



Documents of the European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)

To reduce download time, the ITU Library and Archives Service has divided the conference documents into sections.

- This PDF includes Document No. 1 - 100.
- The complete set of conference documents includes Document No. 1 - 413.

This electronic version (PDF) was scanned by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) Library & Archives Service from an original paper document in the ITU Library & Archives collections.

La présente version électronique (PDF) a été numérisée par le Service de la bibliothèque et des archives de l'Union internationale des télécommunications (UIT) à partir d'un document papier original des collections de ce service.

Esta versión electrónica (PDF) ha sido escaneada por el Servicio de Biblioteca y Archivos de la Unión Internacional de Telecomunicaciones (UIT) a partir de un documento impreso original de las colecciones del Servicio de Biblioteca y Archivos de la UIT.

(ITU) للاتصالات الدولي الاتحاد في والمحفوظات المكتبة قسم أجراه الضوئي بالمسح تصوير نتاج (PDF) الإلكترونية النسخة هذه والمحفوظات المكتبة قسم في المتوفرة الوثائق ضمن أصلية ورقية وثيقة من نقلاً.

此电子版（PDF版本）由国际电信联盟（ITU）图书馆和档案室利用存于该处的纸质文件扫描提供。

Настоящий электронный вариант (PDF) был подготовлен в библиотечно-архивной службе Международного союза электросвязи путем сканирования исходного документа в бумажной форме из библиотечно-архивной службы МСЭ.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 1

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 8 - Replacement to Document No. 1

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference

København, 1948



RD Document No 1 - E

June 22, 1948

Submitted in : English

Heads of Delegations Meeting

June 24, 1948 2 p.m.

Agenda:

1. Appointment of Secretariat.
2. Organization of committees (RD Doc. No 2 - E).
3. Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship of committees.
4. Internal Regulations (RD Doc. No 4 - E).
5. Working Methods (RD Doc. No 6 - E).
6. Language Arrangements.
7. Admission of International Organizations.
8. Miscellaneous.



European Regional Broadcasting Conference,
København, 1948.

RD Doc. No. 2-E
22n June, 1948.

DENMARK.

Original: French.

Draft Proposal for the Formation of Committees of the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference,
København, 1948.

-
1. Executive Committee: (Chairman and Vice chairman of the Conference and Committees): terms of reference: problems connected with the timetable of the Conference and with the coordination of work in the different committees.
 2. Credentials Committee: terms of reference: examine the validity of credentials.
 3. Organising Committee: terms of reference: proposals concerning problems of organisations relating to the work of the Conference and to the future implementation of the frequency plan, also drafting the convention.
 4. Technical Committee: terms of reference: defining the technical bases for the preparation of the Plan, mainly:
the possibility of designating Broadcasting Stations admitted in derogation in frequency bands allocated to other services,
determining the separation in Kc/s between the frequencies allocated to Broadcasting Stations,
power limitation,
use of directional aerials,
synchronisation of national groups of transmitters.
 5. Frequency Allocation Committee: terms of reference: draw up a frequency plan and discuss the date of its entry into force.
 6. Drafting Committee: The Rules of Procedure give the terms of reference of this Committee.

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference

København, 1948

RD Document No. 3 - E
22 June 1948

original : English

Opening Meeting

25 June 1948 at 10 a.m.

(European Regional Broadcasting and Maritime Regional
Radio Joint Conference)

Opening address and Reply to this Address

15 minutes' recess (A photograph is taken
of the Delegates)

First Meeting of the Plenary Assembly
of the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference
(after the photograph has been taken)

- 1.- Opening Address by the Head of the Danish Delegation.
 - 2.- Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference.
 - 3.- Appointment of the Secretariat.
 - 4.- Establishment of the Committees (RD Doc. No. 2 - E).
 - 5.- Nomination of the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees.
 - 6.- Rules of Procedure (RD Doc. No. 4 - E).
 - 7.- Working Methods (RD/MAR Doc. Nos. 6 - E/8 - E).
 - 8.- Working Hours of the Conference.
 - 9.- Linguistic Arrangements.
 - 10.- Admission of International Organisations.
 - 11.- Miscellaneous.
-



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 4

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 12 - Corrections to Document No. 4
- Document No. 76 - Replacement to Document No. 4

D E N M A R K

DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE EUROPEAN REGIONAL
BROADCASTING CONFERENCE

In accordance with the Directives for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference annexed to the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City, 1947, para. 12, the Conference shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

The following rules of procedure have been drawn up largely on the basis of the directives given in Chapter 6 of the General Regulations annexed to the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City, taking into account those provisions of the rules of procedure adopted by the preceding broadcasting conference at Lucerne and Montreux which seem appropriate in view of the special nature of the København Conference.

Draft Rules of Procedure
for the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference
(Copenhagen, 1948)

Rule I

Definitions

1. In these rules of procedure, the term "delegation" shall denote a group of delegates from the same country within the European area.
2. The term "delegate" shall denote a person representing a government or administration of a country within the European area.
3. Each delegation may be assisted by one or more aides, by one or more advisers, and by one or more interpreters.
4. The term "observer" shall denote:
 - a) Persons representing countries outside Europe which have signed or adhered to the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City, 1947;
 - b) Persons representing the United Nations who are present at the Conference;
 - c) Persons representing the International Frequency Registration Board (I.F.R.B.);
 - d) Persons representing international bodies who have asked to be admitted to the Conference and whose request has been approved by a plenary meeting of the Conference.

Rule 2

Admission to the Conference

1. As a general rule, only the following shall take part in all the deliberations of the Conference: delegations from countries within the European area, observers from countries outside Europe, from the United Nations, and from the I.F.R.B.
2. The first Plenary Assembly shall lay down the limits within which observers from the bodies cited in Rule I, para. 4 d) may attend, and take part in, in an advisory capacity, the deliberations either at sessions of the Plenary Assembly, or at all or some of the Committees.

Rule 3

Order of Seating

At sessions of the Plenary Assembly, delegates, aides, advisers, interpreters, and observers shall be grouped by delegation and by country and agency. These delegations and observers shall be seated in the alphabetical order of French names of the countries and agencies represented.

Rule 4

Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference shall be elected at the first session of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference.

Rule 5

Presentation of Credentials

1. Each delegation shall present to the Secretariat of the Conference credentials giving it authority to sign all the agreements entered into by the Conference.
2. These credentials shall be examined by a committee during the first week of the Conference.
3. No delegation shall enjoy the right of vote unless and until the above Committee has declared its credentials to be in order.
4. Observers shall present to the Secretariat an official note from their organization accrediting them to the Conference.

Rule 6

Powers of the Chairman

The Chairman shall open and close the sessions of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, direct the deliberations, and announce the results of the voting.

He shall also have the general direction of all the work of the Conference.

Rule 7

Secretariat of the Conference

At the first session of the Plenary Assembly a Secretariat of the Conference shall be constituted. It shall be composed of personnel of the Secretariat of the International Telecommunications Union and, if necessary, of personnel of the Danish Government's administration.

Rule 8

Appointment of Committees

The Plenary Assembly may appoint committees to examine questions submitted for the consideration of the Conference. These committees may in their turn appoint sub-committees or working groups.

Rule 9

Composition of Committees

1. Committees shall be composed of delegations from countries in the European region.
2. The following may be present at, and take part in, the deliberations of the committees, in a consultative capacity.
 - a) Observers from non-European countries.
 - b) Representatives of the United Nations.
 - c) Representatives of the International Frequency Registration Board (I.F.R.B.).
 - d) Representatives of international organizations, as laid down by the first Session of the Plenary Assembly.

Rule 10

Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, and Reporters of Committees and Sub-Committees.

The Chairman of the Conference shall submit for the approval of the Plenary Assembly the choice of chairman and of vice-chairman or vice-chairmen of each committee.

The Chairman of each committee shall propose to his committee the nomination of the reporters and the choice of the chairmen, vice-chairmen and reporters of the sub-committees.

Rule 11

Summons to Sessions

The sessions of the Plenary Assembly and of the committees and sub-committees shall be announced either by letter or by notice posted in the meeting place of the Conference.

Rule 12

Order of Discussion

1. Persons desiring to speak may do so only after having obtained the consent of the Chairman. As a general rule, they shall begin by announcing the name of their country or of their organization.
2. Any person speaking must express himself slowly and distinctly, separating his words and pausing frequently, so that all his colleagues may be able to follow his meaning, and so that the interpreters can translate his speech.

Rule 13

Proposals Presented before the Opening of the Conference.

Proposals presented before the opening of the Conference shall be allocated by the Plenary Assembly to the appropriate committees.

Rule 14

Proposals Submitted during the Conference.

1. No proposal or amendment may be submitted unless it is countersigned or supported by the Head of the Delegation of the country concerned or by his deputy.
2. The Chairman of the Conference shall decide whether the proposal or amendment shall be announced to all delegations by distribution of copies or merely by oral statement.
3. At sessions of the Plenary Assembly, any authorized individual may read or request to be read any proposal or amendment presented by him during the Conference, and may be allowed to explain his reasons therefor.

Rule 15

Proposals Presented to Committees during the Conference.

1. Proposals or amendments submitted after the Conference has opened must be delivered to the Chairman of the appropriate committee, or, in case of doubt as to the appropriate committee, to the Chairman of the Conference.
2. Every proposal or amendment shall be submitted in the definitive form of words to be included in the documents.

3. The Chairman of the committee concerned shall decide whether the proposal or amendment shall be announced to all members of the Conference or committee by distribution of copies or merely by oral statement to the members of the committee.

Rule 16

Postponed Proposals.

When a proposal or amendment has been reserved or when its examination has been postponed, the delegation sponsoring it shall be responsible for seeing that it is not subsequently overlooked.

Rule 17

Voting Procedure.

1. Only delegations of governments in the European area may vote, each delegation having one vote.
2. A duly accredited delegation may give a mandate to another duly accredited delegation to exercise its vote at one or more sessions at which it is unable to be present. In no case may one delegation exercise more than one such proxy vote.
3. At sessions of the Plenary Assembly, each proposal or amendment shall be submitted to a vote after discussion.
4. For a valid vote to be taken at a session of the Plenary Assembly, at least one half of the delegations accredited to the Conference and having the right of vote shall be present or represented at the session during which the vote is cast.
5. Voting shall take place by a show of hands. If a majority is not clearly apparent, even after a recount has been taken, or if an individual count of the votes is requested, there shall be a roll-call in the alphabetical order of the French names of the delegations.
6. In sessions of the Plenary Assembly, no proposal or amendment shall be adopted unless it is supported by a majority of the delegations present and voting. In determining the number of votes required for a majority, abstentions shall not be taken into account. In case of a tie, the measure shall be considered rejected.
7. If the number of abstentions exceeds one-half of the number of delegations present and voting, the measure shall be reconsidered at a subsequent session, at which time the abstentions shall not be taken into consideration.

8. If five or more delegations, present and entitled to vote, request, when a vote is about to be taken, that it shall be taken by secret ballot, this shall be done. The necessary steps shall be taken to guarantee secrecy.

9. Voting procedure within Committees shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 of this Rule.

Rule 18

Minutes of the Sessions of the Plenary Assembly.

1. The minutes of the sessions of the Plenary Assembly shall be drawn up by the secretariat of the Conference.

2. 1) The minutes shall contain only the proposals and conclusions with the chief reasons for them in concise terms.
- 2) However, each delegate or observer shall have the right to require the insertion in the minutes, either summarized or in full, of any statement which he has made. In such a case, he must himself supply its text to the secretariat of the Conference within two hours after the end of the session. It is recommended that this right shall only be used with discretion.

Rule 19

Reports of Committees

1. (1) The debates of the committees and sub-committees shall be summarized, session by session, in reports in which shall be brought out the essential points of the discussion, the various opinions which are expressed and which it is desirable that the Plenary Assembly should know and the proposals and conclusions which emerge.

(2) However, each delegate or observer shall have the right to require the insertion in the report of any statement which he has made (either summarised or in full). In such a case, he must himself supply to the reporter the text to be inserted within two hours after the end of the session. It is recommended that this right shall only be used with discretion.

2. If circumstances warrant, the committees or sub-committees shall prepare at the end of their work a final report in which they shall recapitulate in concise terms the proposals and conclusions which result from the studies which have been entrusted to them.

Rule 20

Adoption of Minutes and Reports

1. (1) At a general rule, at the beginning of each session of the Plenary Assembly or of each session of a committee or of a sub-committee, the minutes, or the report, of the preceding session shall be read.

(2) However, the Chairman may, if he considers such procedure satisfactory, and if no objection is raised, merely ask if any members of the Plenary Assembly, the Committee or the sub-committee, have any remarks to make on the contents of the minutes or of the report.

2. The minutes or the report shall then be adopted or amended in accordance with the remarks which have been made and which have been approved by the Plenary Assembly, or by the Committee or sub-committee.

3. Any final report must be approved by the respective committee or sub-committee.

4. (1) The minutes of the closing session of the Plenary Assembly shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the Conference.

(2) The report of the last session of a committee or of a sub-committee shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the committee or sub-committee.

Rule 21

Languages.

The final documents of the Conference shall be drawn up in the languages mentioned below, in versions equivalent both in form and content.

In case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic. All other documents shall be drawn up in:

At meetings, there shall be an efficient system of interpretation in:

Other languages may be used in the debates provided that the delegations using them make arrangements themselves for oral translation into any one of the languages mentioned in the first sub-paragraph above. Similarly, delegates may, if they wish, arrange for speeches to be translated orally into their own languages from one of the languages mentioned above.

As to ~~the share~~ to be taken by each country in the expenses attributable to the use of these languages, the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention, ~~Article 15~~, paragraph 5 shall apply, by courtesy of the I.T.U.

Rule 22

Editorial Committee, Numbering

1. The texts of the agreement or of the frequency allotment plan, which shall be worded so far as practicable in their definitive form by the various committees, following the opinions expressed, shall be submitted to an editorial committee charged with perfecting their form without altering their sense, and with combining them with those parts of the former texts which have not been altered.
2. The whole of the revised texts shall be submitted for the approval of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, which shall decide on them, or refer them back to the appropriate committee for further examination.
3. The numbers of the chapters, articles and paragraphs of the texts subjected to revision shall be preserved until the first reading at a session of the Plenary Assembly. The passages added shall bear provisionally the numbers bis, ter, etc., and the numbers of deleted passages shall not be used.
4. The definitive numbering of the chapters, articles, and paragraphs, shall be entrusted to the Editorial Committee after their adoption following the first reading.

Rule 23

Final Approval.

The texts of the agreement and of the frequency allotment plan shall not acquire final status until they have been read a second time and approved.

Rule 24

Signature.

The final texts approved by the Conference shall be submitted for signature to the delegates provided with the necessary powers in the alphabetical order of the French names of the countries.

Rule 25

Publicity.

1. Plenary meetings of the Conference shall be open to the public, unless expressly stated to the contrary.
2. Official releases to the press about the work of the Conference shall be issued only as authorized by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Conference.

Rule 26

Documents.

The General Secretariat of the International Telecommunications Union shall be entrusted with the publication of all documents relative to the Conference, and with their distribution to all the delegations and observers taking part in the Conference.

Rule 27

Franking Privileges.

1. The delegates and observers as defined in Rule I, shall be entitled to postal, telegraph and telephone franking privileges to an extent arranged by the Danish Government in agreement with contracting governments and the private operating agencies concerned. These franking privileges shall start two days before the opening of the Conference, and shall come to an end two days after the Conference ends.
 2. Telegraph and telephone franking privileges shall be limited to communications exchanged between delegates and observers and their respective governments, administrations, and agencies, and between them and their families.
- . The staff of the Conference Secretariat shall also benefit by these privileges.
-

European Regional Broadcasting Conference
and
Maritime Regional Radio Conference
Copenhagen 1948

RD Document No. 5-E
June 22, 1948
Original : English
MAR Document No. 7-E
June 22, 1948
Original : English

Meeting of Committees I
(Executive Committees)

European Regional Broadcasting Conference

and

Maritime Regional Radio Conference

(Joint Meeting)

on the 25th June at 4:30 P.M.

Programme of the Meetings to be held in the coming week.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 6

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 144 - Replacement to Document No. 6

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document N° 6 - E
June 22, 1948

Maritime
Regional Radio Conference
København, 1948

MAR Document N° 8 - E
June 22, 1948

Submitted in: French

D R A F T

WORKING METHODS TO BE FOLLOWED AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS

WORKING METHODS TO BE FOLLOWED
AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Rules of Procedure

- a) In principle, the rules of procedure of the Conference shall apply to Committee Meetings.

Designation of proposals and amendments

- b) In order to facilitate the work of the Conference, as well as the drafting of the final documents and reference to them, the Rapporteurs shall always designate proposals and amendments by the number of the document in which they have been published.

Reports shall bear at the top of the page the number of the Committee which has drafted them.

Inclusion of additional proposals in the reports

- c) The Rapporteurs shall be responsible for inserting in their reports the text of additional proposals, the examination and discussion of which are related thereto.

Numbering, mimeographing and distribution of reports

- d) The Rapporteurs shall submit the first draft of their reports to the General Secretariat of the Conference.

The Secretariat shall be responsible for their numbering, mimeographing and distribution.

Corrections

- e) Requests that corrections be made in a report may be addressed either to the Secretariat or to the group responsible for the adoption of the report. In the former case, they shall be accompanied by the endorsement of the responsible Rapporteur, numbered, and published immediately. They shall show clearly upon whose request the correction has been made.

- f) Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committee of the Conference shall meet on Fridays to fix the time-table for the meetings of the following week.

Allocation of Rooms - Summonses to Meetings

- g) The rooms required for the meetings fixed by the weekly time-table shall be reserved, in agreement with the Reception Committee, at the weekly meeting of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees.

In the case of meetings outwith the time-table, the Rapporteurs shall apply to the Reception Committee for reservations of the necessary rooms. The Committee shall also be responsible for the posting of the date, time and place of meetings. In the case of changes in the arrangements for the meetings, it will be appreciated if the Rapporteurs will inform the Reception Committee. As far as possible, summonses to meetings shall be posted at least 24 hours in advance.

- h) Opinions and views which Sub-Committees or Working Groups may be asked to formulate shall be submitted for ratification to the relevant Committee and then, should the occasion arise, to the Plenary Assembly. Similarly, opinions and views formulated by Committees shall be submitted to the Plenary Assembly.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

ED Document N° 7 - E
June 22, 1948.

Maritime
Regional Conference
København, 1948.

MAR Document N° 9 - E
June 22, 1948.

Submitted in: English.

Denmark.

Report on the calling of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference and the Regional Maritime Radiocommunication Conference in Copenhagen.

Under the provisions of section 1 of the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City, 1947, signed by the Delegates of the European Region, the Government of Denmark is requested to call the European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

In order to comply with a proposal of the Radio Conference the Government of Denmark has issued invitations for a European Maritime Radiocommunication Conference to be held in Copenhagen at the same time as the Broadcasting Conference.

In order to facilitate the work of the Conferences the Danish Administration has found it appropriate to issue a report on the action taken by the Danish Government and Administration on this same question at the same time as the report on the preparation of these Conferences.

A. Invitations.

In accordance with the provisions of § 1.1 of the Directives for the European Broadcasting Conference the Danish Government has invited through diplomatic channels the following countries to send representatives to the Broadcasting Conference:

People's Republic of Albania
Austria
Belgium
The Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
Bulgaria
State of Vatican City
Egypt
Finland
France
Greece
Hungary
Ireland
Iceland
Italy
Lebanon
Luxembourg
Monaco
Norway
Netherlands
Republic of Poland

Portugal
French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia
Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia
The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Rumania
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Sweden
Swiss Confederation.
Syria
Czechoslovakia
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The Danish Government has been informed that Lebanon will not take part in the Conference. On June 18 no definite reply had been received from the following countries:

The Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The extra-European countries, which pursuant to the provisions of § 1.2 of the Directives have the right to be represented at the Broadcasting Conference by observers, have been informed of the convening of the Conference by the Notification no. 544 from the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union. The Danish Government has been informed that representatives of the United States of America will attend the Conference as observers.

The United Nations Organization of which the telecommunication operating services are entitled to take part in the Conference in a consultative capacity pursuant to the provisions of § 1.3 of the directives have been informed by the Danish Government, through the permanent delegate of Denmark to the United Nations, of the convening of the Conference. No reply has been received.

In accordance with the provisions in Article 4 § 6 of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations the "International Frequency Registration Board" has been invited by the Danish Administration to send representatives to participate in the Conferences in advisory capacity. This invitation has been accepted.

International Organizations which pursuant to the provisions of § 1.4 of the Directives may be authorized to participate in the Conference in an consultative capacity have been informed of the convening of the Conference by the Notification no 544 from the Bureau of the Union. Furthermore, in the invitation from the Danish Government to the countries in the European Area, these countries were asked to make the calling of the Conference known to the international organizations and to inform them that applications for participation should be forwarded through the government of the country in which the organizations are domiciled. Applications for admission to the Conference have been received from "Organisation Internationale de Radiodiffusion" (OIR) and "Comité International Radio-Maritime" (CIKM) through the Belgian Administration and "Union Internationale de Radiodiffusion" (UIR) through the Swiss Administration.

The invitations for the European Maritime Radiocommunication Conference have been issued at the same time and to the same countries as the invitations to the Broadcasting Conference.

The Danish Administration has been informed that the following countries will not take part in the maritime conference:

Swiss Confederation
Lebanon.

Credentials for the Conferences.

With regard to the nature of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference the Atlantic City Conferences discussed whether this should be an administrative or a plenipotentiary conference. However the task of deciding the nature of the European Conference was left to the Delegates of that Conference (Documents no. 986 R and no 522 TR of the Atlantic City Conferences).

Therefore in the invitations to the countries of the European Region the Danish Government has emphasized that it was advisable for the Delegates to be invested with powers to sign all agreements and other documents resulting from the work of the Broadcasting Conference irrespective of the nature of the documents.

Secretariat of the Conferences.

In order to ensure maximum efficiency in the work of the Secretariat of the Conferences the Danish Administration has asked the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union to assist, and the Director has kindly agreed to this.

Frequency Bands to be dealt with by the Conferences.

The task of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference is defined in the Additional Protocol signed at Atlantic City and in the document annexed thereto. In the main, it is similar to those of the Lucerne and Montreux Conferences.

With regard to the question of what frequency bands should be considered at the Conferences in Copenhagen it seems that the situation differs to some extent from the situation at the previous conferences. The main reason for this is that the "Resolution Relating to the Preparation of the New International Frequency List" adopted by the International Radio Conference in Atlantic City is in fact imposing on the Administrations the task of considering the frequency band 150-2850 kc/s during the regional conferences. The European Regional Broadcasting Conference, and the Regional Maritime Radiocommunication Conference are the only regional conferences scheduled for the European region for dealing with frequencies in the band 150-1605 kc/s at the present moment, and in the opinion of the Danish Administration it would be natural for the two conferences to decide upon the division of the work between the two conferences and whether other conferences should be convened.

This question has been discussed by the "Provisional Frequency Board" which has issued a recommendation (Doc. 66 of 9th February 1948) dealing with some of the frequency bands in question. This recommendation has been approved by the Administrative Council during its second session and should therefore serve as a directive on this question. The pertinent part of this recommendation reads as follows;

"A. The Administrative Council draw the attention of all Administrations concerned to the necessity of convening suitable regional conferences and propose the following action be taken by the Administrations concerned:

- (1) The Copenhagen Broadcasting Conference to integrate the European aeronautical and maritime mobile requirements (see note 11, page 23 Reg:s) with those of broadcasting within the band 255-285 kc/s.

(2) The Copenhagen Maritime Conference integrate the European requirements within the band 405-415 kc/s."

The Danish Administration has been asked by the Italian Administration to state what programme and frequency bands should be considered by the Maritime Conference. The following reply has been published in Notification no. 547 from the Bureau of the Union:

"The Regional Maritime Radiocommunication Conference in Copenhagen will consider the maritime requirements in the bands 255-285 kc/s, 405-415 kc/s, 415-490 kc/s and 510-525 kc/s. Furthermore the Conference will deal mainly with the same questions as the Maritime Radiocommunication Conference in Montreux, 1939, it will especially deal with the allocation of frequencies to coast stations in the European Waters from the North Sea to the Mediterranean (see doc. no. 98OR, 25.9.1947 of the Radio Conference in Atlantic City)".

The frequency band 150-160 kc/s shared by broadcasting and maritime mobile services has not been included in the above list of frequency bands to be considered by the Maritime Conference as it is not clear to the Danish Administration whether it is indispensable for the Maritime Conference to study this with a view of re-allocating the coast stations of the European Region. A decision on this question will naturally be taken by the Maritime Conference itself.

The Italian Administration has presented the proposal that the Maritime Conference should:

1. deal with allocation of frequencies to coast stations in the maritime mobile bands between 150 and 2850 kc/s,
2. prepare a new plan for medium frequency radio beacons to replace the pre-war Bordeaux-plan.

This proposal has been circulated as a conference document (MAR-doc no. 1) by the Bureau of the Union.

In a letter dated 4th June 1948 from Bureau of the Union the Danish Administration was informed that the following recommendation had been made by the International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference in Geneva:

"A."The International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference considers that the whole problem of aeronautical frequency requirements should be settled as expeditiously as possible. The Conference therefore recommends that regional conferences be convened without delay to prepare frequency assignment plans for the bands allotted to the aeronautical mobile service on the regional level. A special Administrative Conference will be convened in 1949 to approve the new frequency list; hence these plans should be ready in good time for the Conference to study them.

2. From a study of the frequency allocation table contained in the Atlantic City Radio Regulation, and by comparing it with the Atlantic City Resolution relative to the P.F.B., it appears that no I-T.U. agency has been specifically charged with assigning frequencies in:

- the 315 - 325 kc/s band, allocated in Region I to aeronautical radionavigation, and
- the 325 - 405 band, shared throughout the world between the aeronautical mobile service and aeronautical radionavigation.

3. As regards Region I, it is probable that a special aeronautical conference will be convened by the Administrative Council of the I.T.U., and will meet in September, 1948.

However, it may be noticed that;

- a) The European Zone is the cause of the problem for Region I.
- b) Expert representatives of aeronautical radio services in the European Zone will be in Copenhagen from the 25 June, 1948, to consider the question of broadcasting stations operating by special arrangement in the bands reserved for aeronautical mobile frequencies. (Frequency allocation table, note 19). In doing so, they would be bound to study the assignment of frequencies to aeronautical stations in the 325-405 kc/s band.
- c) If a special conference were to be held, its scope would be limited in practice to the 315-325 kc/s band, 10 kc/s wide.

In these circumstances, it would seem that the delay and expense occasioned by a special conference would be out of all proportion to the ends to be attained.

Hence the Danish Government might well be requested to profit by the presence of these experts by convening a meeting, in order that they might forward to the P.F.B. any proposals on frequency assignment in the above bands. These proposals, on approval by the special administrative Conference, would then be incorporated in the new frequency list. The Danish Government would of course inform the countries concerned about this meeting.

Should the Danish Government accept this proposal, requests submitted on forms 2 for the corresponding bands would be forwarded to it together with those relative to the mobile maritime service."

