:   Resolution ITU-R 5-5 states in *considering* e) that "it is incumbent upon the SGs to conduct continual reviews of their assigned Questions and to replace old Questions (eight years old) by new Questions with new work plans;" Interpreting the expression "it is incumbent upon" as "it is the duty of", the statement is viewed as firm guidance or advice to be followed by the Study Group but not mandatory. Secondly, it should be noted that the "instruction" is in the *considerings* and not the *resolves* part of the Resolution. It can also be noted that *resolves* 8 (third bullet) of Resolution ITU-R 5-5 instructs deletion of Questions where a study has been completed and for which no contributions are expected, but this provision is well understood and causes no problems of interpretation.

  It should also be noted that there is a further, long-standing provision relating to the deletion of Questions contained in the third bullet of section 1.6 of Resolution ITU-R 1-5 where Study Groups are asked to bring to the attention of the RA any Questions for which no contributions have been received for two study cycles. Unless some justification is given, the RA is encouraged to delete such Questions. Again, this is a well understood, long-standing provision that causes no problems of interpretation.

- *Concerning Recommendations:*   Resolution ITU-R 1-5, §11.1, states that "any updating of ITU-R Recommendations for which substantial revision has not been made within the last 10-15 years should, as far as possible, be avoided;"  This represents clear guidance for the Study Groups but indicates nothing mandatory. (The period of "eight years" doesn't figure in any Resolution as regards Recommendations.) It can also be noted that this guidance is first referred to in §2.27 of Resolution ITU-R 1-5 where Study Groups are encouraged to update and review maintained Recommendations with proper justification for old ones and, if found no longer necessary, should propose deletion. Then follows a cross-reference to §11.

**2.1.2      Concerning Document 12 (Rohde & Schwarz):** RAG advised the Director to follow strictly the rules regarding the registration of contributions from the membership and the correct referencing of their source in any subsequent publication.

**2.1.3      Concerning Document 14 (Japan):** RAG advised the Director to seek a suitable solution to identify editorially updated Recommendations, taking into consideration the practice followed by ITU-T.

**2.1.4      Considering Document 15 (Ch SG 4):** RAG noted the document concerning revision of Recommendations and the Chairman of SG 5 informed the meeting that a similar review was taking place in Study Group 5.

**2.1.5****Concerning Document 18 (USA):** Some support was expressed for the proposals on definitions of technology but taking account of Resolution 142 (Antalya, 2006), RAG recognized that decisions on the matter are still awaiting further discussions at PP-10, the results of which could be forwarded to the next RA and/or WRC for further action.

**2.1.6****Concerning Document 23 (Korea):**

§2 – RAG advised the Director to seek an appropriate solution on electronic file naming.

§3 – RAG agreed that there was no difference in the status of Annexes and Appendices, both being integral parts of a Recommendation. What is important however, is that the Recommendation states clearly (e.g. in the *recommends*) what information should be applied and where it is to be found within the text of the Recommendation concerned.

§4 – RAG recognized that the period between the completion of the draft CPM Report and the WRC could indeed be used for the pursuit of "regular" studies, notwithstanding the need for WPs and SGs to complete (where required) work on Recommendations and Reports in support of CPM texts.

**2.1.7****Concerning Document 26 §§3 and 5 (Syria):**

§3 – RAG advised the Director to find ways and means to reduce the length of meetings. It further supported the suggestion for each Study Group to meet normally once per year and furthermore invited Study Group management teams to explore the possibility of applying the example of Study Group 7 to their own Study Groups as regards the holding of a one-day meeting immediately before and immediately after a block of WP meetings. In the planning of Study Group meetings, due account should be taken of Decision 5 of the Plenipotentiary that provides options to follow on cost savings.

§5 – RAG referred to §11 of Resolution ITU-R 1-5 and advised that Study Groups adopt a flexible, case-by-case approach to the treatment of old Recommendations (10-15 years old).

**2.2****Agenda item 4.2: Study Group preparations for WRC-12**

**2.2.1****Concerning Documents 1 §3.2 and 17 (USA):** RAG endorsed the deadline for the completion of draft CPM texts, as quoted by the Chairman of the CPM, and took note of Document 17 with no advice offered.

**2.3****Agenda item 4.3: Liaison and collaboration with ITU-T and ITU-D Sectors and with other organizations**

**2.3.1****Concerning Document 1 §3.4:** RAG expressed its satisfaction for the collaboration between ITU-R Study Groups and those of ITU-D.

**2.3.2****Concerning Documents 3 (Ch, SG 6), 6 (Italy), 9 (IARU), 11 (Ch, SG 5), 16 (USA) and 24 (Ch, SG 1):** RAG noted the various contributions addressing issues of collaboration, particularly on the topic of PLT, and expressed satisfaction with the action being taken with regard to future liaison on this particular topic. RAG invited the Director to continue his efforts to identify potential areas of overlap between the Sectors with a view to avoiding similar problems in the future.

