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1. **Agenda Item 9.3 on action in response to Resolution 80 (Rev.WRC-07).**

Resolution **80** was first adopted by WRC-97 and revised by WRC-2000 and WRC-07. Each version of Resolution 80 has instructed the RRB either to develop Rules of Procedure, conduct studies, or consider and review possible draft recommendations related to linking the principles contained in No. 0.3 of the Preamble to the Radio Regulations to the notification, coordination and registration procedures in the RR and to report to a subsequent WRC. In the case of Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**, these linkages were extended to include the principles contained in Article 44 of the Constitution. The 2007 revision of this Resolution pointed out that some of the issues identified in the RRB report to WRC-2000 had been resolved before WRC‑07. Subsequent RRB reports to WRCs, although wide ranging and comprehensive have had little impact or consideration.

1. **APT Common Proposals and APT Views for WRC-19 (which has been submitted to WRC-19)**

APT Members support the ITU-R studies on this issue, in accordance with Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**.

APT Members are encouraged to consider the Radiocommunication Bureau Director’s Report to WRC-19 on any responses to Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)** that may include the outcome of the Radio Regulations Board under Resolution **80 (Rev.WRC-07)**.

1. **Topics proposed by other regional Groups or ITU Members which are not included in no. 2 above**

See table below.

1. **Progress of discussion during WRC-19 on the Agenda Item**

Consideration of RRB Report on Res 80(Rev.WRC-07) on the following topics.

| **Topic** | **Contribution by** | **Status of Discussion** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Linkage between Bringing into Use and Notification for Recording in the MIFR | [**RRB**](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)([*15*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)* | *Discussion on-going.* |
| Situations of co-passenger delay | [**RRB**](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)([*15+C1*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)* | The RRB proposed the following the following information, as a minimum, hould be provided to facilitate the consideration by the Board of a request for extension due to co-passenger delay:   * a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency assignments ~~bands~~ concerned**;** * the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date; * the state of readiness of the satellite to be launched;   *Some remarks from the meeting on this point are:*   * *information may not be available soonest, sometimes available close to expiry of satellite networks and RRB questions why submit so late* * *this point is important to know progress of satellite.* * *RRB - states that for cases where administrations provided these elements, it was easy to come to a decision.* * *Chairman - may be can change the wording, to say that if not for the passenger delay, otherwise, the satellite is ready.* * the name of the launch service provider and the contract signature date; * the initial and revised launch window; * 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); * ~~status of coordination;~~   *Some remarks from the meeting on this point are:*   * *administrations question the need for coordination status and claimed that the information is not related for tis consideration* * *RRB - No insistence of coordination status.* * the Board is inviting administrations to provide sufficient detail to justify the length of the requested extension period; and * any other supporting information and documentation, if appropriate or applicable.   *Discussion on-going.* |
| Compliance with the regulatory time limits for space stations using electric propulsion | **RRB** ([*15*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)*  **US** *(*[*10(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0010/en)*)* | *The meeting agreed that this issue should be further studied by the ITU-R under Agenda Item 7.* |
| Requests from developing countries that do not qualify as force majeure or co‑passenger delay | **RRB** ([*15*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)*  **CAN** *(*[*14(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0014/en)*)* | *The meeting supports to study the conditions that clarify any administrations as developing country, in the following circumstance (not limited to),*   * *extension effort,* * *limit the request i.e. one time per country,* * *length of extension,* * *timeline of such request* * *primary use within territory\** * *coordination should be completed* * *should not be related with established satellite operator.*   *\* one administration questioned whether should limit to national territory. If the case is trying to assist developing country, may be extending the service area would assist in their commercial and development plan.*  *The meeting agreed that a clear guidance is needed to RRB consideration of cases that qualify as developing countries.*  *Discussion on-going.* |
| Requests for a transfer or change of the “notifying administration” from one to the other | **RRB** ([*15*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)*  **US** *(*[*10(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0010/en)*)* | *To be discussed.* |
| Interpretation of the definition of “satellite network” in RR No. 1.112 and RoP No. 1.112 | **RRB** ([*15*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)*  **US** *(*[*10(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0010/en)*)* | *To be discussed.* |
| The application of RR No. 13.6 | **RRB** ([*15*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0015/en)*)*  **US** *(*[*10(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0010/en)*)*  **CAN** *(*[*14(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0014/en)*)*  **Multi-Country** ([*42*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0042/en)*)* (Cyprus (Republic of) / Greece) | *To be discussed.* |
| Application of CS Article 48 | **RRB**  **US** *(*[*10(A23)*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0010/en)*)*  **CAN**  **Multi-Country***(*[*78*](https://www.itu.int/md/R16-WRC19-C-0078/en)*)*  (Germany (Federal Republic of) / Austria / Brazil (Federative Republic of) / Cameroon (Republic of) / Djibouti (Republic of) / France / Luxembourg / Mali (Republic of) / Norway / Netherlands (Kingdom of the) / Portugal / Sweden / Switzerland (Confederation of) / Tunisia) | *4.8 Article 48 – national use*  *Some administrations support that there is transparency in the satellite networks that invoke Article 48.*  *Some administrations believe that such details could be requested from the BR individually and there is no need to make the information available.*  *Considering that Article 48 of the Constitution is developed by the PP, it is rightful that the PP direct the BR to study this matter.*  *The meeting agreed to bring this matter to attention of PP, that the Conference received proposal wrt to difficult arising from invoking of Art 48.* |

1. **Issues which require discussion at APT Coordination Meetings and seek guidance thereafter**

None.