On 8th June 1948 the Danish Administration informed the Bureau of the Union that Denmark could accept the recommendation on the assumption that this preparatory meeting would take place within the framework of the Maritime Conference and that reasonable support for this proposal would be found among the countries taking part. On 12th June 1948, 4 countries had seconded the proposal that such a meeting be called and no objection had been received.

Below is given a list summarizing the different directives and recommendations concerning the frequency bands to be considered at the Copenhagen Conferences.

1. Additional Protocol, Atlantic City 1947.

The European Regional Broadcasting Conference shall set up a new plan for a location of frequencies to broadcasting stations (on long and medium waves).

2. Document Annexed to protocol.

The European Regional Broadcasting Conference shall deal

with frequencies below 1605 kc/s in broadcasting bands, in shared bands or in derogation.

3.- Atlantic City Radio Regulations 131.

The next European Regional Broadcasting Conference shall decide to what extent existing broadcasting stations in Europe may be allowed to operate in the aeronautical bands 325-365 kc/s and 395-405 kc/s.

4.- Atlantic City Radio Regulations 138.

The next European Regional Broadcasting Conference shall decide to what extent existing broadcasting stations in Europe may be allowed to operate in the maritime bands 415-490 kc/s and 515-525 kc/s.

5.- Resolution of the Administrative Council concerning the recommendation presented by PFB in doc. No. 66.

The Copenhagen Broadcasting Conference shall integrate the European aeronautical and maritime mobile requirements with those of broadcasting in the band 255-285 kc/s.

6.- Invitation at the Radio Conference in Atlantic City 1947

(Doc. 980 - R)
The Regional Maritime Radiocommunication Conference in Copenhagen should make assignments of frequencies in the 500 kc/s band to the coast stations in the region of the European waters from the North Sea to the Mediterranean.

7.- Notification No. 547 dated 16.3.48 from the Bureau of the Union.

The European Maritime Radiocommunication Conference in Copenhagen will deal with the maritime requirements in the bands 255-285 kc/s, 405-415 kc/s, 415 kc/s-490 kc/s and 510-525 kc/s.

8. Resolution of the Administrative Council concerning the recommendation presented by the PFB in Doc. No. 66.

The Copenhagen Maritime Conference shall integrate the European requirements within the band 405-415 kc/s

9. Recommendation adopted by the International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference 1.6.1948.

The Danish Government might well be requested to profit by the presence of the aeronautical radio experts by convening a meeting, in order that they might forward to the PFB any proposals on frequency assignment in the bands 315-325 kc/s and 325-405 kc/s.

The following frequency list has been prepared to give a general view of the frequency bands to be considered at the different conferences in Copenhagen in accordance with the above stipulations. The Broadcasting Conference is indicated by RD, the Maritime Conference by MAR and the Aeronautical Meeting by AER. In cases where the same frequency band is being dealt with by more than one conference the listing does not indicate any relative priority.

- 7 -
 RL 7 - I
 MAR 9 - I

| Frequency Band | Service x) | Conference |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------|
| 150-160 kc/s | B MM | RD, (MAR) |
| 160-255 | B | RD |
| 255-285 | AeN, B, MM | RD, MAR |
| 285-315 | MM | |
| 315-325 | AeN | ATR |
| 325-405 | AeM, AeN | RD, ATR |
| 405-415 | (AeN, MN, M (excl. Ae | MAR |
| 415-490 | MM | RD, MAR |
| 490-510 | M | |
| 510-525 | MM | RD, MAR |
| 525-1605 | B | RD |

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| x) B | = Radiodiffusion | Broadcasting |
| MM | = Mobile maritime | Maritime Mobile |
| AeN | = Radionavigation aéronautique | Aeronautical Radionavigation |
| MM | = Radionavigation maritime | Maritime Radionavigation |
| AeM | = Mobile aéronautique | Aeronautical Mobile |
| M | = Mobile | Mobile |

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference

København, 1948

RD Document No 8 - E

June 24, 1948

Submitted in : English

replaces RD Document No 1 - E

Heads of Delegations Meeting

June 24, 1948 2 p.m.

Agenda :

1. Appointment of Secretariat.
 2. Organization of committees (RD Doc. No 2 - E).
 3. Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship of committees.
 4. Language Arrangements.
 5. Internal Regulations (RD Doc. No 4 - E).
 6. Working Methods (RD Doc. No 6 - E).
 7. Admission of the State of Israel and the Republic of San Marino.
 8. Admission of International Organizations.
 9. Miscellaneous.
-

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference

København, 1948

RD Document No. 9 - E
24 June 1948

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

This Document cancels and
replaces RD Doc. No. 3 - E

Opening Meeting

25 June 1948 at 10 a.m.

(European Regional Broadcasting and Maritime Regional
Radio Joint Conference)

- - - - -

Opening Address and Reply to this Address

15 minutes' recess (A photograph is taken
of the Delegates)

- - - - -

Heads of Delegations will then meet for their second meeting
at about 11.a.m.

Order of the Day

Item No. 1 having been studied yesterday, the Order of the Day
will be as follows:

2. Establishment of Committees (RD Doc. No. 2 - E)
3. Election of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees.
4. Working arrangements for Linguistic Services.
5. Rules of Procedure (RD Doc. No. 4 - E).
6. Working Methods (RD Doc. No. 6 - E).
7. Admission of the State of Israel and Republic of San Marino.
8. Admission of International Organisations.
9. Miscellaneous.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 10

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 11 - Supplement to Document No. 10
- Document No. 109 - Amendment to Document No. 10

European Regional Broadcasting Conference
København 1948.

RD Document No. 10 - E

24 June 1948

Maritime Regional Radio Conference
København 1948

MAR Document No. 13 - E

24 June 1948

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Minutes of the First Meeting
of the Heads of Delegations
on 24 June 1948 at 2.10 p.m.
at Christiansborg Palace.

The Chairman, Mr. HOLMBLAD, Head of the Danish Delegation opened the Meeting at 2.10 p.m.

The Chairman welcomed the Delegates present and declared that, the Meeting being a preparatory one, he would go straight to the point.

Before coming to the Agenda, the Chairman stated that Mr. Burton, the United States observer, had asked to be allowed to attend to-day's Meeting. Personally, the Chairman had no objection to Mr. Burton's admission.

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. suggested the postponing for one or two days the questions regarding observers, experts, organisation and other questions not mentioned on the Agenda. There were, moreover, Delegations which had only just arrived and had not yet had time to study the documents distributed. As the number of Delegations present appeared to be small, he further suggested that the Chairman should state the exact number of Delegations actually present.

The Chairman replied that, if there were any objections to the presence of observers, the latter would not be admitted to the present Meeting which was a Meeting of the Heads of Delegations. As for the dates of this and the following day's Meetings, they had long ago been communicated by the Berne Bureau. He proceeded to call the roll of Delegations:

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Albania | absent |
| Austria | absent |
| Belgium | present |
| Bielorussia | present |
| Bulgaria | present |
| Vatica City | absent |
| Denmark | present |
| Egypt | absent |
| Finland | present |
| France | present |
| Greece | absent |
| Hungary | present |
| Ireland (Eire) | present |
| Iceland | absent |
| Italy | absent |

(RD Document No 10 - E)
(MAR Document No 13 - E)

| | |
|---|---------|
| Lebanon | absent |
| Luxembourg | absent |
| Monaco | absent |
| Norway | absent |
| <u>Netherlands</u> | present |
| <u>Poland</u> | absent |
| <u>Portugal</u> | present |
| <u>French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia</u> | present |
| <u>Peoples' Republic of Yugoslavia</u> | absent |
| <u>Soviet Socialist Republic of the Ukraine</u> | present |
| <u>Roumania</u> | absent |
| <u>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</u> | present |
| <u>Sweden</u> | present |
| <u>Switzerland</u> | present |
| <u>Syria</u> | absent |
| <u>Czechoslovakia</u> | present |
| <u>Turkey</u> | absent |
| <u>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</u> | present |

The results showed that of the 33 participants, 17 Delegations were present and 16 absent. The Delegate of Roumania joined the meeting at that very moment, which made the previous figures 18 and 15. The Chairman said that work could be continued, although the number of delegations present was only slightly greater than that of the absent ones, as the meeting was of a preparatory nature only and no final decision would be taken.

The Bulgarian Delegate seconded the proposals of the Soviet Delegation with regard to the adjournment of the meeting, in view of the absence of a number of Delegations and the fact that some delegates had not had time to examine the documents. He asked for slow and distinct interpretation of the discussions.

The Chairman assured him that the discussions would be interpreted slowly and distinctly. He added that certain objections had been raised to the presence of an observer. This being so, no observer would be admitted to the meeting.

The Delegate of Ireland asked what article of the Rules forbade the presence of observers. He thought that, in the absence of a Rule, the United States observer should be invited to be present

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

at the deliberations of this meeting for reasons of courtesy.

The United Kingdom Delegate asked the U.S.S.R. Delegate whether it was possible for him to reconsider his point of view and withdraw his objection.

The U.S.S.R. Delegate declared that it was above all a question of procedure. The meeting was a meeting of the Heads of Delegations and it seemed to him illogical that the observer of an extra-European country should be present. He proposed that, in view of the absence of a large number of delegations, Items 1, 2 and possibly 3 of the Agenda should not be discussed, and that the meeting scheduled for the morning of the next day should be deferred until the afternoon, so that the documents might be studied more thoroughly.

The Chairman then declared that, in view of the objections raised, observers would not be admitted to the meeting. The meeting of the morning of the 25th, however, could not be deferred. Its date had been fixed a long time ago, and the arrangements made with the Danish Government made it impossible to modify it. He therefore proposed to begin the work and to proceed as rapidly as possible. A Meeting of the Heads of Delegations had always been customary on the day before the opening of the Conference.

The Chairman said that Document RD No. 1 containing the Agenda had been replaced by Document RD No. 8. Study of the latter document would precede study of the Agenda of the Maritime Conference.

Replying to a further reference by the Delegate of Bulgaria to the question of the presence of the United States observer, the Chairman said that the matter had already been dealt with, since it

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

had been decided that the United States observer would not be admitted to the present meeting.

The Delegate of Bulgaria thanked the Chairman and expressed his satisfaction.

The Chairman proceeded to take point 1 of the Agenda (Nomination of the Secretariat of the Conference). The Danish Administration had requested Dr. d'Ernst, Director of the Bureau of the Union, to make some of his staff available for the work of the Secretariat of the Conferences. Despite the heavy burden resulting from the numerous meetings he was compelled to attend in various places, Dr. d'Ernst had been kind enough to give a favourable reply to this request.

The designation of the following persons was then submitted to the meeting:

For Secretary-in-Chief: Mr. William F. Studer, Councillor at the Bureau of the Union:

For Secretaries: Dr. Victor Meyer,) Secretaries at the
Mr. Henri Voutaz,) Bureau of the Union.
Mr. Jean Revoy, Engineer.
Mr. Leon Boussard, Head of the
Linguistic Service.

These proposals were accepted.

The Chairman proceeded to take point 2 of the Agenda (Composition of the Committees).

Document RD No. 2, prepared by the Danish Administration, containing a list of the proposed Committees with their Terms of Reference, was distributed to the Delegates.

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

The Delegate of Bulgaria again proposed to reserve the matter for the next day. He remarked that six committees were to be constituted, although only seventeen countries out of thirty-three were represented. What did other Delegations think on the matter?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegate of the Netherlands, said that, even if it was impossible there and then to appoint the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of all the Committees, it was nevertheless possible to proceed at once with the establishment of the Committees. The Committees suggested were after all the same as those which had already served at Lucerne and Montreux, though some of the names might be different. Moreover, it would always be possible to set up new Committees subsequently.

The Delegate of France observed that certain matters which were the concerns of the Executive Committee and of the Organisation Committee respectively were closely connected and bound to interact on one other, e.g. matters dealing with the time-table of the Conference (Executive Committee) and the organisation of the work of the Conference (Organisation Committee). Would it not be more appropriate to lump these functions together under - presumably - the Executive Committee?

The Chairman replied that the Executive Committee was concerned only with practical matters. The organisation Committee handled questions concerning the organisation of the work of the Conference. When it took decisions on such questions, it was for the Executive Committee to take the necessary action to implement the decisions. It should not be forgotten that there would be two Conferences taking place simultaneously and that it was necessary to coordinate their work. It was not

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

for the Executive Committee to take steps relating to internal organisation. But it might be possible to alter the text of the terms of reference of the Committee, if a proposal were made to that effect.

The Delegate of France was satisfied with the Chairman's explanation that the main task of the Executive Committee would be a purely practical adjustment and coordination of the two Conference, provided always that, whenever the Organisation Committee proposed changes which might have repercussions on the organisation of the Conference, it should be in a position to obtain a corresponding decision from the Executive Committee immediately.

After a second observation by the Delegate of France, it was decided that the word "drafting" ("redaction") should be replaced by the word "preparation" ("elaboration"). The Organisation Committee was accordingly entrusted with the task of preparing the Convention.

The Delegate of the USSR again proposed that the meeting of Heads of Delegations should be adjourned until the following morning, so as to enable Delegates to study the documents which had been handed to them that afternoon. He supported his argument by the following points:

- 1) Documents Nos. RD 2 and 8 had only just been distributed. The Soviet Delegation wished to translate them, so as to be able to study them better.
- 2) Many delegations were still absent. It was therefore impossible to elect the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees.

(RL Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

- 3) The documents which had been distributed did not say how the work of the Broadcasting and Maritime Conferences was to be coordinated; nor did they contain any information as to the results of the work of the Preparatory Committee of Eight Countries, on which last matter Delegates wished to be informed.

The Chairman again pointed out that the date and time of the official opening could not be changed in view of the arrangements already made. He then mentioned the possibility of resuming the meeting of Heads of Delegations after the official ceremony, unless Delegates decided to discuss the items of the Agenda in plenary meeting.

The Delegate of the USSR agreed to the next day's meeting being taken as an extension of the present meeting, on condition that the present meeting was declared closed immediately.

The Chairman answered that it was not his intention to declare the meeting closed there and then, since there were certain items on the Agenda, on which it might be possible to reach agreement that evening, as they had already done in the case of Item No. 1.

The Delegates of Switzerland and the United Kingdom shared the Chairman's point of view.

The Chairman declared that under those circumstances the meeting of Heads of Delegations would continue, and would be resumed the following day after the opening ceremony.

In reply to a remark by the Delegate of France, he pointed out that certain questions which could properly be dealt with by a meeting of Heads of Delegations, could not be dealt with by a plenary assembly in the presence of a much larger number of people. It was therefore preferable that the next day's meeting should again be a meeting of Heads of Delegations.

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

The meeting was then adjourned, it being 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

The Chairman replied to the two observations submitted previously by the Soviet Delegation.

As regards lack of coordination between the work of the two Conferences to be held in København, the two Conferences were intended to be distinct. The upshot of the work of one of them would be a Convention. The upshot of the work of the other would be a series of arrangements. At the same time there were experts common to both, and there was nothing to prevent the two Executive Committees from holding joint meetings. As to the report on the work of the Preparatory Committee of the Eight Countries, it had been sent to all the participant Governments. Furthermore, it would probably be proposed that the Final Report of the Preparatory Committee of the Eight Countries should be published as a document of the present Broadcasting Conference.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom suggested that the members of the Credentials Committees should be chosen from delegates taking part in both Conferences, in order to facilitate cooperation between the two. The Chairman also pointed out that the Executive Committees of both Conferences were free to coordinate their work whenever common interests were involved.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom agreeing, the discussion on Item. 2 of the Agenda lapsed.

The Chairman then passed to Item 3 of the Agenda (Election of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees). A confidential, unofficial, unnumbered document, containing the proposals which the Danish Administration had been led to make on the subject, was then distributed to Delegates.

(RL Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

The Chairman, in reply to the Delegate of the USSR, said that no decision had been taken on Item 2 of the Agenda (Establishment of Committees), and that members present at forthcoming meetings would still be able to make suggestions in the matter. He did not feel there was any reason to take an immediate decision on the proposals in the unofficial document which had just been distributed. Had any Delegations any remarks to make?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom declared that the British delegation was not in a position to assume the Chairmanship of the unofficial group for the study of frequency assignments to the aeronautical services, because it was not sufficiently documented on the question and did not possess the necessary information.

The Delegate of the USSR. reserved the right to revert to Items 2 and 3 of the Agenda, when his Delegation had had time to study them.

The Chairman agreed. He proceeded to take Item 4 of the Agenda.

At this point, the Delegate of the USSR remarked that, agreement **not** having been reached on Items 2 and 3, the Delegations of Bulgaria ~~and~~ the USSR had reserved the right to return to these questions. He again proposed the suspension of the meeting.

The Chairman did not see his way to accept the USSR proposal. Item No. 4 related to a purely **practical** arrangement. It was not a question for the moment of discussing the use of languages. That was a question which would have to be dealt

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

with in the drawing up of the Rules of Procedure. Similarly, Items 7 and 8 did not call for discussion: he had merely to make a simple statement in connection with them. On the other hand, in view of what the Delegate of the USSR had said, Items 5 and 6 would not be discussed that day.

The Delegate of the USSR stated that, whatever the questions raised, there would doubtless be reservations on the part of certain Delegations, which could only result in loss of time. Item 1 was the only point settled. In regard to all the other Items of the Agenda the Soviet Delegation had not had time to study the documents, and the Chairman had refused to accept the proposal to adjourn the discussion. That being so, the Soviet Delegation agreed to the discussion being continued, but on each and every question raised they would reserve their opinion.

Having taken note of the USSR Delegation's statement, the Chairman repeated that he had no intention of opening discussions or of taking decisions. He wished only to make certain statements in order to clarify certain specific points for the benefit of Delegates. He then read the following statement relating to the use of languages.

Arrangements for the Language Service.

Steps have been taken through the General Secretariat of the Union to recruit the personnel required for the language work of the Conference and to provide for the installation of simultaneous interpretation in two of the Meeting rooms. The hall, where the Plenary Sessions will be held, is equipped for simultaneous interpretation. This hall will also be used for Committee meetings. In addition, one large Committee room (Room 9), located on

(RD Document No.10 - E)
(MAR Document No.13 - E)

the second floor is provided with similar installations. Three smaller committee rooms will be available on the first floor for sub-committees or working groups. In these rooms, consecutive interpretation will be used.

Interpretation will be given in French and English. If the decision is taken to use the Russian language, any remarks spoken in Russian will be translated in the two language rooms simultaneously in French and English. If Russian is used in the smaller groups, the interpretation will be in French and English, and consecutive.

A staff of translators has been recruited to ensure the rapid preparation of documents in French and English, and in accordance with the decision of the Conference in Russian as required. Every effort will be made to ensure the prompt distribution of all documents in the languages approved by the Conference. Rapporteurs and Delegations are requested to submit the text of their documents or proposals to the Secretariat who will undertake to ensure their translation, reproduction and distribution.

The Delegate of Bulgaria suggested again that the meeting should rise in view of the small number of Delegations present. He asked for the opinion of other Delegates on the point.

The Chairman did not wish to give his personal opinion; but he observed that no other member had proposed the adjournment of the meeting. What was the feeling of Delegates in the matter?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom suggested that the Chairman's proposed state/^{ment} should be heard, and that the meeting should then rise.

The Delegate of Switzerland said that the number of Delegations missing was impressive; but he thought the situation would change the following day. Was there any news of the absent Delegations? He insisted on the fact that time was precious and very short.

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

They had to complete a maximum of work in a minimum of time.

The Chairman said that the only news was of the Italian Delegation. It would arrive that evening.

The Delegate of Ireland supported the Delegate of Switzerland. Time was a very important factor, especially for the small Delegations. Work should begin as soon as possible.

The Delegate of Bulgaria opposed the Swiss statement. It was in order to gain time later that it was necessary to give Delegations the time to study the documents.

The Chairman said that the statement which he wished to make was confined to information which would make the work of Delegates easier; it was not a question of matters dealt with in documents.

The Delegate of Belgium could not see any reason why the Chairman should not make his statements. Should the need arise, he could be requested to repeat the information the following day.

The Chairman asked Delegates if they agreed to the Belgian proposal. There being no opposition, he proceeded to say in regard to Item 7 that it would be useful for Delegates to know that the Danish Government had received a request for admission from the State of Israel and from the Republic of San Marino. He recalled that § 1 of the document annexed to the Additional Protocol stated that: "The Conference will be composed of representatives of all the countries comprised in the European area which have signed the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City (1947) or have adhered thereto. The Conference will have the power to invite other countries of the European area." The question which arose, therefore, was to know if the two countries concerned (which were not signatories of the Atlantic City Convention) had adhered to it. With

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

this in view, the Danish Administration had sent a telegram on June 22nd, to the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunications Union asking him for an official statement as to whether the State of Israel and the Republic of San Marino had adhered to the said Convention. The Secretary-General had replied as follows:

"Your telegram of 22nd STOP State Israel and Republic San Marino now adhering Madrid Convention STOP In accordance with what you say, these States may be admitted Copenhagen Conference by Plenary Assembly."

Under these circumstances, the question no longer lay within the jurisdiction of the Danish Authorities. It was for the Conference to decide.

The Chairman repeated that it was not proposed to discuss the question; but he thought it would be useful to Delegates to know the position.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom asked if these documents would be included in the Minutes of the Meeting.

The Chairman replied in the affirmative. Turning to Item 8 of the Agenda, he noted that, in the report on the subject of the summoning of the two Conferences, viz, the Documents Nos. RD 7/MAR 9, which were in Delegates' hands, the Danish Administration had explained the position in regard to the admission of international organisations. Three requests had so far been received, namely from the organisation Internationale de Radiodiffusion (O.I.R), the Union Internationale de Radiodiffusion (U.I.R.) and the Comite International Radio-Maritime (C.I.R.M.)

The Chairman, continuing, asked if there were any observations or remarks to be made on Item 9 of the Agenda (Miscellaneous). He recalled that, according to the decision taken, the Meeting would be

(RD Document No. 10 - E)
(MAR Document No. 13 - E)

adjourned for half an hour after the official opening of the Conference to enable a photograph to be taken of the Delegates. After that there would be a further meeting of Heads of Delegations at 11 a.m. The same Agenda would be discussed, with the exception of Item 1, which had already been adopted. Items 2 to 9 would form the basis for the new discussion.

It was not expected that there would be a meeting on Saturday. The first Plenary Meeting of the Broadcasting Conference would take place on the following Monday at 10 a.m., and that of the Maritime Conference the same afternoon. If it did not prove possible to terminate the work by Friday evening, another meeting of the Heads of Delegations would have to be held on Saturday, because in any case, everything had to be ready for the Plenary Meeting.

There were no objections. The Meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

V. Meyer

Seen:

Seen:

H. Voutaz

W.F. Studer

N.E. Holmblad

J. Revoy

Secretaries

Secretary-in-Chief

Chairman.

European Regional Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948.

RD Document No. 11 - E

25 June 1948

Maritime Regional Radio Conference,
København, 1948.

MAR Document No.14-E

25 June 1948.

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Supplement to: RD Document No.10
MAR Document No.13 of
24th June, 1948.

Insert the following paragraph before the third paragraph on the first page beginning: "before proceeding with the Agenda":

The Chairman: announced the presence of Mr. Gerald C. Gross, Assistant Secretary-General, of the International Telecommunications Union, representing Dr. F. d'Ernst, Secretary-General of the Union, who was prevented from attending the Meetings of the København Conferences.

He also announced the presence of the following Members of the Bureau of the Union:

Mr. L. Destert, Administrative Councillor of the P.F.B.

Mr. William F. Studer, Councillor.

Dr. Victor Meyer and Mr. Henri Voutaz, Secretaries, and

Mr. Jean Revoy, Engineer.

København, 1948

27 June 1948

Original: French
5 + 7

Corrections to be made
in the Draft Rules of Procedure for the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference
(Document Rd 4 - E)

Corrections approved by the Meeting of the Heads
of Delegations

Page 2 - Rule 1

at the end of §1, instead of: "from the same country
within the European Area,"
read: "from the same country within the European
Broadcasting Area" at the bottom of the page, after the
text, insert the following footnote:

Definition of the European Broadcasting Area: The
"European Area" is bounded on the West by the Western
boundary of Regional, on the East by the meridian 40°
East of Greenwich and on the South by the parallel 30°
North so as to include the western part of the U.S.S.R.
and the territories bordering the Mediterranean, with
the exception of the parts of Arabia and Saudi-Arabia
included in this sector.

at the end of §2, read: " of a country within the European
Broadcasting Area,"

Rule 2.
§1, third line, read: "..... within the European Broad-
casting Area,"

Page 3 - Rule 5.

§3 to read as follows:

"§3. No Delegation shall enjoy the right of vote
under Rule 17 unless and until the above Committee has
declared its credentials to be in order."

Page 4 - Rule 9.

§1 to read as follows:

"§1. Committees shall be composed of Delegations
from countries in the European Broadcasting Area which
have made known their intention to participate."

Page 5. Rule 14.

The end of paragraph 1 to read as follows:

".... by the Head of the Delegation of the country from which the proposal or amendment originated, or by his deputy."

Add to §2, without starting a new paragraph, the following sentence:

"Should the Delegation from which the proposal or amendment originates wish copies of it to be distributed, this shall be done."

Page 6. Rule 15.

Add to §3, without starting a new paragraph, the following sentence:

"Should the Delegation from which the proposal or amendment originates wish copies of it to be distributed, this shall be done."

Rule 17.

§1 to read as follows:

"§1. Only Delegations of governments in the European Broadcasting Area may" (the rest without change).

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference

København, 1948.

RD Document No. 13 - E

27 June 1948

Submitted in : English.

First Meeting of the Plenary Assembly
of the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference

- 1.- Opening Address by the Head of the Danish Delegation.
 - 2.- Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference.
 - 3.- Appointment of the Secretariat.
 - 4.- Establishment of the Committees (RD Doc. No. 2 - E).
 - 5.- Nomination of the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees.
 - 6.- Linguistic Arrangements.
 - 7.- Rules of Procedure (RD Doc. 4 - E).
 - 8.- Working Methods (RD/MAR Doc. Nos. 6 - E/8 - E).
 - 9.- Admission of International Organisations.
 - 10.- Working hours of the Conference.
 - 11.- Report on the works of the Committee Eight Countries.
 - 12.- Miscellaneous.
-

EUROPEAN REGIONAL
BROADCASTING
CONFERENCE

RD Document No.14 - E
25 June 1948.

MARITIME REGIONAL
RADIO
CONFERENCE

MAR Document No.16 - E
25 June 1948.

Submitted in French

Formal Inauguration of
The European Regional Broadcasting
Conference
and of
the Maritime Regional Radio Conference
København, 1948.

These two Conferences, convened by the Danish Government, viz the European Regional Broadcasting Conference under the provisions of § 1 of the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City 1947, and the Maritime Regional Radio Conference under the decisions reached at the Atlantic City Radio Conference by the 9th Plenary Meeting on 24 September 1947 (see Atlantic City Document 980 R of Atlantic City), met on 25 June 1948 at 10 a.m. in the "salle commune" of the Danish Parliament in the Christiansborg Castle at København.