**2.3.3     Considering Documents 13 (Japan) and 26 §4 (Syria):** RAG recognized that formal mechanisms for establishing inter-sector groups (e.g. JRGs, JWPs) between ITU-R and ITU-T would be the business of future Assemblies of the two Sectors. In this respect, and as regards ITU-R, the need to revise Resolution ITU-R 6-1 was noted. RAG was informed of recent discussions at TSAG where it was noted that all informal and formal mechanisms regarding collaboration between ITU-R and ITU-T were already in place, be they on the level of the experts, the advisory groups, the Directors of the Bureaux, or the Secretariats of the Bureaux and their respective counsellors. In this respect, RAG confirmed that liaison and collaborative mechanisms already used in the past were still available and advised that they be applied where necessary in the interval leading up to the next RA.

**2.3.4     Considering Document 26 §2 (Syria**): RAG supported the idea of the Chairmen of the Advisory Groups (and the Vice-Chairmen) to meet on an informal basis, when the need arises and circumstances permit, to discuss items of mutual concern. RAG also supported the idea of meetings of Study Group Chairmen from all three Sectors.

**2.3.5     Considering Documents 8 (ITU-T SG 13) and 25 (ITU-T JCA-AHF Convener):** RAG took note of these documents, noting that a BR representative had been assigned to the JCA-AHF.

**3          Agenda item 6: Strategic, Financial and Operational Plans**

**3.1        Agenda item 6.2: Draft Operational Plan (Document 1 (§2.6))**

In accordance with CV181A, RAG reviewed the draft Operational Plan for the period 2011-2014.

**3.1.1     Concerning Document 1 §2.6:** Questioning the most appropriate placing of CPM activities in the Operational Plan, RAG advised that it should remain under Objective 3 in view of its close linkage with Study Group activities.

**3.2        Agenda item 6.4: Contribution from RAG on the preparation of the draft Strategic and Financial Plans for 2012-2015**

**3.2.1     Concerning Document 1 (§§2.6 and 6):** As regards those parts of the draft Strategic Plan concerning ITU-R, the Chairman of the CWG informed the meeting of the efforts underway focussed on linking the strategic plan with the ITU budget structure.

**3.2.2     Concerning Documents 7 (Ch CWG) and 22 (USA):** RAG concluded by endorsing the material prepared by the Secretariat contained in Document 7 and taking note of the contents of Document 22 (USA).

**Part B – Summary of conclusions of discussions held 19 February 2010**

**4          Agenda item 4: Study Group activities (continued)**

**4.1        Agenda item 4.3: Liaison and collaboration with ITU-T and ITU-D Sectors and with other organizations (continued)**

**4.1.1     Concerning Document 28 (Director, BDT)**: RAG noted the document with satisfaction, with emphasis placed on the topic of digital broadcasting.

**4.2** **Agenda item 4.4: Report by the Chairman of the Correspondence Group on EDH**

**4.2.1** **Concerning Document 4 (Coordinator of RAG CG on EDH):** After thanking the coordinator of the report, Mr. José Costa, RAG placed importance on the independence of software on operating systems, the need to have WORD versions of documents in addition to pdf, the continuing need for the availability of a limited number of paper copies of documents and a clarification of the time-scale for the future implementation of WORD 2007 for ITU documentation. The Chairman of TSAG reported results of discussions on EDH at a meeting of TSAG held the previous week, particularly in relation to remote electronic meetings.

**5** **Agenda item 5: WRC issues**

**5.1** **Agenda items 5.1 and 5.2: WRC-07 post-conference activities and WRC-12 preparations**

**5.1.1** **Concerning Document 1 §§4.1 and 4.2**: Under these agenda items, RAG confirmed: the desire for early availability of information in relation to Resolution 95 (Rev.WRC-07); the need for administrations to respond to Resolution 647 (WRC-07); continuing work on Resolution 80, both in Study Group 4 and the RRB; and the need for general coordination and preparation for RA-12.

**6** **Agenda item 7: Seminars and Workshops**

**6.1** **Concerning Document 1 §5**: RAG expressed particular satisfaction with WRS-08 and the Spectrum/Orbit Workshop held in May 2009. The Director confirmed the Bureau's continuing commitment to staging regional seminars within the limits of available resources.

**7** **Agenda item 8: Inter-sector activities**

**7.1** **Concerning Documents 1 §7, 21 (USA)**: RAG noted with particular satisfaction the activities reported in Document 1 in relation to the WTPF, climate change and emergency communications. In a similar vein, Document 21 (USA) was welcomed as an excellent record of the ITU response to the Haiti disaster and RAG requested the information to be input to other groups closely concerned with the subject of emergency communications, in particular ITU-D SG 2.

**8** **Agenda items 9 and 10: Date of next meeting and any other business**

The next meeting of RAG was foreseen to be held in the period 27 June – 8 July 2011, the exact dates to be confirmed in due course.

**Concerning Document 29 (Syria)**: The contents of Document 29 (Syria) were noted, in particular in relation to the Administration of Syria's refusal to allow RR references to RNSS in certain Recommendations.

In his capacity as chairman of the CCV, Mr Kisrawi (Syria) noted that Mme Marie Pardell had retired and announced that Mme Khadija Naaman had been appointed as technical editor in BR.

_____