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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** | **Draft Report based on Consideration of the Meeting** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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)*)* | WRC-19 is invited to consider whether the bringing into use of frequency assignments in Appendices 30, 30A and 30B with a satellite that is subsequently relocated prior to the notification submission should be permitted, noting (1) that §4.1.18 of Appendices 30 and 30A does not apply with respect to an assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 Plan, or in the Region 2 Plan, or for which the procedure of § 4.2 of Appendices 30 and 30A has been initiated, (2) that §4.2.21A of Appendices 30 and 30A does not apply with respect to an assignment in the Region 2 Plan, or in the Regions 1 and 3 Plan or List, or for which the procedure of § 4.1 or 4.2 has been initiated, and (3) that § 6.25 of Article 6 of Appendix 30B does not apply with respect to allotments in the Plan and therefore, a notification submitted within the 120-day period of the bringing into use may not always result in a recording in the MIFR but instead may be returned to the administration and resubmitted with a new date of receipt while the satellite used for the bringing into use has already been relocated.  **On-going discussion on the above draft summary.** |
| 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)*)* | In considering this section of the Report, WRC-19 decided that an administration shall provide the following information to the Board in support of a request for extension of regulatory deadlines due to co-passenger delay:  – a summary description of the satellite to be launched, including the frequency bands;  – the name of the manufacturer selected to build the satellite and the contract signature date;  – the status of the satellite construction, including the date it began and whether it was expected to be completed prior to the initial launch window;  – 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);  – sufficient detail to justify the length of the requested extension period; and  – any other relevant information and documentation.  **The meeting agreed to above summary/action by WRC-19 on this matter.** |
| 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)*)* | In considering this section of the Report, WRC-19 decided to invite the ITU-R to study whether the use of electric propulsion satellite technology should be taken into account in the Radio Regulations for consideration at a future competent WRC.  When considering requests that qualify as force majeure or co-passenger delay, WRC-19 instructs the RRB to continue to take into account the use of electric propulsion on a case-by-case basis when deciding on the length of the extension, based on the merits of each individual case.  **On-going discussion on the above draft summary.** |
| 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)*)* | WRC-19 invites the ITU-R to study the matter of requests for extensions of regulatory time limits from developing countries that do not qualify as force majeure or co‑passenger delay and to develop the specific criteria and conditions upon which the RRB could consider granting an extension of the regulatory deadline to a developing country.  **The meeting agreed to above summary/action by WRC-19 on this matter.** |
| 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)*)* | WRC-19 confirms the approach so far used by the Board for treating cases of the change of notifying administration acting on behalf of an intergovernmental satellite telecommunication organization for a satellite network of that intergovernmental organization, to an administration which is a member of that organization acting on its own behalf. WRC-19 further decided that a letter from an appropriate responsible authority of this intergovernmental satellite telecommunication organization is required to confirm their agreement with the change of notifying administration. In addition, WRC-19 decided that the Board shall deny a request to change:  - the notifying administration acting on behalf of an intergovernmental satellite telecommunication organization for a satellite network of that intergovernmental organization, to an administration that is not a member of that organization,  - the notifying administration, acting on its own behalf, of a satellite network or system to another notifying administration acting on its own behalf, or  - the notifying administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations which are not members of an intergovernmental satellite telecommunication organization to another administration of that group  **On-going discussion on the above draft summary.** |
| 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)*)* | WRC-19 decided that the issue raised in this section of the Report could be addressed directly by WRC-19 under Agenda item 7 Issue H.  **The meeting agreed to above summary/action by WRC-19 on this matter.** |
| 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) | WRC-19 discussed the issue of the application of No. 13.6 extensively and decided that it was not in a position to provide definitive guidance to the Board for its consideration in addressing the issues and concerns noted in the Report.  **The meeting agreed to above summary/action by WRC-19 on this matter.** |
| 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) | WRC-19 considered the issues raised in the Report and these issues were dealt with in minutes to the Plenary.  **The meeting agreed to above summary/action by WRC-19 on this matter.** |

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

None.