The Meeting was opened at 10.10 a.m. by Mr N.E.Holmblad, Head of the Danish Delegation, who requested the Minister of Public Works to take the floor.

Mr Carl Petersen, Minister of Public Works, gave the following address in the Danish language:
Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the name of the Danish Government, I have the honour and the pleasure to wish a cordial welcome to all the delegates who have come to take part in the European Regional Broadcasting Conference and the Regional Maritime Radio Conference. I also welcome cordially the ladies who have given us great pleasure in accompanying the delegates to Copenhagen.

As we all know, it was decided last year at the International Radio Conference at Atlantic City that a European Regional Broadcasting Conference would be held this year, and that a Regional Maritime Radio Conference would take place simultaneously. The common aim of the two conferences was to assign to the European broadcasting and coastal stations the frequencies in the bands allotted to them at Atlantic City.

During the Atlantic City Conference, the Danish delegation, in the name of its government, invited the other delegations to hold in Copenhagen the two very important conferences which bring us here today. It was a great pleasure for us that invitation was accepted, and it is a pleasure as well as a great honour to see assembled within our walls so many eminent representatives of broadcasting and radio. We will try to give the work of this conference a framework enabling its deliberations to be carried on in the best possible conditions.

Let us not harbour the illusion that these deliberations will be easy. Let me recall that, as far as broadcasting is concerned, the European stations are operating according to the plan drawn up at Lucerne as far back as 1933. In view of the

(RD Dec.14/MAR 16-E)

evolution of broadcasting since that time, it is clear that this basis no longer responds to present requirements and that numerous modifications, of a more or less radical nature, have been proved necessary. In 1933, therefore, it was decided to revise the Lucerne plan. That was the object of the European Broadcasting Conference at Montreux, which immediately preceded the present one opening in Copenhagen to-day.

The plan drawn up at Montreux should have come into force on April 1 st. 1940, but the outbreak of war interrupted evolution and progress in this domain, as in so many others. So the Montreux Plan was never carried out. In considering this long preliminary period which has elapsed since the Lucerne Conference, and the enormous upheavals which war brought about in Europe, we are bound to admit that the problems facing the Copenhagen Conference will not be lacking in difficulties.

Let me say at the same time, however, that a Conference which sets out to create order from the chaos now reigning in a large part of European Broadcasting frequencies presents a very attractive task, despite all the difficulties. It is unnecessary to emphasise to you the importance of broadcasting. We all know how this still youthful factor of civilisation sends its message to millions and millions of listeners, in the form of speech or music. It is not an exaggeration to say that Broadcasting exercises a dominating influence on the life of nations both in the national and international sphere.

In order that European broadcasting Administrations may carry out their task, so essential, as it is, in the life of the nations, the instrument which they employ (namely, the European stations) must be as fine and as perfect as possible.

The task of putting this instrument in good order is one which falls upon you, along with the task of solving a problem which is, perhaps, even more fundamental: namely, that of introducing into the given elements the orderliness necessary to ensure that the instrument resounds with all the power and harmony desired. Just as the "well-tempered" scale forms the basis of all our music, we might likewise speak of a "well-tempered" frequency plan, this being a condition essential to enable the European broadcasting stations to resound harmoniously over the air.

(RD Doc 14/MAR 16-E)

I know that the assembly gathered before me is composed of the most competent European representatives appointed to solve the complex and thorny problem which is raised by the preparation of a harmoniously balanced European frequency plan. I have no doubt therefore that the problem will be solved in the most happy manner. I am equally certain that the delegates from the various countries will be able to work as much towards an international as a national ideal, so that we may speak in the future of the brilliant success of the Copenhagen Conference. "From these pyramids forty centuries look down upon you" said Napoleon to his soldiers on the eve of the battle of the Pyramids. Happily it is not a battle, but peaceful deliberations, which will take place here. Nevertheless, to amplify a little, it may well be said, "Do not forget that millions of listeners are waiting to hear you."

I have devoted the larger part of my speech to the Broadcasting Conference. This is not to say that the Maritime Radio Conference is of lesser importance in the field. Maritime Radio is the original and classic field of radio, and it was only later that the other radio services came into prominence, reducing from year to year the frequency bands of the maritime services. That is why the chaos which reigns in the field of the waves, as in many others, also extends to the maritime services, a fact which is borne out by the requirements of radiotelephony.

The problems to be solved in preparing a frequency plan for coastal stations are not, therefore, less complex, than those which arise in regard to other broadcasting stations. The efficiency of a maritime radio station is often a matter of life or death. We must always keep this in mind in dealing with these problems. A radiotelegraphist who, when sending out distress signals, finds himself impeded by a station engaged, as sometimes happens, in broadcasting light music, could not accept such a state of affairs. I am sure that the maritime radio experts who are called upon to collaborate here with the specialists in broadcasting will not lose sight of the respective importance of the two services.

I have spoken sufficiently of the magnitude and scope of the work of the two Conferences. Let us note, in finishing, that there are other aspects, for example, the opportunity offered of passing pleasant hours among friends and colleagues, thereby facilitating the exchange of thoughts and ideas as well as the forging of links of friendship which may have the most happy outcome in the future.

I hope also that our guests from abroad will have the time and the opportunity to become acquainted a little with Denmark, and to look over our capital and its environs, where nature is at present in full bloom and offers all the charms of summer.

I know that the Reception Committee of the Conferences will do their utmost to present Denmark to those who are interested in our country, and to make their stay among us as pleasant as difficult times and the exigencies of our resources permit.

With these words I declare open, at Copenhagen, the European Regional Broadcasting and the Maritime Regional Radio Conference.

This address, simultaneously interpreted in French and in English, was enthusiastically applauded by the meeting.

Mr. Rene Corteil, Head of the Belgian Delegation and Chairman of the Preparatory Committee of Eight Countries which recently met at

(RD Doc 14/MAR 16-E)

Brussels, replied on behalf of all the Delegations in the following words:

Mr. Minister,
Ladies and Gentlemen.

I have the honour to address you on behalf of the foreign Delegations taking part in the Broadcasting and the Maritime Radio Conferences. I regard it as my duty and my pleasure in the first instance Mr. Minister, to thank you for the cordial welcome you have addressed to us.

The ladies also, I feel certain, will allow me to be their mouthpiece to thank you very sincerely for the attention which you have paid them.

You said, Mr. Minister, that we should have no illusions regarding the difficulties of our debates.

You have shown us the importance of our task for the rapid and harmonious development of broadcasting which, as never before, must be an instrument of peace intended to assist the flowering of national cultures, but also intended to promote mutual understanding between peoples and by so doing, gather them closer together.

This task will include lengthy discussions on complex, difficult and sometimes thorny subjects.

Allow me, however, as an old habitué of International Radio Conferences, to say how right you were in expressing confidence in the successful outcome of our work.

I feel certain that all the delegates, although they have the very legitimate task of defending their national interests, are nevertheless inspired by an international spirit of mutual understanding, by a spirit of conciliation allied to a realistic understanding of the possibilities which will lead them, in the end to a solution acceptable to all countries, and to a new plan, the Copenhagen Plan, for the assignment of wave-lengths, which will be welcomed as a benefaction by the millions of European listeners who suffer daily from the utter chaos in the ether.

In another field, Mr. Minister, you spoke of Maritime Radio.

There is here, as you have shown, a whole drama of the waves. Maritime Radio, the oldest of the radio services, a service which is of capital importance for the safety of human life, has had to relinquish progressively some of its wave-bands to enable other rapidly developing services, of no less importance to the community, to make use of them.

Fortunately, we can have faith in scientific and technical progress to find, for these problems, solutions which will enable all the necessary guarantees for good and certain operation to be assured to the maritime services.

As you have said, Mr. Minister, it is very true that our conferences sometimes afford us agreeable moments, I mean those moments, when we meet our old colleagues and friends once again, and the spirit of goodwill which moves us all, helps us to a successful solution of delicate questions, because we can broach them in full confidence and

(RD Doc 14/MAR 16-E)

honesty.

Among these colleagues, I should like to mention, in particular, our very dear friends of the Danish Administration, whom we meet again with renewed pleasure in particularly pleasant surroundings.

In conclusion, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am sure that I speak for you all when I ask the Minister to be kind enough to transmit to the Government, the Authorities and the Danish Administration, our most sincere thanks for the delightful hospitality of which they are giving proof in this splendid building, and for all the efforts which they are making to render our stay in their beautiful country of the most pleasant character and to make sure that we take away with us the most agreeable memories of our stay.

Lively applause greeted this address.

Mr. N.E. Holmblad, Head of the Danish Delegation, informed the meeting that it had been arranged for the first Plenary Assembly to take place after the opening meeting; but, as the Heads of Delegations had not completed the discussion of their Agenda at their meeting of the previous afternoon, the first Plenary Assembly had been fixed for Monday morning, 28 June at 10 a.m.

On the other hand, the present meeting would be followed, at 11 a.m. by the Second Meeting of the Heads of Delegations.

The Inaugural Meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.

Seen:

N.E. Holmblad

Seen:

Secretary-in-Chief:

W.F. Studer

Secretaries:

V. Meyer

H. Voutaz

J. Revoy



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 15

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 109 - Amendment to Document No. 15

Submitted in: French

Minutes of the Second Meeting
of the Heads of Delegations
on 25 June 1948 at 11 a.m. at
Christiansborg Palace.

The Meeting opened at 11 a.m. with Mr. Holmblad, Head of the Danish Delegation., in the Chair.

The Chairman, speaking on behalf of the meeting, congratulated Mr. Jacques Meyer, Head of the French Delegation, on his recent promotion to the rank of Commander of the Legion of Honour. He then asked the Secretary-in-Chief to call the roll of the Delegations present. Of the 33 participating countries, 25 were represented, and 8 Delegations were absent. The absent Delegations were those of Egypt, Greece, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Monaco, Poland, the People's Republic of Yugoslavia and Syria. The Delegate of Monaco later arrived bringing the numbers mentioned up to 26 present and 7 absent.

The Delegate of Ireland expressed the opinion that, the Meeting being now officially opened, the observer of the United States should be allowed to be present during the work of the Meeting. He thought Mr. Burton's request for admission was justified, and that he should be heard by the Meeting.

The Chairman shared the opinion of the Delegate of Ireland. Did the Delegates who had raised objections on this point at the previous day's meeting still maintain them all, now that the Conference was officially opened? He quoted the Document annexed to the Additional Protocol of Atlantic City, sub-paragraph 2 of § 1, which said that "Observers will be permitted to attend all the meetings of this Conference".

The Delegate of Belgium seconded the Chairman's point of view. The situation in the case of the present Conference differed from what it had been at other meetings, where the observers were members of private agencies or of international organisations. Moreover the conference was bound by the provisions just alluded to by the Chairman, and had no right to deny admittance to the Head of the United States Delegation.

(RD Doc.No 15-E)

(MAR Doc.No 17-E)

The Delegate of France drew attention to the difference between an observer and a delegate. The written texts repeatedly opposed these two words. As there was no United States Delegation, there was no Head of the United States Delegation. Nevertheless, there were good reasons why the United States observer should be heard; and he advocated his being admitted, though he was opposed to his admission as of right.

The Chairman, and the Delegate of Belgium, admitted that the United States representatives were, in fact, observers and not delegates, and had never considered that they (the representatives) had a right to vote.

The Chairman observed that there seemed to be general agreement to admit the United States representative as an observer. Were there any objections?

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought it had been decided at the previous day's meeting to discuss the question of the admission of the United States observer at the same time as that of the admission of extra-European countries or of international organizations. Why was an exception being made in favour of the United States? No part of the Atlantic City text specified that observers might be present at a meeting of Heads of Delegations. At such a meeting only Heads of Delegations with full powers and rights should be present. Otherwise such a meeting could not be distinguished from a Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman pointed out that, in paragraphs 2 and 4 of § 1 of the Atlantic City text a distinction was drawn between the case of observers from extra-European countries and that of international Organizations. That raised the question as to whether meetings of Heads of Delegations could be compared with other meetings. However, it seemed that all opinions had been expressed, and the question had now been sufficiently discussed. He proposed to take a vote.

The Delegate of Bulgaria said that in his opinion, as already expressed at the previous day's meeting, the Conference was concerned only with internal European problems. All the representatives present were duly accredited by European Governments. He thought it preferable to begin by discussing questions on the agenda which were much more important than that of the admission of observers. As regards the latter, he agreed with the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. that it would be preferable to discuss the matter when examining the more general question of the attendance of observers from extra-European countries and international organizations.

The Chairman thought there had been time for all opinions to be expressed. He would be glad if henceforth only new points, if any, were raised.

(RD Doc. No 15-E)
(MAR Doc. No 17-E)

The Delegate of Switzerland argued that it would be out of order to proceed to a vote on the question under discussion on the ground that under paragraph 2 of §1 of the Document annexed to the Additional Protocol the admission of observers was not open to question. The admission of the U.S. Observer was therefore prescribed by the texts of the Atlantic City Conference.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia remarked that time was being wasted in argument. He thought they ought to begin their work by taking the most important items.

The Delegate of France desired to approach the subject from a new angle. He thought that the question had not been thoroughly discussed. The fact was that there was one particular question among European problems - that of the American occupation zone of Germany - which was of interest to the United States. Before the Meeting gave a decision for or against the admission of an American observer, he would like to ask the observer whether it was European or extra-European questions which interested him. The Meeting could then decide with knowledge of the facts. The French point of view was that the United States had an interest in one European question, the question namely of Germany; and in that connection the question arose as to the legal footing on which the observer could be admitted. There might be a further question as to whether he should remain a mere observer in the case of a European problem with which he was directly concerned. But it was too early to raise that question.

The Chairman recognized the importance of the question referred to by the French Delegate. Nevertheless he had decided to proceed to the vote, as numerous points of view had been expressed and the existing differences of interpretations had been clearly brought out. Certain Delegates wishing to speak at this point, the Chairman asked them whether, in view of the fact that the discussion was closed, they desired to submit motions.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought that it was contrary to the Rules of Procedure to proceed to a vote. The Soviet Delegation entered a formal protest against such an infraction of the Rules at the very start. It had already made known its opinion on the participation of observers at a meeting of the Heads of Delegations.

It believed that this question should be considered at the same time as the general question of the admission of observers, and that it should not be dealt with at the present time, unless it was absolutely essential.

The question of the United States zone of Occupation in Germany, raised by the Delegate of France, was of interest to all the countries represented at the Conference; and these countries might be able to solve it without the assistance of the Conference.

{RD Doc. No 15-E}
{MAR Doc. No 17-E}

He requested therefore that the discussion on the matter should be declared closed, and that the meeting should pass to the examination of the other items on the Agenda. He asked for his statement to be reproduced in the Minutes.

The Chairman said that the statement made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. would appear in the Minutes. He pointed out that no Rules of Procedure had yet been adopted. Consequently there was no reason against taking a vote. Any Decisions taken could, in any case, be changed by the Plenary Assembly. The Meeting would therefore pass to the vote.

The Delegate of Bulgaria asked for the text on which they were to vote.

The Chairman answered that the question on which a vote was to be taken was the question of the admission of a United States observer to the meeting of Heads of Delegations. The decision taken would apply only to admission to meetings of Heads of Delegations.

The Delegate of Albania did not understand how the meeting of Heads of Delegations could take a decision before the Plenary Assembly had indicated its attitude on the subject.

The Chairman said that the United States observer could undoubtedly be represented at any meetings of the Conference, since that was in accordance with the Document annexed to the Atlantic City Additional Protocol.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. wished to ask the Secretary General of the Union two questions:

- 1) Was there any precedent for an observer being admitted to a meeting of Heads of Delegations?
- 2) Was it legal for an observer to be admitted to such a meeting, i.e., was the meeting of a private or public nature?

Mr. Gross, Assistant Secretary-General of the Union, replied on behalf of Dr. von Ernst, Secretary-General of the Union, who was detained at Berne. He referred the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. to the Atlantic City text, page 324, § 2, where the position of extra-European countries vis-à-vis the present Conference was defined beyond any possible doubt, and also to page 330, § 12, where it was stated that "The Conference shall adopt its own Rules of Procedure". The Delegate of France had pointed out the difference in status between observers and delegates. It was clear that observers did not have the right to vote. On the other hand, the Conference was free to take whatever decision it thought fit as regards their admission.

(RD Doc. No 15-E)
(MAR Doc. No 17-E)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that there still remained two questions which had not been answered, viz. 1) what procedure had been followed at previous meetings of the Union (for example, at Atlantic City), and 2) were meetings of Heads of Delegations public or private? If they were public, what was the difference between them and Plenary Assemblies?

Mr. Gross replied that he would answer as precisely as possible.

- 1) He knew of no precedent for the admission of observers to a meeting of Heads of Delegations.
- 2) He was of the opinion that such a meeting was private.

The Chairman then proceeded to a vote on the Irish Proposal, as modified during the discussions.

A vote was then taken, with the following result:

In favour of the admission of a United States observer:

13 Delegations.

(Austria, Belgium, Vatican City, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Monaco, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, Sweden and Turkey).

Against the admission of a United States observer: 9 Delegations.

(Albania, Byelo-Russia, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R.)

Four Delegations (France, Iceland, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia and Switzerland) abstained.

The Delegate of Iceland said that the Head of his Delegation had been detained at Geneva, and he did not feel authorised to take a decision in his absence.

The Delegate of France wished to explain the reason for his abstention, and asked for his explanation to be inserted in the Minutes. He considered that the vote should not have been taken after the statement made by the Assistant Secretary-General of the Union. In his estimation, the meeting should have followed his proposal to hear the observer from the United States first of all, so as to determine whether his participation was in fact in the European interest. If this had been done, it would have been possible to take a clear decision.

The Delegate of Switzerland explained that he had abstained for reasons which he had already made known. In his opinion, the observer from the United States should have been admitted without further question.

RD (Doc. No. 15-E)
MARR (Doc. No. 17-E)

The Chairman said that these two statements would be inserted in the Minutes.

The Delegate from the USSR considered that the taking of a vote at all was incorrect, and the decision had been taken by a small majority. He reserved the Delegation's right to raise the question again.

The Chairman said that this statement would be included in the Minutes.

The Meeting then adjourned until 3.p.m.

The Chairman declared open the discussion on Item 2 of the Agenda (Establishment of Committees).

As no one asked for the floor, the Committees were considered established as set out in Document No. RD 2, subject to the word "drafting" being replaced by "preparation" in the Terms of Reference of the Organisation Committee.

Discussion was then opened on Item 3 of the Agenda (Election of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen for the Committees of the Broadcasting Conference).

Replying to a question by the Delegate of Italy, the Chairman explained that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference would fulfil identical roles on the Executive Committee, and that the members of the latter Committee would be the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of all the other Committees.

As no objections were raised, the Chairman took it that the countries named in the confidential document drawn up by the Danish Administration were prepared to accept the duties of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees of the Broadcasting Conference in accordance with the proposal, and he thanked them.

The meeting then passed to Item 4 of the Agenda (Linguistic Arrangements).

The Chairman repeated the information which he had given on the subject at the previous day's meeting.

Replying to a question by the Delegate of the USSR, the Chairman said that it was obvious that all the countries which wished to take part in the work of a Committee would be able to apply for membership, with the exception of the Executive Committee, the membership of which would be in accordance with Document No. RD 2. The general custom was for countries to stipulate during the first Plenary Assembly, which committees they wished to join. He did not, however, think it desirable to fix a time limit for applications.

The Delegate of the USSR was satisfied with the Chairman's explanations, but he did not believe it would be possible to prepare a clear plan of work or solve the questions of organisation, such as the number and duties of the Committees, until the Final Report of the Preparatory Committee of Eight Countries had been examined.

The Report in question would, therefore, have to be examined at the first Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman agreed that the Final Report from Brussels must serve as a basis for the discussions of the Conference, and more particularly as a basis of discussion for the Committees which would have to deal with the subjects mentioned in the Report. The Report had been sent to all Administrations, and should therefore be known to all. If that was not so, no useful purpose would be served by examining it in Plenary Assembly.

None of these questions, he added, appeared on the Agenda.

The Delegate of Albania said that the Brussels Report had not reached his country, and there were probably other countries which had not received it. He accordingly supported the proposal of the USSR.

Mr. Corteil, Chairman of the Preparatory Committee of the Eight Countries, replying to the Chairman's request, said that the Committee of Eight Countries had finished its work on June 9th, and that fifty documents (including copies of the Final Report and copies of each of the two preliminary draft plans) had been sent to the Berne Bureau on June 11th. The Berne Bureau should have dealt with their distribution to the thirty-three countries concerned. On the same day he himself as Chairman of the Committee of Eight Countries had sent a copy of this same document to each of the thirty-three countries direct by registered post and by air mail.

The Chairman observed that the documents had clearly been sent in good time and by the most rapid means. If certain Delegations had not received them, the Secretariat would distribute them at the earliest opportunity and at the latest by Saturday morning.

He again noted that the subject under discussion was not within the jurisdiction of the meeting of Heads of Delegations, and proposed accordingly to turn to the next Item on the Agenda.

The Delegate of Roumania said that his country had not received the Brussels report. He thought, therefore, that it was important to have knowledge of this document before discussing other questions.

The Chairman considered that all the remarks which had just been made were in fact reservations which could be presented to the Plenary Assembly.

The consideration of the Final Report from Brussels could not influence the remainder of the discussion. If it became apparent that the examination of this document might involve modification of a decision already taken, the modification was a matter for the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of the USSR gathered that no agenda had been prepared, and he proposed accordingly that an emergency Agenda should be drawn up as quickly as possible, for the First Plenary Assembly with the examination of the Brussels Report as the main item. It had been seen that at least two countries had not received the Report. The principal objective of the Conference was to prepare a plan. The Committee of Eight had appealed to experts, and the Conference could not ignore their appeal. If the Plenary Assembly did not start by examining their work, that would be tantamount to ignoring it, and would create an unfortunate precedent, and prolong the work of the Conference. To entrust this examination to the Committees of the Conference would amount to saying that the Committee of Eight Countries had only studied questions of secondary importance.

The Soviet Delegation therefore proposed that discussion on the following items on the Agenda should be adjourned, and that the Conference should start preparing a new Agenda for the Plenary Assembly immediately, the most important item on such Agenda being the examination of the Brussels documents.

The Chairman reverted to the first statement made by the Delegate of the USSR. There was indeed an Agenda, since everyone had accepted it, and the Assembly was following it. Furthermore, he had never intended to minimise the importance of the work accomplished at Brussels - quite the reverse.

But the purpose of the meeting was to work out methods and to prepare for future work. The Plenary Assembly would take the decisions. Its Agenda would have to be drawn up but discussion on that point could not begin until Item No. 9 (Miscellaneous) of the present Agenda was reached. Items 2, 3 and 4 of the present Agenda having already been dealt with, he proposed to pass to Item 5.

The Delegate of the USSR protested against the manner in which the meeting was developing. The normal rules had been infringed; and he had already been obliged to protest that morning at a similar case, when he had asked for permission to speak and had not been granted it. If his proposal, which had been supported by other Delegates, was not discussed, that would in his opinion be a violation of the normal rules of all international conferences.

The Chairman said that in striving to ensure that the debate was conducted according to the approved Agenda, he was, in fact, following the normal Rules of Procedure. It was not within his power to amend an Agenda which had been duly approved. Furthermore, subjects not provided for could be discussed under Item 9 (Miscellaneous). But examination of the Brussels Report was clearly within the competence of the present meeting.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia asked the Chairman when the Agenda had been adopted.

RD (Doc. No. 15-E)
MHR (Doc. No. 17-E)

The Chairman replied that at the previous day's meeting no objection to the Agenda had been raised, and it had been decided to carry it over in full (except Item 1 which had been dealt with) to the present day's meeting.

The Delegate of France, supported by the Delegate of the Vatican City, suggested that in the interests of shortening the discussion the Chairman might find it expedient to insert there and then in the Agenda of the first Plenary meeting the study of the conclusions reached by the Committee of Eight Countries. No contrary opinion being expressed, the Chairman said that this would be done.

The Delegate of Bielorussia supported the Soviet view that the examination of the Brussels Report would accelerate the work. The USSR supported by several other countries, had made a proposal; it should be discussed unless there were any valid reasons for setting it aside.

The Chairman reminded the Delegate of Bielorussia that it had just been decided that the first Plenary Assembly would examine the Brussels Report. Was that solution satisfactory to him?

The Delegate of Bulgaria replied that he supported the Soviet point of view. The day before his departure he had not received these important documents. On the way to Brussels he had learned that two alternative proposals had been submitted. That was an important point calling for study.

In opposition to all democratic practice he had been refused permission to speak on two distinct occasions; and he could only regret that time had been lost on secondary matters (such as the admission of observers) to the exclusion of fundamental subjects.

The Chairman said that he had never intended to refuse the Delegate of Bulgaria permission to speak; but it was possible that the latter's request had passed unnoticed.

The proposal made by France, and supported by other countries, had not met with any objections, and had therefore been accepted.

The Delegate of the USSR submitted an additional proposal relating to working methods and to the Agenda of subsequent meetings.

He proposed that the first Plenary Assembly should take the Brussels Report on Monday morning. Delegates would obtain the information they required on matters which concerned them. On Monday afternoon the Maritime Conference would hold its first Plenary Meeting. The Heads of Delegations on the Broadcasting Conference would meanwhile continue the study of the draft Rules of Procedure, until agreement was reached. That would give Delegates time to study the plans and reports from the various countries, and they could then debate, having been fully briefed, without loss of time.

RD (Doc. No. 15-E)
MHR (Doc. No. 17-E)

The meeting then adjourned at 5. p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that his point of view was that there was no reason for discussing the Report of the Committee of Eight at the first Plenary Assembly. Discussion of the Report in question was precisely the task for which the present Conference had been convened. He proposed that the Agenda agreed for the present meeting should be completed, and that a decision should then be taken as to the rules and methods to be laid down for the efficient conduct of the work.

The Chairman said that the Delegate of the USSR had proposed a meeting of Heads of Delegations on Monday afternoon, while the first Plenary Assembly of the Maritime Conference was proceeding. Discussion of the Report of the Committee of Eight could not begin before the Rules of Procedure were settled. He suggested a procedure similar to that adopted at Atlantic City, where in view of certain difficulties provisional Rules of Procedure had been adopted, which had subsequently been made final after the difficulties had been overcome. He therefore proposed that provisional Rules of Procedure should be adopted, and that discussion of the Agenda should then be continued, in accordance with the suggestion of the Delegate of the United Kingdom.

The Delegate of the USSR said that it had already been decided that the Report of the Committee of Eight would be studied at the first Plenary Assembly. That question was settled; but there might still be difficulties in the fact that some Delegations had not received this Report, while others had not had time to study it. It would be advisable to make it possible for this report to be studied as soon as possible. He suggested that the Agenda of the first Plenary Assembly should contain one item only viz- Discussion of the Report of the Committee of Eight, and that the Monday afternoon meeting of Heads of Delegations should deal with questions of internal organisation. His proposal was made in reply to the proposal of the United Kingdom, which was based on a misunderstanding.

The Delegate of Belgium, supported by the Delegates of the Netherlands and Italy, did not agree to the proposal that the Heads of Delegations and the Plenary Assembly of the Maritime Conference should meet simultaneously on the Monday afternoon, as certain Heads of Delegations had a direct interest in the Maritime Conference and could not be in two places at once. On the other hand, Rules of Procedure, even if they were only temporary rules, would have to be adopted before any discussion was possible.

The Chairman at this point welcomed the Delegate of Egypt, who also represented Syria. His arrival brought the number of countries represented up to 28 of the thirty-three countries of the European area.

The Delegate of the USSR, presumed that, if the two meetings in question could not sit at the same time, they could take place one after the other.

(Doc. No. 15-E)
(Doc. No. 17-E)

The Chairman thought that the Conference should decide if it could discuss the Report of the Committee of Eight before having any Rules of Procedure. In order to be democratic, and not waste time, he proposed to take a vote by a show of hands on the two following questions:

Who is in favour of discussing Rules of Procedure, provisional or other, on the following day?

Who is in favour of discussing the Report of the Committee of Eight at the first Plenary Assembly without Rules of Procedure?

The Delegate of the USSR said that his proposal had been to take the Report of the Committee of Eight on the Monday, to put questions and to receive answers, but not to discuss it, since there would be no Rules of Procedure. He had no objection to the Rules of Procedure and working methods being discussed on the Saturday morning; but he recalled that the Chairman had said that there would be no work on Saturday. He proposed that the Conference should work on the Saturday or the Sunday.

The Chairman replied that it was true meetings were not generally held on Saturdays; but it might be necessary to continue working on both the Saturday and perhaps the Sunday, so as to finish the preliminary work before Monday's Plenary Assembly. He therefore proposed that Items 5 to 9 on the Agenda should be discussed on the Saturday.

The Delegate of Bulgaria, supported by the Delegate of Albania did not consider that the Conference should meet on either Saturday or Sunday. The object of his proposal was to give Delegates time to study the documents, and enable them to listen with profit to the statement which Mr. Corteil would make on the Monday. He proposed accordingly that the meeting adjourn until the Monday afternoon.

The Delegate of Roumania also supported the Bulgarian proposal. He asked the Secretary when it would be possible to have the Report of the Committee of Eight.

The Secretary-in-Chief said that the stencils of the Report of the Committee of Eight and the two variants of the plan (Brussels Documents Nos. 284, 279 and 281) had been brought to Copenhagen by Mr. Corteil. Copies of the Report would be in the pigeon-holes in the course of Saturday.

The Chairman requested Delegates who had not received the Report of the Committee of Eight to raise their hands. The following Delegates did so: Bulgaria, Switzerland, Albania, Roumania, the Ukraine, Iceland and Egypt. Copies were available for all of these.

(Doc. No. 15-E)
(Doc. No. 17-E)

The Delegate of France wondered how it would be possible to take a vote after the discussion on the Report of the Committee of Eight in the absence of any Rules of Procedure. He might have made the point that morning that the vote taken was open to dispute. The same thing might occur again as long as there were no Rules of Procedure, or provisional Rules of Procedure.

The Delegate of the USSR supported the proposal made by the Delegate of Bulgaria that the discussion should be adjourned immediately. The Delegate of France had not understood fully the proposal of the USSR. The USSR did not want to discuss the Report of the Committee of Eight, but merely to examine it. The discussion would follow, when the Rules of Procedure had been adopted.

The Chairman reviewed the different proposals made for the next meeting of Heads of Delegations, and put the matter to the Meeting. The Meeting decided to meet at 10.00 a.m. on the Saturday, and examine Items Nos. 5 to 9 on the Agenda.

The Delegate of Bulgaria said that his own proposal that the meeting should rise and meet again on Monday was the only proposal which should have been put to the meeting, since it was the only one which had been made officially.

The Chairman said that the Bulgarian proposal was not the only one submitted. There was also the Belgian proposal, seconded by the Netherlands, and by Italy, for the adoption of Rules of Procedure before proceeding to the discussion of any matter.

The Delegate of Roumania was sorry that a decision should have been taken on the Saturday. He would not be in a position to play an active and constructive part in preparing the Rules of Procedure and the Working Methods, as he would not have had the time to study the documents published on the subject. A full knowledge of the Report of the Committee of Eight was also necessary, and he had not received it.

The Chairman again affirmed that he wished at all times to make use of democratic methods, and he had taken the opinion of the majority as to meeting at 10.00 a.m. on the Saturday. To save time, he proposed to have recourse to simultaneous interpretation at the meeting, if no objections were raised. There being no objections, he added that the meeting would take place in Room 17 which contained simultaneous interpretation equipment. The meeting in Room 17 would be without prejudice to the decisions of the Conference in the matter of the use of languages.

The meeting rose at 7.00 p.m.

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------------|
| | Seen: | Seen: |
| V. Meyer | | N.E. Holmblad |
| H. Voutaz | W.F. Studer | |
| J. Revoy | Secretary-in- Chief. | Chairman. |

EGYPT

The Chairman
of the European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
Copenhagen.

Dear Sir,

We have noticed among the items in the order of the day, document RD no 9 - E dated 24 June for the Heads of Delegations meeting on the 25th June under item 8, "The admission of the State of Israel".

According to article "1" of the document annexed to the additional protocol to the acts of the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City, such procedure of admission is only applicable to countries; which is not the case in the so called State of Israel.

For this reason, the Egyptian Delegation strongly protests against the insertion of this item on the agenda and in the meantime would like to make it clear that the Egyptian Government will be obliged to withdraw from the Conference if the so called State of Israel is admitted.

The Egyptian Delegation shall be much obliged if this can be circulated to the members of the Conference.

Delegation of Egypt.

Ibrahim Hamed Saleh

Anis El Bardai

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document n° 17-E

June 29, 1948

Submitted in: English

SYRIA.

The Chairman

of the European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
Copenhagen.

Dear Sir,

We have noticed among the items in the order of the day, document RD no 9 - E dated 24 June for the Heads of Delegations meeting on the 25th June under item 8, "The admission of the State of Israel".

According to article "1" of the document annexed to the additional protocol to the acts of the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City, such procedure of admission is only applicable to countries; which is not the case in the so called State of Israel.

For this reason, the Syrian Delegation strongly protests against the insertion of this item on the agenda and in the meantime would like to make it clear that the Syrian Government will be obliged to withdraw from the Conference if the so called State of Israel is admitted.

The Syrian Delegation shall be much obliged if this can be circulated to the members of the Conference.

Delegation of Syria

Ibrahim Hamed Saleh
Anis El Bardai



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 18

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 25 - Corrections to Document No. 18
- Document No. 109 - Amendments to Document No. 18

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference

København, 1948.

RD Document No. 18 - E

29 June 1948

Original : French.

Minutes of the Meeting
of Heads of Delegations

3rd Meeting

Saturday 26 June 1948.

The meeting was opened at 10 a.m., under the Chairmanship of Mr. Holmblad, Head of the Danish Delegation, who gave some explanations on the working of the simultaneous interpretation apparatus.

Approval of the Minutes of the first Meeting, (Document RD No.10) which has been distributed, was left to a later meeting.

The Chairman recalled that, according to the decision of the First Meeting, they had to discuss that day Items 5 to 9 of the Agenda appearing in Document RD No.9.

He passed immediately to Item 5 of the Agenda (Rules of Procedure), a draft of which had been prepared by the Danish Government and appeared in Document RD No.4. The Chairman proposed to read it Rule by Rule, so that Delegations could make their comments as it was read.

A proposal had been made by the Italian Delegation to add to paragraph 3 of Rule 1 ("Definitions") a second sentence as follows :

"Each Delegation may include a certain number of representatives of recognized broadcasting organizations".

The United States Observer thought it would be preferable to stop at paragraph 1, which included the definition of "Delegation", before dealing with paragraph 3. He was of the opinion that paragraph 1 should be made to conform to the definition in Annex 2 of the Atlantic City Convention (page 53 of the Acts).

The Chairman pointed out that the Danish Administration had taken as a basis for the preparation of these Draft Rules of Procedure, not only the Acts of Atlantic City, but also the Rules of Procedure previously used at the Conferences of Lucerne and Montreux, and to some extent, The Rules of Procedure of the Committee of Eight Countries at Brussels.

(- RD 18 - E -)

The United States Observer thought the definition in paragraph 1 should be made to conform to the Atlantic City Convention. The United States Government had sent a delegation to Copenhagen, although it was only an observer.

The Delegate of Italy agreed with the United States Observer; but he thought that the addition to paragraph 3, which he had proposed, was adequate.

The Chairman wondered whether paragraph 1 should be modified to include observers in the definition of "Delegation".. He thought that there could be no objection to that, as Rule 17 stated that only the representatives of the European Area were to take part in voting, and Rule 5, paragraph 1 (Presentation of Credentials), was concerned only with Delegations of the European Area. (TR 5/R 11)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought that the Conference was of a distinctly European character and that the definition of the word "Delegation" in Doc. RD No.4 should not be altered in any way. Giving this word a wider sense would mean going farther in the wrong direction which had been taken on the previous day.

The Delegate of Roumania agreed with the U.S.S.R. Delegate. He added that, by virtue of the document annexed to the Additional Protocol of Atlantic City, observers were permitted to speak on any question affecting the interests of the radio services of their country. But the discussion in course concerned the rules of procedure by which the interests of the United States were in no way affected.

The Observer of the United States replied that, in its capacity as an occupying power in a zone of Germany, his country had an interest in the present Conference.

The Delegate of France then stated that this was the very declaration he had been asking for on the previous day. The United States were interested in the work of the Conference not as an extra-European power, but by the same right as the U.S.S.R.; the United Kingdom and France as occupying powers in Germany. The U.S.A. Observer had thus replied to a question which in his (the French Delegate's) opinion should have been put to him a long time ago.

The Delegate of Bulgaria recalled one of his former statements to the effect that all European countries were interested in the question of the occupation of Germany. The Conference had been convened in order that cultural questions concerning the peoples of Europe might be discussed. The cultural questions relating to the people of Germany should therefore be settled by the coordinated endeavour of the four occupying powers. The procedure adopted hitherto had tolerated an unjustified interference of the United States in European home affairs. He maintained, therefore, that the Roumanian Delegation was right in its recent assertion that there was no reason why the U.S.A. Observer should be heard. The discussions of the Conference should, in fact, not be in any way influenced by the comments of an observer.

(- RD 18 - E -)

The Chairman could not declare himself in agreement with the Bulgarian Delegation. The Conference must act in accordance with the document attached to the Additional Protocol of Atlantic City, under the provisions of which any observer was entitled to speak on any question which in his opinion affected the interests of the radio services of his country.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked the U.S.A. Observer the following questions :

Did he represent the United States or the American Zone of occupation in Germany?

Were his powers delegated him by the Government of the United States or by the Administration of the American Zone of occupation ?

The Observer of the United States replied that he represented both the United States Government and the department of his Government entrusted with the administration of the American Zone of occupation in Germany, and he was accredited by both sides.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was of opinion that, as the Observer of the United States represented the American Zone of occupation in Germany, the question of the representatives of the zones of occupation should be considered as a whole. The meeting however had the representative of one zone of occupation only, and it was not possible to settle the problem of the representation of the zones of occupation in favour of the United States alone. The question should therefore be the object of closer examination.

(TR 7/R 11)

The Chairman thought the time had not yet come to approach that problem, which was likely to give rise to long discussion. Would the Observer of the United States agree to the discussion on his proposal being temporarily adjourned, on the understanding that it would be examined later on, at a Plenary Meeting for instance?

The United States Observer agreed with the Chairman's proposal, but added that, the United States having been invited to send observers, he was present, in that capacity, and that he had a right to attend all meetings.

The Chairman noted the U.S. Observer's agreement with his proposal. Had Delegates any further observations to make on article 1 of the draft Rules of Procedure?

The U.S.S.R. delegate contested the Chairman's observations as to the representation of the occupation zones in Germany. The delegates present represented their Governments. He himself represented the U.S.S.R. Government. He had no powers regarding the U.S.S.R. occupation zone in Germany. The U.S.S.R. Government thought that the only legal representatives of the occupation zones were the representatives of the Allied Control Commission.

(RD. 18-E)

The Chairman again invited delegates to proceed to the study of paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the draft Rules of Procedure, and to postpone momentarily the discussion regarding the occupation zones on the understanding that it would be taken up later.

The Delegate of France agreed to the question being adjourned till a later session, provided always, it was dealt with as soon as possible, as it was likely to lead to differences of opinion. He added that in any case the terms "European zone" should be maintained in Article 1, 1st paragraph of the draft Rules of Procedure.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. wished to continue the discussion on the paragraph.

(Tr 2/R 11)

The United States Observer had proposed to give a wider interpretation to the definition of the term "delegation". That would lead to the consideration of the question of the representatives of the occupation zones in Germany as a whole.

They could not carry on their work passing from one subject to another. He added, at the request of the Chairman, that paragraph 1 could be made clearer, if it was expressly stipulated that it related to the European "broadcasting" area.

The Chairman thought that the amendment proposed was acceptable; but he again declared that the discussion of the important problem of the representation of the occupation zones in Germany should be postponed: otherwise, the Draft Rules of Procedure could not be prepared for Monday. The question of the occupation zones could be referred to a special Committee, such as the Organisation Committee.

The United States Observer expressed his complete agreement with the chairman.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. could not agree with this point of view. The outstanding question was of a juridical nature and could not be left unsolved. It should be examined in all its bearings.

The Delegate of Albania observed that no peace treaty having been signed with Germany, that country was not included in the 33 European countries invited to the Conference. He agreed with the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. that the only authority entitled to discuss the interests of Germany was the Allied Control Commission.

The Delegate of Italy wished to state, in paragraph 1 of Article 1, that the "European area" is as defined in No 107 of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations.

The Chairman did not see any objection to the proposed addition.

The United States Observer thought there was no reason, at the moment, for adding anything at all to Article 1, since it seemed that the majority of Delegates were for postponing the discussion of it.

The Delegate of Bulgaria repeated that he agreed at all points with the U.S.S.R. Delegate as to the present Conference not concerning any but the European countries, and as to the necessity of the question of the zones of occupation being treated as a whole, if it was desired to continue the work without defining the word "Delegation" first.

(RD. 18-E)

The Delegate of France, seconded by the Delegate of the United Kingdom, submitted two concrete proposals in the following terms:

1. The definition of the word "Delegation" in the Draft Regulations to be approved provisionally, taking into account the amendments submitted by the U.S.S.R. and Italy.
2. The date for discussing the representation of the zones of occupation to be fixed as soon as possible, whether such discussion takes place in a plenary meeting or at a sitting of a limited semi-official group.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed that, with a view to clearing up a situation which he could only describe as "delicate", the United States observer should be considered simply as representing the United States Government. In that capacity, he admitted, the United States observer was entitled to take part in all meetings of the Conference; but he was opposed to the presence (except where indispensable) of the representative of any other country, or of experts, at meetings of Heads of Delegations of the European countries. The United States observer had made it perfectly clear that he also represented the American zone of occupation in Germany. The U.S.S.R. Delegation accordingly considered that it was impossible to pass to any other question without first settling that matter.

The United States observer repeated that he represented both the United States Government and that part of the United States administration which was concerned with the American zone of occupation in Germany.

The Chairman suggested, with a view to shortening the discussion, that the Conference should adopt the French Delegate's proposal, and approve provisionally paragraph 1 of Article 1, on the understanding that a Committee composed of the countries directly interested in the question of the zones of occupation should decide the question as soon as possible. In the case of similar delicate issues at Atlantic City similar action had been found of value.

The Delegate of Albania said that in his opinion, as at present advised, the United States observer only represented a non-European country at the Conference.

The Delegate of Czecho-Slovakia, speaking as the representative of a country bordering on Germany, said that he was in agreement with the U.S.S.R. on the subject of Germany.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that his country too had vital interests in Germany; but, in order to save time, he agreed with the Chairman's proposal to pass to the next item on the Agenda.

The Delegate of Roumania found the arguments put forward by the Albanian and Czechoslovak Delegations irrefutable. He was further of opinion that it was not possible for the Conference to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion of their labours without having a general view of the results of the work of the Committee of Eight. Those questions which were of a general character should be discussed first. Otherwise there was a danger of all their decisions being of a provisional character. He accordingly proposed the adjournment of the meeting.

The Delegate of Bulgaria supported the proposal to adjourn the meeting until the following Monday afternoon in view of the difficulties encountered. In the meanwhile Delegations would have time to study and discuss the documents. The first question to be solved was that of the representatives of the zones of occupation in Germany. He repeated his proposal to adjourn.

The Chairman said that all the observations hitherto had been of the same nature as those which had led up to the vote of the day before. But the absence of any Rules of Procedure rendered his own position difficult, and he hoped Delegates would not add to the difficulties of his task. He did not think questions of substance should be discussed at the present meeting.

The Delegate of France sought for common ground between the different opinions that had been expressed. The conflict between them was in his opinion only apparent. There should be some means of reconciling them if, as the Albanian Delegate had suggested, the United States Observer was considered as the representative of his Government only. The question of the zones of occupation in Germany could be taken up later.

(Tr 11/R 11)

The Observer of the United States declared himself in agreement with the French Delegate on that point. He was of the opinion that, in order to gain time and in view of the fact that numerous Delegations wished the meeting to be adjourned, a vote should be taken.

The Chairman agreed that this would be the correct procedure, but he felt handicapped by the lack of Rules of Procedure, and he proposed, if there was no objection to continue the discussion.

The Delegate of Roumania said that the French proposal treated the U.S.A. Observer as the representative of an Extra-European country. Under the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention he was therefore not entitled to speak except when the questions dealt with affected the United States radio services. As, however, the present discussion arose out of his own intervention, he should, if he shared the French Delegate's point of view, recall his former declaration.

The Delegate of Albania supported the Roumanian Delegate's proposal to adjourn the Meeting to the following Monday. He thought it possible to work without Rules of Procedure. The Atlantic City Regulations provided automatic rules of procedure.

The United States Observer again declared that he agreed with the French Delegate as to continuing the discussion after first provisionally adopting Rule I with its amendments.

The Chairman agreed to put the question to the vote. Delegations in favour of the Meeting being adjourned to the following Monday to reply "Yes"; those to the contrary, "No".

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. desired to make a statement before the vote. In his opinion there were but two solutions:

either an adjournment of the Meeting, as proposed by the Delegate of Bulgaria, or an immediate settlement of the question regarding the representatives of the zones of occupation. The representative of the Secretary General of the I.T.U. had declared on the previous day that the meetings of Heads of Delegations were private meetings; and yet, although no decision had been come to with regard to the zones of occupation, the representative of a zone of occupation in Germany was present at the day's Meeting. This situation was a direct infringement of the provisions under which their work was to be carried on, and it was not possible to go on working in these conditions.

The Chairman read a telegram received by the Danish Government to the effect that the French Delegation was accredited to represent the French Zone of occupation in Germany as well as the French Government.

The Delegate of France acknowledged the accuracy of the Chairman's statement; but he did not consider that it affected the major issue. He intended to define the exact position of the French Delegation as and when the question of the representatives of the zones of occupation in Germany came under discussion.

The Delegate of Albania regretted that the Governments of the United States and of France should have taken an initiative which he considered illegal. He again referred Delegates to the Atlantic City text, and maintained that the Meeting had Rules of Procedure, since the text in question had been used to justify the automatic admittance of a United States Observer.

(Tr 7/R 11)

The Chairman replied to the Delegate of Albania that there was no connection between the document annexed to the Additional Protocol and the other Atlantic City texts; the first alone laid down special directives for the present Conference.

A vote was then taken on the questions previously put forward. It gave the following results:

In favour of deferring the meeting until Monday: 8 Delegations (Albania, Bielorussia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Ukraine, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Against: 16 Delegations (Austria, Belgium, Vatican City, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Monaco, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey).

Abstentions.: 4 Delegations (Egypt, Finland, Iceland, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia).

Absent: 5 Delegations (Greece, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Republic of Poland, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia).

The Chairman regretted that the Assembly had lost precious time, and that fundamental issues had been raised in connection with the discussion. The result of the vote had borne out, he thought, his opinion. The meeting would resume at 2 p.m.; and, if it could not finish that evening, the Plenary Assembly planned for Monday would have to be postponed.

The meeting rose at 12. 15 p.m.

(Tr 5/R 11)

(RD. 18-E)

The meeting resumed at 2. 15 p.m.

The Chairman put the "Draft Rules of Procedure of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference" for discussion, at the same time recalling that paragraph 1 of Rule 1 had already been approved, with certain modifications which would be taken into account.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. insisted on further reference to paragraph 1. He asked the Representative of the Secretary-General of the I.T.U. to reply to the question whether he considered the presence of a Representative of an occupation zone of Germany legal?

The Representative of the Secretary-General of the I.T.U. took it that a vote had already settled the question of the presence of an Observer from the United States Government. On the other hand, as there was not one Representative only of the occupation zones of Germany, but two, viz. the United States and France, as the morning's meeting had been informed, he thought that the Soviet Delegate's question should be more precise.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. recalled the statement of Mr. Burton, to the effect that he was present both as an Observer from the American Government and as Representative of the American occupation zone. He asked for a direct reply to his question.

The Representative of the Secretary-General answered as follows: "The question of the legality of the presence of observers of two occupying Powers has not yet been settled either by the Meeting of the Heads of Delegations or by the Plenary Assembly. Consequently, these zones have not yet the right to be present at these meetings, as they do not appear in the list of 33 countries in the Protocol of Atlantic City, nor are they extra-European countries covered by paragraph 2, page 324. I give you my opinion for what it is worth on this point. From my statement it may be taken that their presence is illegal, so far as the representation of occupation zones in Germany is concerned, inasmuch as the question of such representation still awaits solution."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. replying to the Chairman's question as to whether his objection applied to the two observers of the two occupation zones represented, said that they had to settle the matter of principle - particularly as France had not confirmed her status as Representative of the French occupation zone of Germany.

The Chairman stated that he had in his possession an official document to witness that the French Delegate represented the French occupation zone of Germany as well as the French Government.

Continuing, he invited the United States and France to facilitate the effective consideration of the Rules of Procedure by surrendering their mandates as observers of their respective occupation zones of Germany, as far as the present debate was concerned, until the matter of principle had been settled by the Conference itself.

The Delegate of France recalled that Mr. Meyer in his speech that morning had indicated his intention to reserve the position of France in the matter. The Chairman's proposal was perfectly compatible with what Mr. Meyer had said in the morning.

(RD 18-E)

The United States Observer said that he did not represent any occupation zone of Germany. He represented the Government of the United States of America.

The Chairman observed that these declarations meant that no one was representing occupation zones of Germany, and they could now therefore proceed with the consideration of the Rules of Procedure. That was the decision of the Chair.

The Delegate of Roumania, reverting to the previous question, said that the latest declaration of the United States Delegate was the opposite of what had been stated by him in the morning. As for the declaration of France, it lacked precision.

The Chairman recalled the decision which had just been taken. Unless the Bulgarian Delegation was prepared to withdraw their objection, he would be compelled to put the decision to the vote.

The Delegate of Bulgaria repeated that he wished the question of the representation of the zones of occupation by the United States to be cleared up.

The Chairman considered that this discussion had lasted long enough, and he did not wish the subject to be brought up again, as he had already given his decision from the Chair.

The Delegate of Albania supported the declaration of his Bulgarian colleague. He insisted that the renunciation of the United States and of France had not been clearly expressed, and that the powers granted by the Governments of the two countries in question with regard to their respective zones of occupation were illegal.

In reply to a question by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., the Delegate of France again stated that he did not intend, at the present Meeting, to assert his claims as representative of the interests of the French Zone of occupation. The question of the representation of the zones of occupation could not, and should not, be dealt with at the present time. It should however be resolved in due time in accordance with a procedure which had yet to be agreed upon.

The Chairman, considering that the discussion had been protracted too long, asked the Meeting whether anyone had a counter-proposal to make.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. remarked that the Chairman's question had not been put in precise terms. The Chairman's action constituted an infringement of the Rules of Procedure. His proposal was in fact intended to sanction an illegal proceeding, the representative of the General-Secretary having declared illegal the presence at the Meeting of a representative of the American zone of occupation. All these discussions, in his opinion, were a waste of time and an obstacle to the work of the Meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The Chairman, interrupting the speaker, repeated that there were no representatives of zones of occupation in the room. He would now put his proposal regarding the suspension of the discussion on the subject to the vote, in order that the Meeting might proceed to the Agenda.

(M. 18-E)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. emphatically protested against the gross infringement of the Rules of Procedure on the part of the Chairman in interrupting his (the U.S.S.R, Delegate's) declaration.

The Chairman took note of the U.S.S.R. Chief Delegate's remarks.

The Delegate of France expressed the view that the question put to the vote by the Chairman should not give rise to any ambiguity. France deemed it her right to continue being represented at the Meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The Chairman specified that it had been decided in the case of Delegates having a mandate for zones of occupation that they should make no use of their mandates until a later decision was reached. No objection could be raised to the presence of such representatives at the Meeting of the Heads of Delegations. That was the decision of the Chair, on which they were now to vote.

On his name being called, the Delegate of Bielorussia said that the question to be put to the vote was not clear.

The Chairman repeated his proposal.

The Delegate of Roumania asked for the floor on a point of order. He said that the possibility of the United States Observer challenging the present vote after the fact was not excluded. The position of the United States Observer, as the representative of an extra-European country, could not be compared with that of the Delegate of France, a country of the European area. Why complicate matters?

The Delegate of Bulgaria thought for his part that, inasmuch as it had been established that the presence of representatives of zones of occupation in Germany was illegal, it was equally illegal to take a vote on the question.

The Chairman repeated that both the United States Observer and the Delegate of France had stated that they were not taking part in the meeting in the capacity of representatives of zones of occupation.

The Delegate of Albania referred to the statement by the representative of the Secretary-General of the Union on the illegality of the presence of representatives of zones of occupation. Was the representative of the Secretary-General in a position to say whether the powers of the two Governments in question were invalid?

The representative of the Secretary-General answered that the question was one for the Credentials Committee, but only after a decision by the Plenary Assembly as to the admission to the Conference of representatives of zones of occupation.

The Chairman thought the question to be put to the vote could not be put more clearly. He called upon the Secretariat to take the vote.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., interrupting the vote, said he had asked for the floor before the end of the discussion. He wished to make the following statement: "I put a very clear question to the United States and France, to which I have had no reply. If the United States and France say clearly that they do not represent zones of occupation, we should be in entire agreement with the Chairman's proposals."

The Chairman said that the replies to the question of the U.S.S.R. had been given. The United States Observer had said three times over that he was not present at the meeting of Heads of Delegations in his capacity as representative of a zone of occupation. France had made a similar statement in perfectly clear terms.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. read out the notes which he had taken at the time of the United States Delegate's statement. The notes showed that the United States Observer was representing both his Government and the interests of the American zone of occupation in Germany. Consequently, the reply for which he had asked, had not been given up to the present.

The United States Observer undertook to give the Soviet Delegation in writing the text of the statement he had already made three times, in order to preclude any possible error in the translation of it.

The Chairman suspended the meeting accordingly at 3.15 p.m. for a few minutes.

On resuming, the Chairman apologised for the length of the interval which had lasted for over half an hour. He called upon the United States Delegate to read his text, so that it should be clear to all.

The Observer from the United States read the text which had been submitted to the Chairman during the suspension of the meeting:

"The Head of the United States Delegation represents both the United States Government, and that part of the United States Government charged with the administration of the United States Zone in Germany. It is impossible for this meeting of Heads of Delegations to divide the United States Government. The United States Government includes all its parts, whether they be in the United States itself or in Germany."

He repeated that he did not represent Germany or any of its zones of occupation per se.

The Chairman said that the above text was a written reproduction of what had previously been said. The last sentence was the statement which the Head of the Delegation had repeatedly made. He did not represent Germany or any one of its zones of occupation. He asked the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. whether he was now in agreement with the written text.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that, if a vote was taken on the subject of the last phrase of the United States statement, in which the Head of the United States Delegation repeated that he was not the representative of Germany, or of any of its zones - eliminating, that was to say, the first part of the statement - the Soviet Delegation would be satisfied.

The Observer of the United States replied that he was not quite certain what the U.S.S.R. Delegate was still asking, at the very moment when he said that he was satisfied. Was he now in agreement with the written statement?

The Chairman had understood that the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. accepted the end of the United States statement; and that would be inserted in the Minutes of the meeting.

The discussion of definitions was continued.

The Chairman wished to proceed with the study of the Rules of Procedure as quickly as possible.

§ 1 adopted with the amendment's already decided on.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed that, whenever the question of European zones arose in the Rules of Procedure, the words "European Broadcasting areas" should be used.

Adopted.

§ 2 adopted.

§ 3. The Italian Delegation proposed to add a second sentence as follows:

"Each Delegation may include representatives of recognised private broadcasting enterprises, so as to conform with the provisions of Annex 2 of the Atlantic City Convention."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that the question of the allocation of frequencies to broadcasting stations in the European area was a matter for Administrations and not for private agencies.

The Delegate of Italy pointed out that there were numerous representatives of private agencies who formed part of delegations. His proposal was based on the definition of the word "delegation" on pages 53 and 54 of the Annex to the Atlantic City Convention.

The Chairman asked the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. whether he was prepared to support the proposal of the Delegate of Italy.

The Delegate of Italy did not wish to press his amendment. He had simply wished to make the paragraph clearer.

§ 3 adopted in its present form.

§ 4 adopted.

Rules 2, 3 and 4 adopted.

Rule 5, § 1.

The Observer of the United States considered that the long discussion which had taken place regarding § 1 of Rule 1 concerned equally § 1 of Rule 5, and that a final decision should be suspended in the case of both paragraphs.

The Chairman was of the same opinion. All that had been done at the meeting of Heads of Delegations was provisional, pending the final decision, which could only be taken by the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought that the attention of the meeting was too often taken up by interventions by the Delegate of the United States, who did not represent a country of the European area.

The Observer of the United States agreed to proceed with the agenda, if assurance was given him that the question would be taken up again at a subsequent meeting.

Rule 5, § 2. The Delegate of Austria asked whether the Broadcasting Conference was a Conference of Plenipotentiaries or not.

(RD Doc. No. 18-E)

The Chairman stated that the Danish Government had asked each Delegation to present to the Secretariat the necessary credentials giving the authority to sign any Act resulting from the deliberations of the Conference. It was for the Conference itself to decide what credentials should be requested.

The Delegate of Roumania proposed to insert a reference to Rule 17 as follows:

"No Delegation is authorised to vote, in accordance with the provision of Rule 17, unless..."

§ 3 adopted.

§ 4 adopted.

Rule 6. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. considered that the second sentence of the Rule was not clear.

The Chairman observed that the text was in conformity with Rule 4 of the General Regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention.

Rule 6 was adopted in its present form

Rules 7 and 8 adopted.

Rule 9. § 1. On the proposal of the Delegate of Czechoslovakia, which was adopted, § 1 of the Rule was amended to read as follows:

§1. "Committees shall be composed of Delegations from countries in the European Broadcasting area, who have declared their willingness to take part therein."

§ 2 adopted.

Rule 10 adopted.

The Chairman asked Delegations to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible of the names of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of all Committees as well as the names of Rapporteurs of Committees.

Rules 11, 12 and 13 adopted.

Rule 14. § 1. The Delegate of the United Kingdom proposed that the last part of § 1 should read as follows:

"by the Head of the Delegation which submits the proposal or amendment, or by his deputy."

Adopted.

On the proposition of the Delegate of the United Kingdom, which was adopted, the following sentence was added to § 2 :

"If however the Delegation, which submits a proposal or amendment, wishes a copy of the proposal or amendment to be distributed, this shall be done."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. reserved the right to return later to the wording of the paragraph, if possible, before the Plenary Assembly.

§ 3 adopted.

Rule 15, §§ 1 and 2 adopted.

§ 3. On the proposal of the Delegate of the United Kingdom, which was adopted, the following sentence was added to § 3:

"If however the Delegation, which submits a proposal or amendment, wishes a copy of the proposal or amendment to be distributed, this shall be done."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. again reserved the right to return later to the wording of the paragraph, if possible, before the Plenary Assembly.

Rule 16 adopted.

Rule 17, § 1. "The expression "European area" to be replaced by "European broadcasting zone."

§ 2. The Delegate of the United Kingdom considered that the first part of § 2 was not clear. He proposed that any country invited to the Conference, whose Delegation had the right to vote under Rule 17 § 1, should be entitled to delegate to another Delegation with the right to vote the power to vote in its name at any meeting at which it was not present.

The Delegate of Italy pointed out that, if that were done, the right to vote would be accorded to Administrations who were not present; and that was something which the Administrative Council had never accepted in its own case.

In reply to a request for clarification made by the Delegate of France, the Delegate of the United Kingdom cited the case of a Delegation which had to leave the Conference prematurely and which had previously formulated a decision on some question, which was subsequently put to the vote. Such a Delegation should have the opportunity of making known its point of view.

The Chairman drew the attention of the Delegate of the United Kingdom to the text at the top of page 62 in the first page of the Final Acts of Atlantic City. That was word for

(RD Doc. No. 18-E)

word of §2 of Rule 17, which was the matter in hand at that very moment. The Danish Administration had considered it reasonable to take this text as a basis for the Rules of Procedure; and they thought that the same text should be adopted, provided no other question arose necessitating departure from the General Provisions for Conference laid down by the Atlantic City Conference.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. maintained his opinion that the proposed §2 was not worded as it should be, and he reserved the right to revert to the point.

Rule 17 §3. The Delegate of the Vatican City wished to propose an amendment which concerned only the French text.

The Chairman pointed out that the paragraph had been taken word for word from §1 of Rule 16 on page 67 of the first Part of the Acts. The Delegate of the Vatican City did not press his amendment, and the paragraph was adopted as it stood.

§4 and 5 adopted.

§6. The Delegate of the United Kingdom proposed the addition of a new sub-paragraph to paragraph 6, as follows:

"No new delegation shall be admitted to the Conference with the right to vote, unless its admission is supported by at least 2/3 of the votes of the delegations to which §1 of this Rule relates."

That procedure was in conformity with the procedure adopted at Atlantic City.

The Delegate of Egypt supported the U.K. proposal.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that §6 should be drawn up in two parts. The first part should deal with voting on important questions, as for example questions of Rules of Procedure, allocation of frequencies, and the Convention to be drafted. Voting on these questions should require a 2/3 majority. The second part should cover questions for which a simple majority sufficed.

The Delegate of the Vatican City reminded the meeting of the manner in which the question of the 2/3 majority vote had been dealt with at Atlantic City. At that Conference, where the work involved was no less than the complete reconstitution of the Union, the proposed procedure had been confined to two fundamental questions - namely, the admission of new members and the seat of the Union.

The Delegate of Bulgaria proposed that, in view of the great importance of the question, a special Committee should meet to study the matter thoroughly before a decision was taken.

The Delegate of Italy observed that the Rule 17 at present under study was similar to Rule 16 of the General Regulations, without sub-paragraph 5 of the latter.

The Chairman said that there were two questions before the meeting. On the one hand there was the question of the 2/3 majority vote proposed by the United Kingdom as a condition for the admission of new delegations, and by the U.S.S.R. for the solution of unspecified major questions. On the other hand, there was the question raised by the Delegate of Italy. He agreed with the Bulgarian Delegate's suggestion of a small committee to study the voting question. He considered that, inasmuch as the present Conference had no definite Rules of Procedure, the General Regulations, which were in the spirit of the Atlantic City Convention, should be followed.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. agreed with the Chairman and with the Delegate of Bulgaria as to the desirability of setting up a small group, and declared himself willing to participate therein.

The Chairman noted his concurrence, and took it that Rule 17 was as a result provisionally adopted, account being taken of the British amendment. The latter could in fact be incorporated as it stood without discussion, since it was entirely in accordance with the General Regulations of Atlantic City.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. wished his amendment to be likewise adopted, since it concerned a question of principle.

(RD 18-E)

The Delegate of France also considered that a complex question such as that of the 2/3 majority vote should be entrusted to a small group. For his part, he would propose an amendment on the manner of submitting questions which were to be put to the vote, since the results of the voting might depend substantially on this.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom agreed to the meeting of a small group, but wished to make it clear that no new Delegation with the right to vote would be admitted to the Conference before the question of the vote was settled. Subject to that reserve, he considered that Rule 17 could be provisionally adopted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. considered it expedient to set up the working group as soon as possible. He proposed that the Delegations of Denmark, Bulgaria, the United Kingdom, France, and the U.S.S.R., who had taken part in the discussion, should be included in the group, and that it should finish its work by the afternoon of June 29th.

The Delegates of Egypt, the Vatican City, and Albania asked to be admitted to the group.

The Delegate of Roumania said that he also would have liked to take part in the group; but the number of members should not be too large.

The Chairman agreed with the U.S.S.R. representative as to the composition of the working group. Nevertheless, he thought that, since the convening Government was obliged to assume the functions of Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference and of the Executive Committee, according to tradition, it was not right that Denmark should participate in other Committees such as the one in question. He thanked the U.S.S.R. delegate for having proposed Denmark, and suggested, in view of the fact that the first proposal for amendment had been made by the United Kingdom, that the Chairmanship of the Group should be entrusted to the United Kingdom.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom accepted the Chairman's suggestion. A member of his Delegation, other than he himself, would undertake the Chairmanship of the working group.

The Chairman noted that the question had been decided as follows: The working Group to comprise seven members: The United Kingdom (Chairman), Albania, Bulgaria, Vatican City, Egypt, France and the U.S.S.R.. It should, if possible, finish its work by 29 June.

Rule 17 being as a result provisionally adopted, the Chairman noted that few important subjects remained to be dealt with in Document RD 4, and the study of them should not require much time.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. considered that those items which remained unsettled should be referred to the Plenary Assembly on Monday.

The Chairman did not wish the meeting to close before hearing any observations which Heads of Delegations might wish to make before the Plenary Assembly.

(RD 18-E)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. had intended to request that the system of simultaneous interpretation should be extended to cover the Russian language, but the question could be decided later.

The Chairman said that he too had hoped to deal with the question of the Russian language under Rule 21 of the Draft Rules of Procedure before the Plenary Assembly. The Russian language could be used subject to the provisions of Article 15 of the Convention, § 4 (1) and (2).

The Delegate of Bulgaria supported the request of the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. and read out a telegram dated June 12 from his Government:

"In principle the Bulgarian Administration supports the use of the Russian language, basing itself on the fact that the U.S.S.R. is a large country and technically well developed, this being a circumstance favorable to international telecommunications. In addition, the Bulgarian Administration requests that at the Stockholm Conference, as well as at all other conferences where there are numerous Russian-speaking Delegations, these latter may have facilities for expressing their views in Russian, as in the case of the French and English languages."

Mr. Gross, Assistant Secretary-General of the I.T.U., said that in accordance with the provisions of the Atlantic City Conference and in particular those of Article 15, § 4 (1) and (2) simultaneous interpretation had been used at various Conferences, e.g. at Geneva. The Union had drawn up accounts of the expenses incurred in the use of languages other than the normal working languages, and had sent them to the respective Administrations. He cited the example of the Polish Government, which had asked for the use of Polish and had assumed responsibility for the expenses of translation into this language, on the understanding that in exceptional cases it would be possible for the translation to be done orally.

The request submitted by the Russian and Bulgarian Delegations could therefore be considered, subject to the conditions laid down by Article 15 of the Convention.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Gross for his explanations, which required no comment.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. felt it was indispensable that he should define his point of view, since his proposal had not been accepted; but in view of the late hour, he would not press for detailed discussion of the question.

Under the Atlantic City Provisions, the Conference was to adopt its own Rules of Procedure; and the language question was included in those Rules. At the present Conference there were no Spanish-speaking countries, two English-speaking countries, several French-speaking, and several Russian-speaking countries. It was only logical therefore for Russian to be adopted as a working language on an equal footing with English and French; that would conform to the Directives of Atlantic City and would accelerate the work.

(RD 18-E)

The Chairman said that at the first Plenary meeting the simultaneous interpretation would operate as at present - that was to say, from and into English and French, and from French or English into Russian, subject to subsequent definitive provisions in the matter.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said in reply that he would not ask at the present for any further provisions.

The Chairman, noting that there were no further observations on the draft Rules of Procedure, said that the first Plenary Assembly would take place on Monday, June 28, at 10 a.m., and that its Agenda would include, among other items, the examination of the Report of the Committee of Eight Countries.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

Seen:

Seen:

V. Meyer,
H. Voutaz,
J. Revoy,

W.F. Studer,

N. E. Holmblad,

Secretaries

Chief Secretary

Chairman

(TR.4/R.11)

REPORT OF THE WORKING
GROUP ON THE QUESTION OF VOTING

I) ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

2/3 Majority Vote

Although we have the right to establish our own Rules of Procedure, we should, nevertheless, work in the light of the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention, Article 12, Page 15, which stipulates, among other things, the 2/3 majority vote decisions relating to the admission of new members to the Union. (Article 1, Paragraph 2(c) Page 1) It is indeed a very important question, for, in principle, if admission was not subjected to stringent rules, the very composition of the majority of an Assembly might be changed.

Since this question has been considered as being one of primary importance in the World International Union, it is equally essential and even more important for certain countries in the Regional Conference.

Simple Majority

The admission of new members is not a question which in itself presents sufficient importance to be settled by a majority of 2/3. It is important that, in a Regional Agreement, the greatest number of countries disposed to accept and to implement the plan effectively may participate. Therefore, the admission of new members should, on the contrary, be facilitated and the accession of any country accepted which desires to take part in the Conference and which is ready to guarantee the implementation of the plan. This is all the more necessary and easy because this Conference is a purely European one, completely free to decide on its own Rules of Procedure by virtue of the Atlantic City Convention itself (Document annexed to the additional protocol of the Atlantic City Convention Directives for the European Regional Conference, paragraph 12, page 330.) It is quite certain that the admission of new members will not hamper the work of the conference. On the contrary this participation is necessary in order that they may contribute to the preparation of a new list of frequencies which will be more acceptable to all countries.

The admission of countries in the capacity of observers was not discussed

(Follows on Document No. RD 19-E
1 July 1948)

Original: FRENCH.

2) PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF FREQUENCIES

It is understood that the plan in the final form will not be the subject of voting either with a simple or with a 2/3 majority, but that it must be signed unanimously, or semi-unanimously, and thereon ratified and applied accordingly.

However, in the case of preliminary decisions relating to the preparation of the plan, two proposals have been submitted requiring that these decisions be taken respectively:

By 2/3 Majority.

In principle, the preliminary decisions relating to the plan should be unanimous: but if it is impossible to obtain this, they should at least obtain a considerable majority, viz., 2/3 of the vote.

If 2/3 of the votes are not obtained at an initial vote, it will be necessary to study the question more deeply, to improve the text of proposals and to find a more satisfactory formula so as to obtain full mutual understanding and achieve the majority of 2/3.

The 2/3 majority rule applied during the preparation and discussion of the plan is a useful measure for ensuring efficient work in the final drafting and implementation of the plan.

This rule should be applied for all questions not only in Plenary Meetings, but also during the work of committees, sub-committees and working groups. No proposal from these latter should be referable to the Plenary Assembly before it has been accepted by 2/3 majority. In following this procedure, the Plenary Assembly will have a guarantee that time will not be lost in examining half-studied proposals.

By Simple Majority.

The acceptance of a general and rigid use of the 2/3 majority voting procedure would entail both a slowing-up of the work and the risk of undermining it: this would thwart the preparation of any plan whatsoever.

For example, a plan could not be drawn up, either on a 9 kc/s, 10 kc/s, or on any other basis, unless at 2/3 of the votes favoured one of these bases.

It is for this reason that, although a substantial majority should at all times be sought by resorting to reasonable compromises, the 2/3 rule cannot be accepted as a principle: it could indeed result in a minority vote bringing work to a standstill.

Likewise, it is undeniable that even where decisions are taken by a narrow majority, unanimous approval may subsequently be reached during negotiations as a result of modifications in the viewpoints expressed. In the same way, the lodging of reasonable reservations at the time of signing may facilitate the effective implementation of the plan by all the signatories.

In conclusion, the simple majority vote has regularly been used at international conferences, even at those of a technical character. It is difficult to imagine, in particular, how Committees, Sub-Committees, and Working Groups could adapt themselves to any other voting system. Their work would certainly be held up considerably and, even if they were able to draw up texts capable of commanding a $2/3$ majority, it is unlikely that such texts would be confirmed by the Plenary Assembly, since the composition of these groups may be very different from that of the Plenary Assembly, inasmuch as they may consist of a small number of members only.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948.

RD Document No. 19 - E
1 July, 1948.
(Follows on Doc. RD.19-E 30 June)
ORIGINAL: FRENCH.

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE QUESTION OF VOTING

3) RULES OF PROCEDURE

At the Plenary Session of this Conference, decisions have been taken on all the Rules of Procedure with the exception of Rule 17. The Rules of Procedure with this one exception have thereby been adopted and this question should not therefore give rise to any further discussion.

On this subject, the following opinions were expressed:

The rule dealing with acceptance of decisions to be taken by a 2/3 majority cannot be introduced in a Plenary Session, except by a decision taken in the same manner, that is, by a 2/3 majority.

The possible rule for the adoption of a qualified majority of 2/3 cannot be introduced at a Plenary Session, except by a simple majority.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No. 19-E
8 July 1948

Following RD Document No. 19-E
1 July 1948

Original: Russian

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP
ON THE QUESTION OF VOTING

4) CONVENTION

The same arguments were set forth as in the course of the discussion about voting procedure for preparing the plan, and the following two proposals about voting were formulated when discussing voting procedure for preparing the Convention.

By Two-Thirds Majority

When preparing the Convention, preliminary drafts of articles should be adopted unanimously; but when this is not possible they should in any case be approved by a substantial majority of two-thirds.

It is necessary to adopt this procedure owing to the fact that the Convention is a document of which the plan of allocation of frequencies will constitute an integral part. In view of the fact that the voting procedure by a majority of two-thirds is to be applied during the drafting of the frequencies allocation plan, it would be illogical to apply the voting procedure by simple majority during the drafting of the wording of the Convention.

By Simple Majority

The same arguments as in the case of the majority recommended for the preparation of the Frequency Plan (document RD No. 19-E, Item 2)

June 30, 1948

Submitted in: Russian

The Chairman of the Conference
has the honour to communicate the following telegram
received from
the Government of the Latvian S.S.R.
(Translation of the Russian original)

CONFERENCE RIGA
M 93 121 26 2300

NORTHERN

CONFERENCE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EUROPEAN BROADCASTING CONFERENCE
COPENHAGEN

The Government of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic,
possessing a powerful net-work of broadcasting stations capable
of causing interferences in the broadcasting of other countries,
considers it necessary and expresses its desire to participate at
the European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

The Government of the sovereign Latvian S.S.R. trusts that
the delegates of all democratic countries, filled with the desire
for a successful settlement of the questions raised before the
Conference, will unanimously support the invitation to the Conference
of the representatives of the Latvian S.S.R. with the full right
to vote. Being a participant of the Conference of Lucern and
Montreux the Government of the Latvian S.S.R. entertains no doubt
that its representatives will participate at the Copenhagen
Conference.

The Government of the Latvian S.S.R. avails itself of this
opportunity to extend its greetings to all delegates of the
Conference, and its wishes for a successful settlement of the
problems raised.

Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Latvian S.S.R.

P. Valeskaln

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 21-E

June 30, 1948

Submitted in: Russian

The Chairman of the Conference
has the honour to communicate the following telegram
received from
the Government of the Moldavian S.S.R.
(Translation of the Russian original)

CONFERENCE KISHINEV
M 90 117 27 0245

NORTHERN

CONFERENCE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EUROPEAN BROADCASTING CONFERENCE
COPENHAGEN

The Government of the Moldavian Soviet Republic sends its greetings to the European Broadcasting Conference and expresses its assurance, that the Conference will deal successfully with all problems raised before it. Stop. Taking into consideration that the Moldavian S.S.R. disposes of powerful broadcasting radio stations, whose work should be taken into account in the Plan of European broadcasting, in order to avoid interferences to other countries comma the Government of the Moldavian S.S.R. expresses its desire to send its representatives to take part in the work of the European Conference with full right to vote stop The Government of the Moldavian S.S.R. does not doubt that the countries represented at the Conference and concerned with the setting up of an equitable waves assignment Plan between European Countries, will satisfy the request of the Government of the Moldavian S.S.R.

Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Moldavian S.S.R.
G. Rud

(29)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 22-E
June 30, 1948
Submitted in: Russian

The Chairman of the Conference
has the honour to communicate the following telegram
received from
the Government of the Estonian S.S.R.
(Translation of the Russian original)

COPENHAGEN CONFERENCE TALLIN

M 75 109 26 21.40

NORTHERN

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EUROPEAN BROADCASTING CONFERENCE

COPENHAGEN

The Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic, who signed together with all other democratic European countries the Protocol in Atlantic City, is directly concerned with the settlement of the questions of European Broadcasting and expresses the desire of sending its representatives to the Copenhagen Conference. The Government of the Estonian S.S.R. does not doubt that the representatives of all European democratic countries will support its request, since no success can be achieved in the work of the European Broadcasting Conference if the powerful network of the Estonian S.S.R. Broadcasting stations, and its desire to cooperate with all democratic countries of Europe, will not be taken into consideration. The Government of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic avails itself of this opportunity to extend its greetings to the delegates of the European Broadcasting Conference.

Del. of the Estonian S.S. Republic
Gans Kruus

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 23-E
June 30, 1948
Submitted in: Russian

The Chairman of the Conference
has the honour to communicate the following telegram
received from
the Government of the Lithuanian S.S.R.
(Translation of the Russian original)

CONFERENCE WILNUS

M 92 144 26 18.20

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN OF THE EUROPEAN BROADCASTING
CONFERENCE COPENHAGEN

The Government of the Lithuanian Socialist Republic avails itself of this opportunity to extend to the representatives of 33 countries foregathered in Copenhagen for the European Broadcasting Conference, its greetings and wishes for the successful settlement of the questions which are confronting it. Taking into account, that the questions under consideration by the European Broadcasting Conference, concern the broadcasting of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republics, the Government of the Lithuanian S.S.R. expresses its desire to participate in the work of the Conference and appeals to the representatives of all countries, represented at the Conference, to support the request of the Government of the Lithuanian S.S.R. for inviting its representatives to the European Broadcasting Conference with full right to vote; when deciding this question, the Government of the Lithuanian S.S.R. requests to take into account, that the Lithuanian Republic was represented at the Broadcasting Conference (Montreux-Lucerne) and the participation of its representatives at the Copenhagen Conferences will contribute to the successful settlement of the questions in which all European democratic countries are interested.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of
the Lithuanian S.S.R.
(signed) P. Rotomskis.

(D27)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 24-E
June 30, 1948
Submitted in: Russian

The Chairman of the Conference
has the honour to communicate the following telegram
received from

The Government of the Karelo-Finnish S.S.R.
(Translation of the Russian original)

CONFERENCE PETROZAWODSK

M 91 101 26 20 45

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN OF THE EUROPEAN BROADCASTING

CONFERENCE COPENHAGEN .

The Government of the sovereign Karelo-Finnish Soviet Socialist Republic extends its greetings to the delegates of the 33 European countries, foregathered in Copenhagen for the European Broadcasting Conference and expresses its sincere wishes for success in the settlement of the problems raised. The Government of the Karelo-Finnish S.S.R., in possession of many powerful broadcasting stations, does not consider it possible that questions of European broadcasting could be decided without the participation at the Conference of its representatives, and expresses its desire to participate in the work of the Conference with the full right to vote. The Government of the Karelo-Finnish S.S.R. hopes to meet in regard to this question the unanimous support of the delegates of all democratic countries, concerned in the successful settlement of the questions raised before the European Broadcasting Conference.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of
the Karelo-Finnish S.S.R.
sign. Sukkijnen

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 25-E

June 30, 1948

Maritime
Regional Radio Conference
København, 1948

MAR Document No 19-E

June 30, 1948

Original: French

C O R R E C T I O N
to Document No. RD - 18 - E

The heading of Document No RD-18-~~E~~ of the 29 June 1948
should read as follows:

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 18 - E

29 June, 1948

Maritime Regional
Radio Conference
København, 1948

MAR Document No 18 - E

29 June, 1948

Original: French

and the reference - (MAR 18 - ~~E~~) - should be added at the top of
pages 2 to 20.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 26

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 109 - Amendments to Document No. 26

Minutes
of the Plenary Assembly

First Meeting

Meeting of Monday 28 June 1948

The Meeting was opened at 10.20 a.m. under the Chairmanship of Mr. N.E. Holmblad, Head of the Danish Delegation.

The Chairman gave the following opening address:

"Ladies and Gentlemen,

"The Minister of Public Works extended to you the cordial welcome of the Danish Government at the opening meeting held on Friday last.

"The Danish Post and Telegraph Administration has asked me, as the Representative of the Convening Country, to initiate the work of the present Conference.

"In so doing, I wish above all to express, on behalf of the Danish Administration, its pleasure in welcoming you and its hopes for the successful outcome of our work.

"I hope I may be allowed to extend a personal welcome to all present and to tell them how glad I am to see so many colleagues, among whom I count not a few old friends here in my own country.

"In initiating the work of the Conference, I should like above all, to draw your attention to Document RD 7, published by the Danish Administration, entitled, "Report on the calling of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference and Regional Maritime Radiocommunication Conference in Copenhagen".

"In this document, my Administration sets out most of the essential facts which are the basis of the Copenhagen Conferences. It is therefore not necessary for me to go into them here.

"The task awaiting us will not be an easy one. The Atlantic City Radio Conference assigned to each service a place in the frequency spectrum. It is for us to instal, for the European Area, broadcasting stations in the bands reserved for us.

"Fortunately the execution of the delicate task of which I have just spoken will be facilitated by the facts supplied by the Committee of Eight Countries. The documents of this Committee, viz.:

1. Final Report of the Committee of Eight Countries (Doc. No. 284 of 9 June 1948).
2. Variant based on a separation of 9 kc/s (Doc. No. 279 of 9 June 1948).
3. Variant based on a separation of 10 kc/s (Doc. No. 281 of 9 June 1948).

were sent direct to the countries of the European area by the Belgian Government to save time, and through the intermediary of the Bureau of the Union at Berne.

"At the meeting of Heads of Delegations on Friday last it was asked at the afternoon sitting whether it was possible to place these documents at the disposal of the members of the Conference. The Secretariat replied that the wish expressed could rapidly be met thanks to the foresight of Mr. René Corteil, Chairman of the Committee of Eight.

"Accordingly on Saturday morning at 9 a.m. the three documents in question were in the pigeon-holes of all Delegates.

"I take the opportunity to thank the Committee of Eight for their work, and for the efforts they have made to give us a fixed starting-point for our labours. In particular I thank Mr. René Corteil, Chairman of the Committee of Eight, for his activities in connection with the organisation and direction of the work of his Committee. I beg him to express, on behalf of our Conference, to the Belgian Government our appreciation of their action in inviting the Committee to sit in Brussels.

"The authorities of my country cherish the hope that, thanks to the preparatory work done, and to the enlightened cooperation and good-will of all, we shall arrive as soon as possible at agreements affording the utmost possible satisfaction to each and all of us.

"Before passing to the discussion of the Agenda I have the pleasure of greeting amongst us Mr. Gerald C. Gross, Assistant Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union. Dr. von Ernst, whose time is largely taken up by his work in connection with the numerous international Conferences which are being held under the auspices of the Union, by the preparations for the Third Session of the Administrative Council, and by the direction of our Central Bureau, has apologized for not being able to attend our Conferences, and has asked Mr. Gross to be his representative at them. I much regret, and am sure you will share my regret, at not having our distinguished Director among us. We regret also that Mr. Gross can only follow the course of our labours for a short period, in view of the multiple activities by which he too is claimed. It is however a matter of great satisfaction to us to have him with us for a few days."

Mr Gross, Assistant Secretary- General of the I.T.U. thanked the Chairman in the following terms;

"Gentlemen,

"Dr von Ernst, Secretary General of the Union, has charged me with the task of expressing to you his greetings and his great regret at not being able to be present for this Conference, at which I have honour of representing him for the first week.

"As many of you probably know, we have had during this transitional year an extremely overloaded schedule. Beginning with the first meeting of the I.F.R.B. on January 8, 1948, we have had successively the P.F.B. Conference beginning January 15, the meeting of the Administrative Council, beginning January 20, the meeting of the High Frequency Broadcasting Conference Preparatory Committee, beginning March 22, the meeting of the Aeronautical Preparatory Committee, beginning April 24, the meeting of the World Aeronautical Conference, beginning May 15, and now the European Broadcasting Conference which started here on June 24. I have mentioned so far only the radio Conferences. We have also had the CCIT Conference in Brussels and the CCIF Committee at Stockholm.

"The remainder of the year promises to be equally charged, with the CCIR meeting at Stockholm, beginning July 12, the Administrative Council meeting, beginning September 1, and the World High Frequency Broadcasting Conference in Mexico City beginning the 22nd October, 1948, in addition to which there will be two preparatory meetings of the same group also in Mexico City.

"In addition to this heavy schedule of international conferences, the Union is charged with moving its headquarters from Berne to Geneva during the course of this year, and of course the duties of the Secretariat have been considerably increased, to say nothing of the extra responsibilities flowing from the transformation during this year of the Union from a single-language Union, where French alone was official, to a multi-lingual Union, in accordance with the terms of Article 15 of the Convention.

"We are a comparatively small staff in Berne and Geneva, and unfortunately none of us have yet found a solution for that desirable process of being in two different places at the same time.

"Perhaps progress in this technical art, particularly in the realm of the P.F.B., where one channel will have to serve many stations if radio needs of the world are to be satisfied, may afford us a clue in this direction in the future.

"At any rate, we shall do our very best in accordance with the tradition of the Union, the oldest international government organisation in the world, and we beg your indulgence and sympathetic understanding during this difficult year."

M.Corteil, Head of the Delegation of Belgium, thanked the Chairman for the laudatory words which he had addressed to him, with which he wished to associate all the members of the Preparatory Committee of the Eight Countries on account of the work they had done.

The Delegate of the USSR, was surprised to find that simultaneous interpretation in Russian had not been provided. He thought a decision had been taken to that effect at the end of the meeting of the Heads of Delegations.

The Chairman observed it had been decided, with the agreement of the U.S.S.R. Delegation, that for that day's meeting the system of interpretation employed would be exactly the same as that used for the meeting of June 26, and that the use of the Russian language as a working language would be examined. Moreover from the technical point of view it was not possible to instal new installations at such short notice.

(Tr2 / R.11)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. maintained his complaint. He was supported by the Delegate of Bulgaria, who said the Chairman was in the wrong. He (the Bulgarian Delegate) recalled the discussion which had taken place at the end of the Meeting of Heads of Delegations with regard to the use of the Russian language, and he concluded that they must have Russian, and at once at the present Meeting.

The Chairman reiterated his former declaration. If any misunderstanding had arisen between him and the Soviet and Bulgarian Delegations with relation to the decisions reached on the previous Saturday, it was doubtless due to the translation.

Mr. Gross asserted that the Chairman's words were entirely in accordance with the facts. The U.S.S.R. Delegation had agreed to the proposal to continue the provisional arrangement adopted on the previous Saturday at the present Meeting. If, however, when the Rules of Procedure came under discussion, the Meeting were to decide that Russian should be used as a working language at the Regional Conference, the Secretariat would take the requisite measures. But such measures could not be improvised and new technical installations would be required. Mr. Gross asked the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. whether the "whispering interpreters" at their disposal could not temporarily be requested to translate into Russian the speeches made in English or in French. The Secretariat would engage adequate personnel as soon as a definite decision had been reached.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. repeated that he maintained his viewpoint with regard to the decisions reached on the previous Saturday, and he considered that the Meeting had ignored the decisions in question. As the installations required for simultaneous interpretation in Russian were not ready, he asked for consecutive interpretation of the speeches in Russian.

The Chairman observed that the divergence in opinions persisted; but he asked Mr. Gross whether the Secretariat was in a position to provide consecutive interpretation there and then from English and French into Russian as requested by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Gross answered in the affirmative. But the interpreters available were at present engaged in interpreting Russian into French and English, and the Secretariat would need the authorisation of the Conference to engage interpreters to translate from French and English into Russian. According to the rules

in force, it was incumbent upon the U.S.S.R. Delegation to provide the interpreters they required for consecutive interpretation.

On the Chairman inquiring whether anyone objected to the use of consecutive interpretation in the Russian language, the United Kingdom Delegate stated that, although this procedure would lengthen the discussions, he would not object to its being adopted, provided it did not set a precedent. He pointed out that the Meeting had not been constituted, and had no definitively appointed Chairman.

The Chairman said that the U.K. Delegate's remark was an invitation to proceed to Item No.2 on the Agenda ("Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference"); and he requested Mr. Corteil to address the Meeting. The latter then proposed that the Meeting should elect by acclamation:

As Chairman of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference:

Mr. N.E.Holmblad, Chief Engineer, Chief of the Technical Division of the Danish Administration of Post and Telegraph, Head of the Danish Delegation,

and as Vice-Chairman of the same Conference:

(Tr.7 / R. 11)

Mr. Gunnar Pedersen, Chief of the Technical Broadcasting Section, Danish Administration of Posts and Telegraphs, Deputy-Head of the Danish Delegation.

The Meeting approved these proposals by acclamation.

Mr. Holmblad, as Chairman of the Conference, thanked the Meeting on his own, and on Mr. Pedersen's, behalf for the honour shown to their country and to themselves. His task, he felt, would be no easy one, as experience had already shown; but he would do his utmost to give the Conference the best possible guidance. He hoped all Delegates would assist him in accomplishing his duties and show forbearance for his shortcomings. He noted that Item No.2 of the Agenda had thus been dealt with.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. expressed the view that one of the first points to be discussed was No.11 in Document RD: 13 "Report on the Work of the Committee of Eight Countries". That had been agreed upon by the Meeting of the Heads of Delegations. In his opinion, that should be Item No.4 of the Agenda.

The Chairman deplored this new misunderstanding. The Heads of Delegations had asked for the Report on the work of the Committee of Eight Countries to be included in the Agenda of the present Meeting, and their wish had been complied with. But the item in question could not take precedence over other items concerning matters of organisation.

The Delegate of France remarked that the sequence of items was not intangible. The Brussels Report was important; but so also was the linguistic question. To be logical with himself, the U.S.S.R. Delegate should acknowledge that the discussion on languages should come first.

He (the French Delegate) proposed that Item No. 11 should

become Item No.4. This would allow the working group, to which the vote had been entrusted, to complete its work before the Meeting examined the Draft Rules of Procedure.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. maintained his viewpoint. The Meeting of Heads of Delegations had decided that the Report of the Committee of Eight Countries should be considered before all other questions, and in particular before the linguistic question and the draft Rules of Procedure. He was, therefore, unable to agree with the French Delegate.

The Chairman remarked that three different proposals had been submitted to the Meeting : the proposal of the Danish Administration which was a draft agenda, the U.S.S.R. proposal and the French proposal. The last proposal should be put to the vote first, inasmuch as it could be considered as an amendment to the U.S.S.R. proposal. The French proposal was rejected by 11 votes to 8. The U.S.S.R. proposal was then put to the vote, and was likewise rejected by 16 votes to 6.

The items on the Agenda were accordingly left to be dealt with in the order in which they were listed in Document RD.13.

The Delegate of Bulgaria asked whether the Plenary Assembly could alter a decision taken at the Meeting of the Heads of Delegations.

The Chairman replied that the Meeting had just agreed that the items of the Agenda should be dealt with in the order in which they had been given in Document RD.13. The Plenary Assembly was the supreme authority in the Conference and was unquestionably empowered to modify any decision reached at any other meeting whatsoever of the Conference. The discussion on this point was therefore closed. He put Item No.3 of the Agenda for disension.

(Tr.7 / R. 11)

Election of Secretariat

In accordance with the proposals of the meeting of Heads of Delegations, the Secretariat was constituted as follows:

Secretary-in-Chief: Mr. William F. Studer, Councillor of the Bureau of the Union.

Secretaries: Dr. Victor Meyer } Secretaries at the Bureau
Mr. Henry Voutaz } of the Union.
Mr. Jean Revoy, Engineer.
Mr. Leon Boussard, Head of the Linguistic Service.

The Assembly approved the above proposals.

The Chairman replied to questions put by the Delegate of Roumania asking for explanations with regard to the preceding statement of the Bulgarian Delegate. He proceeded to suspend the meeting for a few minutes to allow of the Chairman's seat being raised so that he could be seen by all Delegates.

On resuming, he said that it was desirable to treat the question of languages on practical lines. As the Assembly was aware, it had been decided to have consecutive interpretation henceforward from English and French into Russian.

The Delegate of Bulgaria proceeded to explain certain points of his former statement, which he said had been rendered obscure by faulty translation.

The Chairman said that the Bulgarian Delegate had already had a clear answer to the effect that (1) the point raised by him was not on the Agenda, and (2) meetings of the Heads of Delegations were not qualified to take decisions. It was only the Plenary Assembly that could take decisions.

He turned to Item 4 on the Agenda ("Establishment of Committees").

In the absence of any observations, the establishment of Committees, as proposed in Document No. RD.2, was approved, subject to the substitution of the word "preparation" for the word "drafting" in the sentence dealing with the terms of reference of the Organisation Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. reserved the right to raise again the question of the number and powers of the different Committees. The meeting would remember that he had already expressed a wish that these questions should not be definitively settled until the Report of the Committee of Eight Countries had been heard.

The Chairman said that the U.S.S.R. Delegate's reservation would appear in the Minutes.

In the absence of further observations, the Chairman passed to Item 5 of the Agenda ("Appointment of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees of the Broadcasting Conference").

(Tr 11/R11)

The Secretary-in-Chief read a document containing the following proposals which the Danish Administration had been led to submit in this connection:

Committees:

1. Executive: the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference;
2. Credentials: Belgium, Portugal;
3. Organisation: France, Czechoslovakia;
4. Technical: U.S.S.R., Sweden;
5. Frequency Allocation: United Kingdom, Yugoslavia;
6. Drafting: Switzerland, United Kingdom.

The Assembly ratified the above proposals.

The Secretariat distributed a form to the various Delegations, for the purpose of indicating the Committees on which they wished to serve.

The Chairman stated that Item 6 of the Agenda, ("Language arrangements"), would be dealt with later during the consideration of the Rules of Procedure.

The Meeting was temporarily adjourned at 12. 15 p.m.

The Meeting resumed at 2. 15 p.m.

The Chairman put Item 7 of the Agenda ("Rules of Procedure") for discussion, at the same time observing that the Draft Rules of Procedure prepared by the Danish Administration were contained in Document RD No. 4, while the modifications made by the Meeting of Heads of Delegations had been published in Document RD No. 12. He proposed the adoption of the Draft Rules with the exception of Rule 17 (Voting Procedure) and Rule 21 (Languages), to which he would return later.

The United States Observer thought that § 1 of Rule 1 of the proposed Rules was not compatible with the terms of the International Telecommunication Convention (Annex 2, definition of "Delegation") and proposed the following addition:

"The Copenhagen Conference accepts the definition of "delegation" as it appears in Annex 2 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City. Certain delegations only however will have the right of voting at this Conference. Consequently, the title of "delegation" having the right of voting, will, in these Rules of Procedure, mean a group of delegates of the same country within the European broadcasting area."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that the representative of the United States was an observer, and not a delegate; and, the present Conference being "European", the definition of "delegate" should include a mention of the "European" character of the delegate, which was of fundamental importance in the case.

The United States Observer replied in the following terms to the two points raised:

1° According to the International Telecommunication Convention (Annex 2: Definition of "delegation"), each country had the right of nominating and forming a delegation at its convenience. The United States had accordingly sent a delegation of observers, and had notified the convening country to that effect.

2° Although the present Conference was "European", it had arisen out of the Atlantic City Conference and the Atlantic City Convention should be the basis of it.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom agreed with the United States Observer on the latter point.

The Delegate of Roumania said that the observer of an extra-European country could speak only on matters concerning the radio services of his own country. The idea of a delegation of observers was a new one, which did not appear in the Atlantic City texts.

The United States Observer replied that his Government had sent a delegation of observers to collaborate in the work of the Conference. To reject the idea of a delegation of observers was to fly in the face of fundamental documents of the Union.

The Delegate of Roumania maintained his point. He read out the definitions of "observer", of "delegate", and of "delegation" in Annex 2 of the Convention. He noted that the expression "delegation of observers" was nowhere to be found in the Annex. He again asked the United States Observer how the radio services of his country were implicated in the present discussion.

The United States Observer thought that the presence of his delegation was in conformity with the spirit of the Atlantic City documents. He said that the allocation of frequencies to broadcasting stations - which was the task of the present Conference - concerned Germany in particular, where as an Occupying Power the United States had interests. He proposed that a vote should be taken on the motion submitted by him in writing, which had been seconded by the United Kingdom.

The Delegate of the Vatican City thought it essential to distinguish between words and facts. It was the latter only, he suggested, which were important. The issue of fact was what rights were to be granted to the United States Representative, whether the latter was called "observer", "delegate" or "observer-delegate". There was certainly no question of his being granted the right of voting; but he should not be refused the right of submitting observations. Even on that issue two points of view were possible. The observer might be "passive" or "active" according to whether he was, or was not, authorized to ask for the floor. The definition of "observer" in Annex 2 of the Convention appeared to support the conception of a "passive observer". On the other hand the text of the Additional Protocol clearly supported the conception of an "active observer". Though there was only a shade of difference between the two conceptions, the essential point seemed to him to reside in the difference.

(Tr 5/R 11)

The Chairman pointed out that the discussion was being prolonged, and that in the present case an immediate vote was not indicated as the proposed amendment was rather long, and would have to be submitted in writing to each Delegation. He proposed that in the first place those speakers, who had asked for the floor, should be heard, and that the whole question should then be submitted to a working group.

The Delegate of France said he would speak in a propitiatory spirit in presence of these "altercations over words". He thought the Atlantic City definitions (Annex 2 of the Convention) were inadequate for the reason that they did not mention the right of voting which in earlier texts was regarded as a prerogative inherent in the quality of a Delegate. Consequently, he proposed to add to § 1 of Rule 1 of the draft Rules of Procedure the following sentence:

"Delegations from extra-European countries shall have only the rights of observers at the Conference."

This text, he thought, should be satisfactory to all, conforming completely, as it did, to the Document annexed to the Additional Protocol, that is to the Directives for the present Conference.

The Chairman was in favour of the amendment proposed by the French Delegation. As he understood it, this amendment would not be an addition to § 1 of Rule 1, but would become a new § 2, in place of the old § 2.

The Delegate of Albania observed that, although the observer of the United States had frequently quoted the definitions contained in the Convention, he had made no reference to those contained in the Document annexed to the Additional Protocol. He feared that, if representatives who were in fact observers were once called "Delegates", they would eventually demand the right to take part in the voting.

The Delegate of Ireland remarked that a slight disparity seemed evident between the definitions annexed to the Atlantic City Convention and the terms employed in the Additional Protocol, since the definitions had been drawn up before the Additional Protocol. In his opinion, the Atlantic City text gave the United States representative the right to assume the title of Head of Delegation.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R summarized the important questions of principle which were under discussion, as follows:

- 1) Separate definitions were required for the words "observer" and "delegate".
- 2) The question of Germany had to be settled.
- 3) The powers of the Conference had to be determined.

He considered that the Observer of the United States was putting a free and personal interpretation on the Atlantic City texts, and he wished to ask him point-blank the following question: Was he the observer of the American Government, or of the American Zone of Occupation in Germany?

The Observer of the United States said that he had already replied on several occasions to that question. He had even replied in writing : and the Chairman and the Delegate of the U.S.S.R had

both received copies of his reply. He claimed afresh the title of Head of a Delegation of Observers, basing his claim on the definition of "Delegation" in Annex 2 of the Convention. In virtue of this, he considered that the representatives of the United States should have the rights and privileges of a delegation. He repeated that he was not the representative either of Germany or of any one of its Zones of Occupation.

The Delegate of Roumania reverted to the question of the representation of the American Zone of Occupation in Germany. The Observer of the United States had provisionally abandoned his position as the representative of the Zone in question until such time as the Conference took a decision on the question. He should therefore refrain from availing himself of a right which the Conference had not yet accorded him.

(Tr.4/R.11)

The Chairman replied that the object of the present discussion was the approval of the Rules of Procedure. He was of opinion that a vote might solve the pending question; but he preferred to refer it to a working group with a view to reaching an understanding on a written text. He proposed that the working group should include representatives of the U.S.S.R, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Vatican City and Roumania.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R was not satisfied with the reply given by the United States Observer. In his opinion, the U.S.A. Delegate's assertion at the previous Meeting to the effect that "he did not represent Germany, nor any zone whatsoever in Germany" conflicted with his present assertion to the effect that the only U.S. radio interests in Europe lay in the American Zone of occupation in Germany.

He further objected to the presence of the representative of the United States on the working group proposed by the Chairman.

The Chairman stated that the two questions must be considered separately :

1. The representation of the zones of occupation would have to be dealt with later, although the assertion of the U.S.A. Observer was in itself quite unequivocal. He represented neither Germany nor any zone in Germany, but his own Government who had interests in one of those zones.

2. Observers from extra-European countries being entitled to participate in all Meetings of the present Conference, the United States could be represented on the proposed working group.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. again protested that he formally objected to the United States Observer being a member of the group in question. If however the group was set up, he had no objection to the United States being heard, if the members of the group so desired.

The United States Observer could not agree to exclusion from the proposed group.

The Delegate of Albania suggested that the United States Observer should withdraw his proposal, and that the question should not be taken up again until a decision had been reached by the Conference with regard to the representation of the zones of occupation in Germany.

The Chairman abandoned his proposal of a working group and declared that the United States proposal, supported by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, would be mimeographed with a view to a vote at one of the next Meetings.

The Delegate of France wished the text of his amendment also to be put to the vote.

The Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia supported the French proposal. The situation of the United States Observer should be cleared up : for his successive statements had appeared to conflict with one another. Either he desired to take part in the work of the Conference as the representative of an extra-European country having interests in Europe, but without representing any part of the European area, in which case his position was governed by the existing texts : or else he wished to intensify his participation in the work of the Conference, and to be granted more definite rights and even perhaps the right to vote, in which case it would be wise to bring a working group into play.

(T.7/R.11)

The Delegate of the Vatican City also supported the amendment moved by the Delegate of France. He proposed a slightly different wording, as follows:

"The Delegation of an extra-European country will have only the rights of observers at the Conference".

The Delegate of France thanked the Delegations which had supported his amendment. He observed, however, that according to the terms of Article 13 of the General Regulations, it was not necessary that the proposition of a Delegation should be supported by other Delegations to be considered.

The Chairman then declared that the two amendments proposed by the United States and France should be put to the vote at a later meeting of the Plenary Assembly. The meeting would resume on Tuesday June 29 at 10 a.m., the simultaneous interpretation in Russian to be provided if possible.

The meeting adjourned at 4.50 p.m.

V. Meyer,
H. Voutaz,
J. Revoy,
Secretaries.

Seen:

W.F. Studer,

Secretary-in-Chief

Seen :

N.E. Holmblad,

Chairman

(T.2/R.11)

FRANCE

Eventual Amendment proposed by the French
Delegation to be inserted in Rule 17
of the Rules of Procedure.

This eventual amendment regards the discus-
sion of Doc. RD.19 E, Item... of the Working
Group on the Question of Vote.

Whenever a majority of two thirds is required for a
vote⁺), the vote shall be taken according to the procedure
indicated below :-

When the first vote "for" or "against" has not yielded
a majority of two thirds, a second vote in the opposite⁺⁺)
sense shall be taken at once. If a majority of two thirds
fails to be secured at the second vote, the vote shall be
adjourned to the following meeting, when it shall be taken
in its first form with the difference that a simple majority
will be sufficient for the decision.

⁺) With the exception of the vote for the admittance of a
new member, where there is no ambiguity.

⁺⁺) The second vote shall be a vote "against", if the first
was "for". It shall be a vote "for", if the first was "against"

EUROPEAN REGIONAL
BROADCASTING CONFERENCE
København. 1948

RD. Document No 28. E.

2. July 1948

Original: French.

UNITED KINGDOM

U.K. Delegation's proposed amendment to
Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure of the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

After paragraph 6 add the following paragraph:

"In the case of questions of admission to the
Conference with voting rights, no proposal in favour of
the admission of a country shall be accepted unless it
secures the approval of two-thirds of the countries of
the European Broadcasting Area which have already been
invited to the Conference in accordance with Article 1
para. 1 of the Document annexed to the Additional Protocol
to the Acts of the International Radio Conference of
Atlantic City, 1947."



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 29

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 109 - Amendments to Document No. 29

MINUTES OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

FIRST MEETING

Tuesday 29 June 1948.

The meeting was opened at 10.15 a.m. by Mr. Holmblad, Chairman of the Conference.

The Chairman announced that, during the night, a third booth had been installed for simultaneous interpretation into Russian, and would be in operation during the present meeting. He also announced that an unnumbered document containing the two amendments to Rule 1 §1 submitted by France and the United States of America had been distributed in the meeting.

The Delegate of Bielorussia observed that he had not received the document in Russian.

The Chairman replied that a decision had not yet been taken on the publication of documents in the Russian language. Reverting to the Rules of **Procedure** he said that consideration of the amendments had been suspended. Were there any further comments on the Rules apart from Rule 1 §1 and Rules 17 and 21?

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought it would be more practical to study the Rules paragraph by paragraph.

The Assembly seeing no objection, the Chairman proposed that the Rules of Procedure be adopted rule by rule.

Rule 1. Definitions.

§1 was put aside for the moment. The rest of the Rule was adopted, with the amendments made in Document RD 12.

Rule 2. Admission to the Conference. Adopted.

Rule 3. Order of Seating. Adopted.

Rule 4. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Adopted.

Rule 5. Presentation of Credentials. Adopted.

Rule 6. Powers of the Chairman. Adopted.

Rule 7. Secretariat of the Conference. Adopted.

Rule 8. Appointment of Committees. Adopted.

Rule 9. Composition of Committees. Adopted.

Rule 10. Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, and Reporters of Committees and Sub-Committees. Adopted.

Rule 11. Summons to Sessions.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought it practical to indicate in Rule 11 that the Agenda should be sent round at least two days before the meeting.

The Chairman saw no objection to an addition of that nature to Rule 11 provided it applied to Plenary Assemblies only. It was understood that the Agenda of a postponed Plenary Assembly would not have to be published two days before the meeting.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. agreed.

The Delegate of Belgium remarked that it would be a mistake to tie themselves by a form of words, for it was not always possible to follow the procedure indicated. In any case the words "in general" should be inserted in the proposed text.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that obviously there were sometimes questions which arose too late to be included in the Agenda, but which ought nevertheless to be dealt with during the meeting. Such questions could, and should, be dealt with; but as a general principle it would be as well for the Agenda to be published early enough to enable Delegations to study it.

The Chairman proposed the following addition to Rule 11:

"As a general rule, the agenda of meetings of the Plenary Assembly shall be communicated two days before the Assembly, and in any case as soon as possible."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. concurring,

Rule 11 was adopted as amended.

Rule 12. Order of discussion. Adopted.

Rule 13. Proposals presented before the Opening of the Conference. Adopted.

Rule 14. Proposals submitted during the Conference. Adopted. as amended by RD12.

Rule 15. Proposals presented to Committees during the Conference. Adopted.

Rule 16. Postponed Proposals. Adopted.

Rule 17. Voting procedure. Postponed, pending the upshot of the discussions of the Working Group on the Voting Procedure.

Rule 18. Minutes of the Sessions of the Plenary Assembly. Adopted.

Rule 19. Reports of Committees.

The Delegate of Belgium suggested an addition of a practical nature, as follows:

The words "and working groups" to be added after the words "Sub-Committees" in §2. Working Groups, he said, submitted Final Reports at the end of their work as well as Committees and Sub-Committees. They should therefore be included in the text of the paragraph, particularly as the words "If circumstances warrant" at the beginning of the paragraph left a free hand in the matter of drawing up the reports.

Rule 19 was adopted, as amended by the Belgian Delegate.

Rule 20. Adoption of Minutes and Reports.

The Delegate of Albania thought that Minutes and Reports should be published three days before the meetings, at which it was proposed they should be adopted.

The Chairman saw no objection to the Albanian Delegate's amendment; but he pointed out that Rule 20 would have to be in conformity with the provisions of the Atlantic City Regulations on the subject. He felt however that, where Delegates had not had time to study a Minute or a Report, the adoption of the same should be put off to a subsequent meeting.

The Delegate of France understood the Albanian Delegate's motives. If absolutely necessary, he would be prepared to agree to a time-limit being fixed for the adoption of the Minutes of Plenary Assemblies, though he thought it should not be more than two days, the time-limit fixed in the case of the publication of agendas. On the other hand in the case of Committees, Sub-Committees and working groups, sitting often day after day, no constructive work would be possible, if so paralysing a rule were adopted. He illustrated his point by a specific example.

The Delegate of Albania stated that his amendment did not concern sub-committees and working groups, but only Plenary Assemblies and, if possible, committees.

The Chairman requested the Delegate of Albania to submit a written text of his amendment.

The Delegate of Albania said he would do so very shortly.

Rule 21. Languages. Reserved.

Rule 22. Editorial Committee. Numbering. Adopted.

Rule 23. Final Approval. Adopted.

Rule 24. Signature. Adopted.

Rule 25. Publicity.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was of opinion that §1 of Rule 25 should be modified as follows:

"§1. The Plenary Meetings of the Conference are open to the public unless two or more Delegations raise objections."

In §2, he proposed the following wording:

"Official statements on the work of the Conference may not be communicated to the Press by the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman, unless such statements have been approved at a meeting by the Heads of Delegations."

The Chairman pointed out that §2 of Rule 25 was exactly the same as Rule 26 on page 71 of the Atlantic City Acts.

(RD Doc. No. 29-E)

The Delegate of Belgium did not agree with the proposal of the representative of the U.S.S.R. for the two following reasons: first, because no such rule has ever before been applicable in the case of a Conference. A conference should trust its Chairman and Vice-Chairman sufficiently to allow them to draw up or approve official statements intended for the Press. His second reason was of a practical order. At Brussels an official statement was drawn up at the end of the first meeting of the Committee of Eight Countries. At the request of the U.S.S.R. Delegation, it was agreed that the statement in question should be approved by the Committee of Eight Countries. It was drawn up by a small working group of the Drafting Committee, and then approved in Plenary Assembly. This gave rise to a discussion of three or four hours, the result of which was a text half a page long and absolutely devoid of meaning, everyone having contributed to it. Only one newspaper had published it in all the Brussels Press. In his opinion that experience should be conclusive.

The Delegate of Bielorussia said that what mattered was to know whether the proposal of the U.S.S.R. Delegate was useful or not. It appeared to him just and expedient, and he thought it ought to satisfy all Delegations.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom objected to the proposed amendment of §1. He believed a resolution on this question had been adopted at the Conference on Information and Freedom of the Press, at Geneva, and that the resolution had been supported by the United Kingdom Delegation.

The Delegate of Roumania did not see that the question at issue had anything to do with the Freedom of the Press, to which they were all attached. No shackling of the Press was intended. What was intended was to enable the Conference to inform the Press in such a way as to embody all the opinions voiced at the Conference. No doubt all present had confidence in the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman; but in the interest of the Chair itself, it would, in his opinion, be safer and more advisable to be assured in advance that what was published in the Press commanded the approval of the entire Conference.

It would serve to prevent misunderstandings which might otherwise arise, if certain members of Delegations were to read accounts in the Press, with the accuracy of which they could not agree. For these reasons he supported the U.S.S.R. proposal.

The Chairman was inclined to take §§ 1 and 2 separately, in order to clarify the discussion. The U.S.S.R. amendment to §1 would be tantamount in his opinion to giving a group of Delegates a right of veto.

The Delegate of France also thought that the acceptance of objections on the part of two Delegations alone was tantamount to giving them a right of veto. To allow two Delegates out of 33 to oppose the will of 31 others was not what was usually considered democratic procedure. But the U.S.S.R. proposal was interesting, inasmuch as it might serve as a basis for determining whether an Assembly should be public or not. It was quite normal, he thought, that an Assembly should have to be asked whether its meetings were to be public or private, if not less than two Delegations so demanded. But it rested in his opinion with the Assembly itself to decide. He would not support the U.S.S.R. proposal; but he hoped the U.S.S.R. Delegate would see his way to amend it in the sense that, if two Delegations or more wished the Plenary Assembly not to be public, it should be obligatory to refer their request to the Assembly for a decision on a normal majority basis.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. concurred.

The Chairman thanked the U.S.S.R. Delegate for his concurrence. He asked the French Delegate to give him the exact text of his amendment to § 1.

Text of the French amendment:

"§ 1 The Plenary Meetings of the Conference will be public, unless two Delegations are opposed to such publicity. The Assembly will in that event have to decide according to the voting rules applicable."

The Delegate of the United Kingdom felt bound to oppose any change in the Rule because of the international obligations by which his country was bound. Clearly it was always within the competence of a Plenary Assembly in special cases to suspend the right of the public to attend plenary meetings; but resort to such competence should not be encouraged.

The Chairman thought the question had no direct effect, though it was of great importance. The present text seemed to him to cover all possible objections. The proposal made by the U.S.S.R. and France went further in the way of restriction.

The Delegate of Belgium proposed a new text for § 1 as follows:

"§ 1 Plenary Assemblies are public unless the Assembly decides to the contrary by a majority of votes."

The Chairman thanked M. Corteil for his proposal, which seemed to give satisfaction to everybody.

There being no further objection to the text, as amended by M. Corteil, it was adopted.

(Tr.2/R.11/D.19)

§ 2 stipulated that official communiqués could not be released to the Press without the assent of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. It had been proposed that the words "after approval at a Meeting by Heads of Delegations" should be added. The Chairman suggested that, instead of considering the Meeting of Heads of Delegations as the competent institution in the case it would be better to have recourse to the existing Committees, e.g. the Executive Committee, for the approval of releases to the Press. The question was whether the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should be given the responsibility of exercising these functions. The proposed new text might delay action in the matter. The approval of Heads of Delegations or of the Executive Committee would to a certain extent relieve the Chairman of his responsibility; but he thought it might nevertheless be preferable, if the Rules of Procedure gave the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman the power to approve Press releases.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom strongly advocated the adoption of § 2 as it stood in the initial text.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. shared the Roumanian Delegate's point of view. The Press releases of preceding Conferences, including the Atlantic City Conference, were issued after preliminary agreement between Heads of Delegations. The actual text did not refer to official statements, but to statements emanating from official persons, which was another way of saying personal documents. From a legal point of view that made all the difference. If the statements in question were to be official, they must be approved either by the Heads of Delegations or by the Plenary Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN gathered that it was proposed to have two sorts of Press communiqués, viz.:

1. those for which the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman would be responsible,
2. those which would be considered as official Press communiqués on the work of the Conference, and which would be adopted by the Plenary Assembly.

He had never attended any Meeting of Heads of Delegations at Atlantic City, where the question of Press releases had been under discussion; but there was no doubt as to the purport of the regulations of the Atlantic City Conference. They stipulated explicitly that Press releases could not be issued unless the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman had given their assent. The actual practice might have been different. It seemed to him very desirable that it should be possible to issue certain Press communiqués without the approval of the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed to postpone the drafting of the definitive text of the paragraph to a later meeting. That would not hold up the work of the Conference.

The Chairman agreed with the suggestion and requested the U.S.S.R. Delegate to submit a concrete draft proposal. § 2 of Rule 25 would remain pending in the meanwhile.

Rule 26. Documents. Adopted.

Rule 27. Franking Privileges. Adopted.

The Delegate of Belgium, speaking on behalf of all present, thanked the Danish Government and the Danish Postal Administration for the franking privileges accorded by them. (Applause.)

The Delegate of Albania read out his proposed amendment to Rule 20, to be inserted in the Rule as Para. 2, the former Para. 2 becoming Para.3. The amendment was as follows:

"2. Minutes and Reports submitted for consideration and approval at meetings of the Plenary Assembly, or at meetings of Committees, should as a general rule be distributed to Delegates two days before the meetings."

The Chairman said that the Secretariat of the Conference would do its best in all cases to have the Minutes distributed two days before the meetings at which they were to come up for approval. He took it that the words "as a general rule" did not constitute a rigid or absolute obligation.

The Delegate of France agreed with the Albanian Delegate in the case of Plenary Assemblies, but was opposed to the enforcement of the proposed rule in the case of Committees, Sub-Committees and working groups for the reasons he had already stated.

The Delegate of Albania said that his proposal did not relate to Sub-Committees or working groups, but only to Plenary Assemblies and Committees. The words "as a general rule" implied that there was no formal obligation.

The Delegate of Ireland agreed with the French Delegate that the proposed amendment was impracticable in the case of Committees sitting as a rule every day.

The Delegate of Belgium remembered his experiences at the Committee of Eight at Brussels, and could well understand the difficulties which certain Delegates might have in reading documents drawn up in a language other than their own. It would be better at the end of Para. I (1) to add the words:

"Provided the said documents have been distributed not later than the previous day in each working language."

The Delegate of Bulgaria was for cutting short the discussion, and postponing it to the next meeting, on the ground that the Working Group, which had important questions to settle, was to meet that day, and there was to be a new meeting of Heads of Delegations either that day or the following.

The Delegate of Italy was perfectly satisfied with the text of Para. I (1) as proposed by the Danish Administration. It was a common practice to postpone consideration of a Minute to the next meeting, where it was distributed too short a time before the meeting to enable Delegates to study it.

Under Rule 5 § 3 no Delegation was authorised to vote in accordance with the provisions of Rule 17 until its credentials had been declared in order by the Credentials Committee. It ought to be clearly understood that these provisions could not be applied for the moment, but only when the Credentials Committee had been able to examine the question at a meeting. Until then no vote could be taken in accordance with the conditions laid down in Rule 5 § 3.

The Chairman thought a mere mention in the Minutes should be sufficient to settle the question of Rule 20 § 1. In accordance with what had been said in the course of the general discussion, no Minutes would be submitted for approval at a meeting, where Delegates had not had time to study them because they had been distributed too short a time before the meeting.

There being no objection, the Chairman's proposal was adopted.

On the question of voting raised by the Delegate of Italy, the Chairman said that in principle no Delegation had the right to vote in a Conference like the present until their credentials had been declared in order, which necessarily took some time.

They would therefore follow the usual procedure and permit the 33 countries of the European area to vote on questions under discussion, unless there were objections to so doing. The Credentials Committee would meet as soon as possible to deal with these matters. It was indispensable for the Assembly to admit the legality of this procedure, if the Conference was to be able to continue its work.

They had now come to the end of the consideration of the Draft Rules of Procedure. Four points remained to be settled, namely:

- Rule 1 § 1,
- Rule 17 on "Voting Procedure", to be dealt with by the Working Group which was to submit a report,
- Rule 21 on "Languages",
- Rule 25 on "Publicity".

The Delegate of Bielorussia said that, as a result of some linguistic difficulties encountered in the consideration of the Draft Rules of Procedure (Doc.RD.4), he reserved the right to revert to certain points in this document.

The Chairman declared that his remark would appear in the Minutes.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., like the Delegate of Bulgaria, was in favour of adjourning the meeting of the Plenary Assembly in order to allow the Working Group to finish its work and the Heads of Delegations to meet again.

As regards the proposal on languages (the first to be considered at the next Plenary Assembly), he thought it practical for the latter to meet on Wednesday afternoon to allow time for the examination of the report by the Working Group.

The Chairman said that such had been his intention. He wondered also whether it was necessary to have another meeting of Heads of Delegations to settle questions left pending. Possibly the observations already made at the meetings of the Heads of Delegations were sufficient to enable these questions to be dealt with directly by the Plenary Assembly. He gathered that the U.S.S.R. and Bulgarian Delegates wanted a new meeting of Heads of Delegations. What did other Delegations think?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom felt that meetings of Heads of Delegations should only be held as a means of gaining time in the Plenary Assembly. As it was, he thought all the questions still pending were ripe for direct treatment in the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegates of France, the Vatioan, Italy and Belgium supported the United Kingdom proposal not to call a meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The Delegate of France added that he could not see much difference between a meeting of Heads of Delegations and a Plenary Assembly. The same persons said, and repeated, the same things at both.

The Delegate of Bulgaria again raised the question whether the Chairman took decisions of meetings of Heads of Delegations into account, or whether such meetings were quite useless.

The Chairman reminded the Bulgarian Delegate that all decisions taken at meetings of Heads of Delegations were provisional, since the Plenary Assembly was the sovereign authority of the Conference and the only body capable of taking definitive decisions. He proposed to take a vote by show of hands.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. could not allow certain observations which had just been made to pass without comment. There was a fundamental difference between meetings of Heads of Delegations on the one hand, the purpose of which was to discuss questions about to be dealt with the Plenary Assembly and to shape the direction of such discussions in accordance with the views of the majority, and Plenary Assemblies on the other hand, which exercised the sovereign right of decision.

The Delegate of France was concerned to avoid misunderstanding. He quite agreed with the U.S.S.R. Delegate in the case of the subjects already dealt with by meetings of the Heads of Delegations, such as the question of languages, voting procedure, Observers and so on. At the same time he thought it unnecessary to have further meetings of Heads of Delegations, except of course to discuss subjects which were new.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that the questions already dealt with were still only in a preliminary stage, and were in need of further discussion by a new meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The Chairman took a vote by show of hands.

16 Delegates were in favour of leaving the continuation of the discussion to the Plenary Assembly.

9 Delegates were in favour of referring the discussion back to the meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The Delegate of Bulgaria observed that he had been the first to propose the postponement, and that it was his proposal that should have been put to the vote.

The Chairman thought the question which had been put was to know whether there should be another meeting of the Heads of Delegations, or whether the discussions should be continued by the Plenary Assembly. On that issue, when it was put to the vote, the result had been in favour of the discussion by the Plenary Assembly which would meet on Wednesday at 2 p.m. with the same Agenda. The Working Group would thus be able to finish its work.

The observation of the Bulgarian Delegate would be recorded in the Minutes.

The Meeting adjourned at 12,15 p.m.

V. Meyer
H. Voutaz
J. Revoy

Secretaries

Seen :

W.F. Studer

Secretary-in-Chief

Seen :

N.E. Holmblad

Chairman.

(tr. 2/R.11/D.25)



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 30

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 109 - Amendments to Document No. 30

Copenhagen 1948

3 July 1948.

Original : French.

Minutes
of the
Plenary Assembly

First Meeting

Meeting of Wednesday 30 June 1948

The meeting was opened at 2.10 p.m. under the Chairmanship of Mr. N. E. Holmblad.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Delegation of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, and new Members of the Delegations of Bielorussia, the Ukraine, and the U.S.S.R., who had just arrived at Copenhagen.

He then made the following statement:

"The rooms in the Christiansborg palace which we now use for our meetings are available only until the middle of August. Further it will not be possible after the middle of August to keep the necessary number of hotel rooms in Copenhagen. If therefore the Conference has not finished its work by that date, it will have to transfer its headquarters elsewhere.

As you are no doubt aware, the Danish Administration has reserved premises where the Conference can meet, and rooms for the Delegates, at the Hotel Marienlyst, near Elsinore (Helsingør). These arrangements are for the period August 15 to September 10, by which date the Conference will certainly be terminated.

I fully realize that it is impossible for us to fix the exact date of the close of the Conference. It is however a matter of some importance financially that the Conference should decide here and now whether or not the arrangements made with the Management of the Marienlyst are to be maintained.

If we occupy the Marienlyst for the whole of the period from August 15 to September 10, we shall have to pay a relatively low rent for the necessary premises. If, on the other hand, the Conference does not use the Marienlyst Hotel, the Hotel will have to be compensated, for, if the notice is left too late, the Management will no doubt find it impossible to secure a sufficient number of guests to make up for the loss.

(RD Doc. 30-E)

The amount to be given in compensation must be fixed by July 1 at the latest. If the Hotel could be warned from today that the Conferences will not occupy the Marienlyst from August 15 to September 10, the sum payable would be 61.000 Kr. If we wait until tomorrow or later, it will be 80.000 Kr.

I am quite aware of the fact that, ultimately, it will be for the Danish Administration to take the definitive decision on such a practical question of internal organisation; but I should be happy to hear Delegates' opinion, and grateful for any suggestions upon which to base our decision.

In this connection I may add that, before coming to an agreement with the Management of the Marienlyst as to the premises to be put at our disposal, we consulted the Committee of Eight Countries in February last.

The Committee expected the Conference to last a long time, but could give no accurate estimate of its duration. It will not be much easier to make a precise forecast in the present case; but I should be very grateful none the less, if you would let me know your views on the matter."

After hearing the above statement, the Assembly decided to rent the Marienlyst Hotel. The Delegates were of opinion that the work of the Conference should be expedited as much as possible so as to finish, if possible, by September 1 and, in any case, not later than September 10 - particularly in view of the proposed meeting of the Administrative Council of the Union at Geneva on September 1, and of the High Frequency Broadcasting Conference in Mexico in October. The fundamental questions, it was felt, should be settled without delay and, if possible, before the Meeting of the C.C.I.R. at Stockholm to which certain of the Delegates participating in the Copenhagen Conference would be going.

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to the next item on the Agenda:
Item 7 - Rules of Procedure.

Rule 21. Languages:

The draft proposal of the convening Government regarding this item consisted of three parts:

1. Final Documents;
2. Other written Documents of the Conference;
3. Oral discussions.

In Document RD No. 4, the languages to be used were left blank on each of these 3 sections.

After long discussion, it was decided that English, French and Russian would be used as working languages on an equal footing. The following took part in the discussion: the Delegates of U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Ireland, Portugal, France, Netherlands, Hungary, and Belgium.

1. The publication in Russian of the final documents was adopted without objection.

(RD Doc. 30-E)

2. The publication in Russian of the working documents of the Conference was adopted after a vote which had the following results:

For: 24 Delegations:

Albania, Belgium, Bielorussia, Bulgaria, Vatican City, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Monaco, Norway, Netherlands, Poland, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia.

Against: 2 Delegations: Portugal, United Kingdom.

Abstentions: 4 Delegations: Austria, Egypt, Syria, Turkey.

Not present: 3 Delegations: Greece, Lebanon, Luxemburg.

3. Finally, following on this vote, the use of Russian as a spoken working language was adopted without objection.

Rule 21 was therefore adopted, the 3 blank spaces to contain the words "English, French and Russian".

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded to paragraph 1 of Rule 1 (Definitions) of the draft Rules of Procedure. Two amendments: to this paragraph had been submitted. The first, submitted by the Observer of the United States, was as follows:

Rules of Procedure (Doc. RD No. 4) Rule 1 § 1, add:

"The Copenhagen Conference agrees to the definition of "Delegation" as written in Annex 2 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City. However, at the Conference only certain delegations shall be eligible to vote. Therefore, in these Rules of Procedure the term "delegation with the right to vote" as defined in Rule 5 of this document, shall denote a group of delegates from the same country within the European broadcasting area."

The second, submitted by the French Delegation, was as follows:

"In these Rules, the term "delegation" denotes a group of delegates from the same country.

a. Only delegations from the European Broadcasting area have the right to vote.

b. Delegations from extra-European areas have the rights of observers only, in accordance with No. 2 of § 1 of the Directives annexed to the Additional Protocol of the Atlantic City Convention"

The Observer of the United States announced that he would withdraw his amendment.

The discussion therefore proceeded on the French Delegations amendment only. After a long exchange of views, arising out of a request by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. that in paragraph b) of the amendment in question the term "delegations" should be replaced by another expression, the Meeting decided to replace "delegations" by "persons representing countries", after considering in turn the terms "representatives", "countries" and "persons".

The expression "persons representing countries" was in fact the word used in the English text of Annex 2 of the Convention (definition of the word "delegate").

During the preceding discussion, the Delegate of Switzerland pointed out that the Rules of Procedure in their present form did not mention the possibility of future official representation of the zones of occupation in Germany. The lengthy debates which had already considerably delayed the work of the Conference were due, at least in part, in the opinion of the Swiss Delegation, to the fact that the question of a possible representation of the zones of occupation in Germany was not decided. In order to clarify the situation and thereby facilitate the work of the Conference a decision on this point was indispensable in the opinion of the Swiss Delegation. Such a decision should be implemented by the addition of a sub-paragraph to each of Rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of Procedure.

The CHAIRMAN however pointed out that it had been decided to refer this question until later, and it was not discussed.

The Meeting having adjourned at 4.10 p.m. resumed at 4.40 p.m.

After the Chairman of the Working Group had observed that the Group would still require half a day for the completion of its work, the CHAIRMAN drew attention to Item 8 of the Agenda, viz., Working Methods. Document RD No. 6, which contained the Danish Administration's draft, was not yet published in Russian, and the Chairman therefore agreed to adjourn the study of this item.

Item 9 of the Agenda (Admission of International Organisations) was then taken up.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Document RD No. 7 contained the report of the Danish Government on the manner in which the invitations to the two Copenhagen Conferences had been issued. Requests for admission had been received from:

1. The International Broadcasting Organisation (O.I.R.)
2. The International Broadcasting Union (U.I.R.)
3. The International Radio-Maritime Committee (C.I.R.M.)
4. The International Chamber of Navigation.

The admission of the O.I.R. was ratified by the Meeting without discussion. It was then decided to adjourn the question of the admission of the 3 other organisations until the Meeting knew officially whether Spain was a member thereof. As regards the U.I.R. the Meeting also wished to have a list of those countries which were members at present, and those which were members during the war.

During the discussion leading to this decision, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. supported by the Delegates of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Yugoslavia announced that he opposed the admission of the above-mentioned organisations (other than the O.I.R.) before it was officially known whether Spain was at present a member of them, and what had been the position of these organisations during the war.

In reply the Delegate of the Netherlands, supported by the Delegates of Switzerland, Ireland and Portugal pointed out that a long discussion had taken place at Atlantic City regarding the U.I.R., that all arguments had been examined at that time, and that the U.I.R. had finally been admitted by a majority.

The Delegate of France also said that a repetition of the Atlantic City discussions on this point was not called for, and that, with the object always of achieving agreement and unity in a field where they were essential if final agreement was to be reached, he would not oppose the admission of the U.I.R. although he had opposed it at Atlantic City. Its admission would evidently not result in the presence at the Conference of a representative of Spain even if only in the capacity of an observer.

The Delegate of Rumania asked the Delegate of France what were the reasons for his change of attitude since Atlantic City, and it was decided that the latter would reply the next time the question was discussed.

Finally, the Delegate of Switzerland announced that, if the U.I.R. was not admitted, he reserved the right to reconsider his approval of the admission of the O.I.R. Moreover, the U.I.R. was to his knowledge an unofficial organisation, and the Spanish Government could not therefore be a member of it.

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the following amendment to Rule 25 (Publicity) paragraph 2 proposed by the U.S.S.R. Delegation.

"Official information on the work of the Conference may be released to the Press by the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman in agreement with the Heads of Delegations."

The Delegate of Belgium would prefer the present working of paragraph 2 to stand with the addition of the following text, if the U.S.S.R. Delegation so desired:

"However, the official information released at the end of the work of the Conference shall be approved by the Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. withdrew his proposal, and supported the Belgian text which was then adopted.

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to Item 10 of the Agenda (Working Hours of the Conference). The Assembly accepted the following times as the usual working hours: Morning, from 9.30 a.m. for Committees and Working Groups, and from 10 a.m. for Plenary Assemblies. Afternoon, from 2.30 p.m. to 6 p.m. with a recess for tea.

The Assembly thought it too late to begin consideration of Item 11 (Report on the Work of the Committee of Eight Countries). The Chairman asked whether Delegates had any other observations.

The Delegate of Belgium suggested that unofficial documents distributed by the Secretariat should be numbered, if necessary in a special series.

The Delegate of Italy said that, as it had not yet been decided whether the present Conference was a Plenipotentiary or an Administrative, the Credentials Committee could not begin its work effectively.

(RD 30- E-)

The Delegate of France thought that the question should be put on the Agenda. It had a bearing on the work of the Credentials Committees, in that the latter could do no more than take note of the credentials submitted to it, pending a decision on the fundamental issue.

Delegates were reminded in this connection to hand their credentials in to the Secretariat. After some discussion, it was decided that the Organisation Committee should report as to the character of the Conference.

The Assembly then discussed the time-table for the two following days. It was finally drawn up as follows:

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| <u>Thursday 1 July</u> | Morning- last meeting of the Working Group, Afternoon- continuation of the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly. |
|------------------------|--|

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| <u>Friday 2 July</u> | Morning- Meeting of Heads of Delegations of the Maritime Conference. Afternoon- Meeting of the Plenary Assembly of the Maritime Conference. |
|----------------------|--|

The CHAIRMAN said that certain Delegations had not yet made known to the Secretariat the list of the Committees on which they wished to be represented or the names of the Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen they were to supply. He asked them to give the information in question the earliest possible moment.

He adjourned the meeting at 6. 15 p.m.

V. Meyer,

H. Voutaz,

J. Revoy,

Secretaries.

W. F. Studer,

Secretary-in-Chief.

N. E. Holmblad,

Chairman.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 31

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 109 - Amendments to Document No. 31

M I N U T E S
of the Plenary Assembly
First Meeting

Minutes of Thursday 1 July 1948

The meeting was opened at 2.30 p.m. under the Chairmanship of Mr. N.E. Holmblad.

The first item on the Agenda was Item 11 (Report on the work of the Committee of Eight Countries.)

The Chairman gave the floor to Mr. Corteil who gave the following address:

"Some Delegations have expressed the desire to have the Chairman of the Committee of Eight Countries in Brussels make a quasi-formal presentation of the final document of that Committee, that is to say, of the Final Report and the two variant Draft Plans drawn up to serve as documentation in the preparation of the Copenhagen Plan.

"I must say that this put me, as Chairman of the Committee of Eight - or rather as Ex-Chairman, for the Committee's work came to an end on June 9 at 11.30 p.m. - in a very difficult position. As is usual in a meeting representing a number of different and sometimes divergent points of view, the deliberations of the Committee of Eight were often marked by clashes of opinion.

"It was with a view to keeping the Administrations very fully informed, that the Committee of Eight decided to send them the Minutes of our numerous Plenary Meetings. These documents were prepared from the shorthand records and from notes, and give an almost verbatim report of the debates. They are, therefore, a source of very detailed information for the Administration. We have reason to think that the Administrations will have considered them, and that the same applies to the Delegates at Copenhagen.

(RD Doc. No. 31-E)

"For the sake of those Delegates who have not these documents with them, I have brought from Bussels stencils of all the documents of the Committee of Eight - some 3,000, I think - and, if the Chairman agrees, the Secretariat of our Conference will probably be able to supply copies of these Minutes in as short a time as material considerations permit.

After these practical remarks, here is what I have to say to you in my capacity as ex-Chairman of the Committee of Eight:

The Final Report was drawn up by a small Working Group. The subjects dealt with and the wording of the text both formed part of the work of the group. The group expressed a unanimous wish to bring all the points on which a decision had been taken by the Committee of Eight into the Final Report: in other words, the Final Report contains all that united us, and does not mention the points on which no agreement was reached.

"The Plenary Meeting made a few minor amendments to the draft prepared by the Group, and then adopted the draft unanimously. Incidentally, it should be noted that our Chairman directed, but remained completely outside, the discussions in accordance with the conception of a Chairman prevailing in Belgium, where our Committee was sitting. He took no part in the debate, and expressed no personal opinions. He was content to reflect the opinions expressed by the Delegates. He intervened only to appeal to the Rules of Procedure, and in the special case of our Committee to see that the Rules laid down for us at Atlantic City were equally observed.

"Such being the position of the Chair in relation to the Committee of Eight, I do not feel that, as Ex-Chairman, I have the right to give you either my personal opinion on the tone of the debates, or to mention details which would of necessity be incomplete and therefore inaccurate, in the statement I am about to make. Such details would not give a faithful picture of what actually happened. It is, however, certain that the interesting points dealt with by the Committee of Eight will be considered in more detail in Committees or Plenary Assemblies of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference when the various aspects of our work come up for discussion. Delegates will then be able to refer to the contents of the Minutes and to the opinions of Delegates to the Committee of Eight who are present in Copenhagen. I can only refer them to the Minutes of the Committee of Eight.

It is possible that in the case of some subjects, which were dealt with intermittently or continuously in the course of several meetings, and in the case of some Delegates, the work of documentation may take time. The Secretariat of the Committee of Eight included only a very limited staff, in order to comply with the instructions issued by the 33 countries at Atlantic City with a view to reducing expenditure. Our Brussels Secretariat had therefore no time to prepare an analytical table of contents for the Minutes of the Committee of Eight. If the Conference thought it necessary, we could perhaps ask the Chairman whether the Conference Secretariat could not be responsible for the drawing up of such a list, when it has a little leisure.

"It will be of interest, I feel sure, to many Delegates to hear how, and under what conditions, our Committee worked. You yourselves, the Delegates of the 33 European countries here present, who signed the Atlantic City Convention, laid the foundations of our work in the shape of the Additional Protocol and its Annex, the Directives.

"You instructed, I say, eight countries to form a preparatory Committee - France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland, the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia, with Belgium in the Chair. The Committee of Eight met several times at Atlantic City, with first myself, then Mr. Metzler, then (after our departure) Mr. van der Pol in the Chair. It prepared draft texts of the Additional Protocol and of the Directives, which were submitted to the 33 countries, amended by them, and finally adopted unanimously and signed by them all - by all the 33 countries, that is to say, of the European broadcasting area. The instructions of the Committee of Eight can be put in a few words. They were invited, on the basis of the provisions of the Directives annexed to the Additional Protocol, to prepare in two stages or series a preliminary draft for the allocation of frequencies to the broadcasting stations of the European area, for the consideration of the Danish Government as the Director of the Conference and for the Governments of the 33 countries. The work was to be done in two stages.

"On the basis of the Directives and of the requirements involved, the Committee at its first Session was to hear the Delegates of the Administrations desirous of stating their views, and then to draw up a first preliminary draft plan, for transmission to the 33 Administrations of the European area.

"With that, the Committee of Eight was to close its First Session. The Administrations were then, after study of the first preliminary draft, to send the Committee their observations.

"In the second stage, which followed, the Committee of Eight held its Second Session to study the said observations, and take them into account. The Committee might be led by the observations, where they were of sufficient importance, to reshape its work, and so produce a second draft plan for transmission to Copenhagen and to all the 33 countries.

"Such in a few words was the line of conduct laid down for the Committee of Eight in principle in the following short extracts from the Atlantic City Directives.

Under the provisions of the Atlantic City texts (para 5),

1. Each country shall communicate its broadcasting requirements as soon as possible, not later than January 1st, 1948, to the Belgian Government which shall transmit them without delay to the Committee of Eight Countries (see para 2 of the Additional Protocol).
2. This Committee shall meet in Brussels not later than January 5, 1948, shall proceed to the study of these requirements and shall obtain all other useful information from any available source, if necessary, by calling in experts.

6. In principle, six weeks before the date fixed for the European Conference, the Committee shall meet again in Brussels to proceed to the study of the observations received.

With these provisions in mind let us consider the activities of the Committee of Eight.

The Committee was convened at Brussels as from January 1st 1948. From the outset each member renounced his own nationality, and considered himself as an international official mandated by the 33 countries. Accordingly, in order to emphasise the independence of the Delegates in relation to their native countries, the Committee of Eight unanimously decided that none of its members should represent his own country in the Committee of Eight. Thus no country represented on the Committee of Eight can be alleged to have derived any advantage whatsoever from his membership.

It may be useful for me to add that the former Chairman did his utmost to prevent any discussion on political questions from arising. He was at pains also to avoid creating precedents of a political character which might be brought forward at Copenhagen. He insisted throughout on the purely technical character of the Committee of Eight.

"What fundamental elements were at the Committee's disposal at the beginning of its First Session?

"The Secretariat had prepared certain tables reproducing the Convention of Lucerne (1933) and the Montreux Plan (1939). At the same time, in accordance with the Directives, the Committee had a series of documents before it, indicating the 'requirements' of the countries of the European area.

"The Committee further drew up an account of the existing position in the matter of areas, populations, numbers of listeners in etc., as also of the existing position in regard to transmitters (sites, power, frequencies).

"The Directives treated the Committee of Eight as the first stage of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference (§11). As the Conference under §12 had to adopt its own Rules of Procedure, so the Committee of Eight had to draw up Rules of Procedure for its own labours. It was guided in so doing by the General Regulations of the Atlantic City Conference in their main lines. The Rules of Procedure gave rise to lengthy discussions on certain points; and the disputed points had to be held over for greater or lesser periods of time in the hope of reaching unanimous agreement.

"Such was the case with Rule 8 (Languages), on which unanimity was attained. Similarly with the following Rules:

- 9 (Experts)
- 17 (Voting), and
- 21 (Final Document of the Committee of Eight).

"The 'requirements' were in most cases furnished by the Administrations. The members of the Committee, who had drawn up the draft plans, were able to take them into account as far as possible. Certain 'requirements' however, gave rise to difficulties, as to which it is perhaps as well to say a few words in explanation of certain points in our drafts.

"The requirements, in connection with which difficulties arose, were those of Germany, Spain and the United Nations.

"Requirements of Germany

"The Committee contemplated a general programme based on the minimum requirements of each occupied zone of the German population. But divergencies of views made themselves apparent in connection with the technical means necessary to ensure such minimum requirements; and these divergencies are reflected in the different allocations to Germany shown in the two variant documents (Docs. 279 and 281).

"As regards the armies of occupation, the Committee of Eight proposed to meet their requirements out of the frequencies assigned to each of the occupying countries for its own national broadcasting, except in the case of the American army of occupation, which was to have a supplementary frequency allocation for its requirements. The whole question of Germany is one which, in virtue of its special character, will have to be studied at Copenhagen.

"In the matter of documentation in respect of Germany, the Committee of Eight received -- at a very late date -- a note on the 'requirements' of the 4 zones from the Allied Commission for the Control of Telecommunications (Catelpost). On March 26 we sent the two variants to the first draft plan to the Allied Commission for the Control of Telecommunications as well as to the 32 other Administrations, asking for observations. But we have never had any response from this Commission beyond an acknowledgement of receipt, in spite of telegraphic reminders.

"Requirements of Spain

"The 33 countries meeting at Atlantic City had instructed the Committee of Eight to obtain all requisite information in regard to broadcasting in Spain (present position and minimum requirements), but without approaching the Spanish Government or the Spanish broadcasting organisation on the subject.

"It was accordingly through semi-official channels only that such information as we received was obtained; and the Committee of Eight is not responsible for its accuracy.

"Requirements of the United Nations

"There was a preliminary exchange of views on the subject; but the United Nations did not send a Delegation to the Committee of Eight to state their views.

"In fact the whole question of the broadcasting of the United Nations has been left in its entirety for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference to deal with.

"The Final Report of the Committee of Eight indicates in broad lines how the Committee worked.

"In order to cut down the work of the Secretariat, and at the same time to expedite its own labours, the Committee decided not to appoint Sub-Committees (which would have involved the keeping of Minutes), but to work instead through Working Groups (thus reducing the accumulation of papers to a minimum). Accordingly a Group G 1 was set up for the study of technical questions, to which all Delegations belonged, with Professor van der Pol (Netherlands) as its Chairman and Mr. Metzler (Switzerland) as its Vice-Chairman. The work of Group 1 consisted in the study of the different countries' requirements, and the establishment of the general fundamental principles on which to base a plan. It also had to study the fundamental principles of a draft plan submitted at one point by the U.S.S.R. Delegation.

"The Final Report indicates the fundamental points, on which agreement was reached. There were not a few others, on which it did not prove possible to reach agreement.

"The Report further explains how, when Group G 1 was unable to agree as to the fundamentals of a plan, the Committee of Eight decided to set up another very small group, G 2, composed of the two Professors Kotelnikov and van der Pol, with instructions to produce a single draft plan. Group G 1 at the same time went on with its study of the U.S.S.R. proposal. The latter however, failed to secure unanimity on the part of Group G 1, while at the same time Group G 2 was unable to produce a single plan within the time-limit set them. The date of the close of the Committee's First Session was now imminent; and the Committee accordingly decided, as the Final Report says, to consider two preliminary draft plans, the one on the basis of 9 kc/s drawn up by Prof. van der Pol, and the other on the basis of 10 kc/s drawn up by Prof. Kotelnikov. The two drafts were sent to the Administrations as preliminary documentation, intended to elicit their observations.

"In view of the position of the work and the impending close of the First Session, the Committee decided not to hear the Administrations at the First Session, but to wait for the Second Session, when the Administrations would have had time to study the two first variants sent them. The First Session was accordingly closed on March 20, instead of on March 15, the date fixed at Atlantic City.

"The Second Session opened on May 11, some six weeks before the Copenhagen Conference. Between May 12 and 25 the Committee heard Delegates of 22 countries desirous of stating their attitude.

In the meanwhile, the observations of the different countries had been received and published, and the members of the Committee of Eight could see with sufficient accuracy what the reactions of the 33 countries were. The Final Report with its very succinct language on the one hand, and the Minutes of meetings on the other hand, together with the observations and the Minutes of the several Hearings, will enable every member of the Broadcasting Conference to gather what were the preferences expressed and the criticisms voiced.

"The Directives had provided that, where the observations of Administrations were relatively unimportant, it would be sufficient for the Committee of Eight to put them on record, whereas in the event of their being of importance the Committee might be led to reshape its work. The Committee decided that the second of the two alternatives was indicated in the present instance, and that a reshaping of its work was called for. Here again the attempt was made, as the Final Report records, to draw up a single draft plan, but again without success.

"Accordingly, as the Report says, the Committee decided to submit two variants, remodelled as far as possible in order to take the observations of the Administrations into account, as a preliminary to the preparation of a plan for the Broadcasting Conference.

"The remodelling of the two variants of the First Session was undertaken by a Working Group consisting of Mr. Hayes (United Kingdom) and Mr. van der Pol in the case of the 9 kc/s plan, and by Prof. Kotelnikov alone in the case of the 10 kc/s plan.

"The Committee of Eight finally closed its labours at a night sitting on June 9, after drawing up and unanimously approving a Final Report, which was sent two days later semi-officially to the Administrations, and further directly by the Chairman, as well as by the Berne Bureau, while it was officially presented to the Belgian Government for official transmission to the Danish Government and to the Governments of the 31 other countries of the European area.

"As ex-Chairman of the Committee of Eight, I should be sorry to end these remarks without once more paying a public tribute, in the presence of the Delegates of the 33 countries from whom the Committee received its instructions, to the work done by all the members of the Committee, to the zeal, devotion and competence which they showed, and to the constructive attitude and mutual understanding of which gave proof.

"I want to thank them all warmly for their great efforts, the value of which will be felt in the course of the labours of the Copenhagen Conference. To quote the names of every member of the Committee would be impracticable; but I am anxious to express my special thanks to Professor B. van der Pol, first Vice-Chairman of the Committee and Chairman of Working Group G 1, to Dr. Metzler, second Vice-Chairman of the Committee and Vice-Chairman of Working Group G 1, and further to the experts who were responsible for the plans or for the reshaping of the same, namely Professor Kotelnikov, Mr. Hayes and Professor van der Pol, all three members of the Committee. The Committee has now brought its labours to a close, and has submitted to you the result in the shape of the Final Report and the two variants attached to it. The great majority of the members of the Committee are present here in Copenhagen, and are all (I am quite sure) ready to bring to bear on your discussions the experience which they have gained at Brussels in the common work of three and a half months of daily meetings long drawn out.

"It only remains for me to thank the 33 countries of the European area for the confidence reposed by them in the Committee of Eight, when they imposed upon us the task of preparatory work, work which we have found to be of the first importance, long as it has been, and under the circumstances was bound to be, and incomplete in all its details."

The Chairman, in the name of the Assembly, thanked Mr. Corteil for his statement. It reflected the brilliant manner in which Mr. Corteil had sided over the Committee of the Eight Countries. Were there any questions for Mr. Corteil?

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia asked why the Committee of Eight had submitted two variants and not a single draft.

Mr. Corteil answered that it was because the members of the Committee of Eight were not able to reach an agreement on a single plan. The explanation of their divergence was to be found in the Minutes of the meetings.

The Delegate of Albania asked why the number of frequencies allotted to Germany was markedly higher in the 9 kc/s variant than in the 10 kc/s. variant. He considered that the first variant gave Germany too great a number of frequencies.

Mr. Corteil answered that the question of the frequencies of the German stations would have to be handled as a whole at Copenhagen. The respective authors of the two variants could better inform the Albanian Delegate. He reaffirmed that he had no personal opinion on the question. He thought the divergences of view on this problem were due to its political nature.

The Delegate of Roumania said that he had not received the Minutes of the Brussels meetings. Mr. Corteil in reply gave the dates on which copies of the Minutes were sent to the 33 European countries, and repeated that all the stencils (about 3,000 in number) were available at Copenhagen.

He thought an analytical table of the Brussels documents would be more useful to Delegates than a resume (which the Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia had proposed to make).

The Delegate of Bulgaria asked Mr. Corteil to give precise answers both to the questions already asked and to those that were about to be asked.

Mr. Corteil was afraid that on certain points he could only give inexact answers. There were a number of points on which one or other of the 20 or 25 persons, who had taken part in the Brussels meetings, were better qualified to answer than he.

The Chairman agreed with Mr. Corteil that the answers to the questions asked were to be found in the Brussels documents. A rapid estimate put at about 20 the number of Delegates present who had not received the documents in question. The Secretariat would distribute them to those Delegates as soon as possible, probably in the course of the following week.

The Delegate of Bulgaria asked in which of the two proposed plans the interests of the countries which had suffered from the war had been best taken into account.

Mr. Corteil answered that, as ex-Chairman of the Committee of Eight, he would be going against the indications of that Committee if he expressed his personal opinion on a question that it had decided to pass over silently in its Final Report. He again referred his interlocutor to the Minutes of the meetings. The Committee of Eight had certainly taken into consideration the needs of the countries which had suffered from the war; but there again it was the authors of the two plans who could say more exactly to what extent they had done so.

The Delegate of Yugoslavia said he would like to be informed as to the reason for the difference of opinion between the supporters of a 9 kc/s separation and the supporters of a 10 kc/s separation. He wanted to know how the remarks of the various countries had been taken into account in the amendment of the first drafts, and the number of countries supporting each solution. He pressed for an immediate reply; for the distribution of the Brussels documents to those who did not already possess them seemed likely to take some time.

Mr. Corteil stated that the Final Report contained an Annex answering one of the previous questions. The limited time at the disposal of the Committee of Eight had not allowed of the reconciliation of opinions differing from the start, and that was why those opinions remained unreconciled.

The Delegate of Albania again asked why the O.I.R. had not been admitted at Brussels, and why the documents of this organisation had not been turned to account by the Committee of Eight.

The Chairman said that any affirmation appearing to cast doubt on the impartiality of Mr. Corteil was out of order.

Mr. Corteil answered the Delegate of Albania in the terms of his previous reply to the Delegate of Bulgaria. He could not give an opinion on a subject that the Committee had not seen fit to include in its Final Report.

The Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia said that, as Mr. Corteil was unable to pronounce on subjects having political implications, and as it appeared that there were difficulties in the way of giving a faithful summary of the Brussels documents, as he had suggested should be done, he would now propose the following measures for the information of Delegates:

- 1) Each of the authors of the two variants should explain how he improved his first draft;
- 2) They should try to show up clearly the difficulties they were not able to overcome;
- 3) A comparison of the two variants should be made by some such organisation as the O.I.R.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned at 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.

The Chairman summed up the situation as it appeared after the exchange of views which had just taken place. It seemed clear that the explanations desired by Delegations would be found in the documents of the Committee of Eight, and there only. But the consideration of these documents would take time. As however, the work must be expedited for the reasons indicated the previous evening, he thought that the Technical Committee should begin work at the earliest possible moment in order to start preparing directives for the Frequency Allocation Committee as soon as possible. The question of whether the spacing between frequencies should be of 9 or of 10 kc/s was, in his opinion, of fundamental importance; it should be submitted to the Technical Committee without delay. No constructive purpose would be served by reverting to the Brussels documents in the Plenary Assembly. The Delegates of the Vatican City, Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands agreed. The last named said that the title "Netherlands Draft" for the 9 kc/s variant was misleading; the Netherlands Delegation was in no way responsible for the draft.

The Delegate of Yugoslavia said that Mr. Corteil's replies put Delegates in a vicious circle. They were first referred to the Brussels Minutes on points not dealt with in the Final Report, and then it was found that these Minutes were not yet available to everyone. He feared that Mr. Corteil did not wish to give satisfaction to Members present.

Mr. Corteil replied that the Delegate of Yugoslavia had been himself a ^{MEM}Member of the Committee of Eight, and as such was just as well fitted as he (Mr. Corteil) to reply to the questions of certain Delegates.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said it was of primary importance that everyone should have the Brussels documents and especially those of the 2nd session, with the observations of the different countries, the hearings of their representatives and the Minutes of the concluding Plenary Meetings. Until every Delegate had read and studied them, no resumption of the discussion in the Plenary Assembly would be possible. He was also in favour of getting the Technical Committee to work as soon as possible. He suggested that the Technical Committee should study the Brussels documents, and report to the Conference not later than July 15. On the basis of its Report it would be possible to draw up directives for the preparation of a plan.

The Delegate of France was of opinion that the Technical Committee could examine all the questions dealt with in Brussels.

The Chairman thought the question of the separation of frequencies should be examined first. The Committees might be set up on Monday 5, so as to begin working on Tuesday, 6 July.

In answer to the Delegate of Bulgaria, who inquired as to which fundamental documents had been used as a basis for drawing up the first and second variants, Mr.Corteil replied that the Committee of Eight had taken into account :

- the Directives of Atlantic City and the requirements

stated by the different countries,
for the preliminary drafts established at the
1st Meeting,

- the written and oral comments of the

different countries,
for the preliminary drafts established at the
2nd Meeting.

He suggested that the Delegate of Bulgaria should apply to the authors of the two variants, if he wanted a more detailed reply.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., supported by the Delegate of Czechoslovakia, proposed that the O.I.R. should be asked to make an analysis of the two documents in question, so that the various Delegations could better compare them.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom expressed the view that, the O.I.R. being, like the U.I.R., unacknowledged by certain countries, its intervention might cause dissensions which it would be better to avoid. In his opinion, the work in question should be entrusted to a Sub-Committee of the Technical Committee.

The Delegates of the U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, Roumania and Poland failed to see how the participation of the O.I.R., unanimously admitted on the previous day in the capacity of observer, could possibly cause dissension. They were convinced that those hypothetical dissensions would be more than compensated by the technical benefit which the Conference would derive from the cooperation of the O.I.R. They were however frankly surprised at the United Kingdom Delegate's mentioning the U.I.R., whose admission to the Conference had been reserved until further notice.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom explained that, in his opinion, Delegations whose countries were not members of the O.I.R. could not without indiscretion consult the documents of the latter organisation.

The Delegate of the Vatican City considered that the best way of avoiding all such difficulties would be for the members of the Conference to work among themselves, at any rate at the start. He had reasons to believe that one country had already requested the O.I.R. to make the analysis suggested by the U.S.S.R. Delegation.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia stated that the analysis in question had in fact been made, and that it would be in the interest of the Conference to avail itself of such excellent work.

In order to settle the question, the Delegate of France, supported by the Delegates of Ireland and the Netherlands, suggested that the Technical Committee itself should decide whether to invite the O.I.R. or any other observers whose cooperation it considered useful, to participate in the work of the Conference.

The Chairman summarised the discussion.

In the first place, he said, it had been agreed that the Technical Committee should submit to the Conference not later than July 15 a Report on the work of the Brussels Committee.

Secondly, the U.S.S.R. proposal that the Conference should ask the O.I.R. to make an analysis of the Brussels documents had not been received with unanimous approval. A possible solution was to adopt the French proposal, and leave it to the Technical Committee to invite, or not to invite, the O.I.R. to take part in its labours. He himself saw no objection to the O.I.R., to which some 22 Delegations belonged, making an analysis of the Brussels documents. The analysis might then be submitted to the Conference by the 22 Delegations in question. The only point at which difficulties might arise was as to the propriety of the Conference making an official application to the O.I.R.; but the question need not arise, if the Conference proceeded in the manner he had suggested.

The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. could not accept the French proposal in its entirety, but was prepared to adjourn the discussion in view of the lateness of the hour.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

| | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| Seen: | Seen: |
| V. Meyer, | W.F. Studer, |
| H. Voutaz | N. E. Holmblad |
| J. Revoy, | Secretary-in-Chief |
| Secretaries. | Chairman. |

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference

København 1948.

RD Document No.32 - E

5 July 1948

Original : French.

TURKEY.

While the new plan for the assignment of frequencies to the different countries of the European Broadcasting area is being prepared, the Delegation of the Republic of Turkey requests the Conference to take into consideration the natural and social situation and corresponding requirements of Turkey, as follows.

The requirements are indicated below :

- 1) The area of Turkey is 767,119 km² (exclusive of the area of lakes and swamps, which amounts to as much as 9,604 km²).
- 2) According to the 1945 census, the population totals 18,860,222 inhabitants, and is increasing by 1.8 % (0.018) every year. The density is 25 inhabitants per km².
- 3) Turkey is surrounded by mountains, the height of which varies from 1,000 to 4,000 metres. In the Eastern and Southern parts of the country the mountains are more than 5,000 metres high. Most of our Eastern towns are situated at an altitude of more than 1,500 metres.
- 4) The capital, Ankara, is situated :

| | |
|--------|-------------------------|
| 950 km | from the Eastern border |
| 570 km | " " Western " |
| 300 km | " " Northern " |
| 650 km | " " Southern " |
- 5) There are 207,650 licensed listeners-in. In this connection the Turkish Delegation wishes to draw the attention of the Conference to the fact that a great number of licences are used for public broadcasting, which ensures group reception in small centres.
- 6) The Eastern part of the country is very mountainous and too far distant from the capital. The density of the population is low, and ~~badly distributed for purposes of culture~~. It is of great importance to provide a broadcasting service for this region, in order to increase its national culture the more so as it is not possible to count on the laying of telephone cables with relay stations over these large territories in the near future.
- 7) From measurements made on the basis of propagation curves, the earth conductivity in the Western and Central parts averages :

$$= 2,10^{-14} \text{ (e.m.c.g.s. units)}$$

In the East the average is more favorable, viz.

$$= 0,5.10^{-14} \text{ (e.m.c.g.s. units)}$$

8) Present situation.

In accordance with the Lucerne Plan, the Turkish Government has constructed a broadcasting station in Ankara which operates with a wave length of 1639 m. (183 kc/s).

The Radio-Paris Station, working with the very close frequency of 182 kc/s, caused many interferences; and the Ankara station accordingly reduced its frequency from 183 to 182 kc/s in 1940.

As the Ankara station has no exclusive wave-length, the reception of its emissions in an easterly and westerly direction is bound to be defective by night.

9) Minimum requirements.

- A.- In spite of the interference caused by other stations (Radio-Paris and Moskwa I), we claim, in view of the fact that Ankara has been working on this frequency for 11 years to keep the frequency 182 kc/s; assigned to us in the Lucerne Plan. All alterations tending to change this frequency of 182 Ko/s, or to modify the antenna system, would involve heavy expenses and long delays. They would be contrary to the principles laid down in the Atlantic City Conference, and they would also delay the application of the new plan.
- B.- With the newly built radiating pylon and the Istanbul transmitter in process of being set up with a specified power of 150 kw. which cannot be reduced, it will not be possible to work outside the range of from 680 to 760 kc/s. We insist on our demand on the above grounds for an exclusive frequency to be assigned to this band for the Istanbul transmitter. The bad earth conductivity, the orographic conditions and the lie of the land make the use of an exclusive frequency in the 680 to 760 kc/s band absolutely necessary.
- C.- For the same reasons, it is also necessary to use frequencies lower than 750 kc/s for the Izmir station and especially for the Malatya station.

The Lucerne and Montreux plans did not meet the effective requirements or the legitimate rights of the different countries among them, Turkey. The Turkish Delegation thinks and hopes that the present Conference will not repeat the mistakes made by the two former Conferences, and that it will greatly contribute to the improvement of the broadcasting services.

(Tr. 2/R. 11/D.25)

Communication

At the joint meeting of the Executive Committees (Committees 1) of the two Conferences on the 3 July, 1948, several Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees of the Broadcasting Conference asked that countries of the European Area be invited to make known, without delay, their comments on the second variants of the plan, drawn up by the Committee of Eight Countries at Brussels during its 2nd session, these comments being important for the work of Committees.

The Executive Committee of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference passed this request. Therefore the Chairman (under-signed) asks the Delegations present at the European Regional Broadcasting Conference to be kind enough to hand to the Secretariat the comments of the countries they represent by the 13 July next, at the latest.

The Chairman of the European Regional
Broadcasting Conference

N. E. Holmblad.

Original: French

EGYPT

This document is an amendment to RD Document No 16 - F
and does not concern the English text.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 35 - E
July 5, 1948

Original: French

SYRIA

This document is an amendment to RD Document No 17 - F
and does not concern the English text.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 36

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 48 - Replacement to Document No. 36

5 June, 1948

Original: in Russian
4th Committee.

Programme of Work and Organisation.

Committee 4 (Technical)

1) Fundamental Tasks.

In conformity with paragraph 4 of Document No.2, the Technical Committee is authorised to establish the general technical principles for drawing up a frequency allocation plan.

The technical principles underlying the establishment of a frequency allocation plan have been studied by the Brussels Conference of Eight Countries. The said Conference presented the results of its work in its Document No.284 and in two alternatives to the frequency allocation plan.

The Plenary Meeting of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference entrusted to Committee 4 - as their first task - the task of furnishing a technical analysis of the work of the Committee of Eight.

Taking the above into consideration, the Technical Committee (Committee 4) should :

a) examine the proposals concerning technical principles and directives as accepted by the Committee of Eight, and add their recommendations.

b) draw up and recommend general technical directives concerning questions which have not been examined by the Committee of Eight; viz:

1.) The conditions of frequency allotting to broadcasting stations in the bands of other services.

2.) Directives and recommendations concerning the use of directed antennae.

3.) Directives and recommendations concerning technical principles with regard to the synchronization of groups of national broadcasting stations.

c) submit a technical analysis of the draft documentation elaborated by the Committee of Eight Countries.

d) on the basis of results attained in the elaboration of tasks specified in paragraphs a), b) and c) - submit recommendations for the Planning Committee.

e) after the termination of the work by the Planning Committee - submit to the Plenary Meeting of the Conference a technical expert's opinion on the result of the work of the Planning Committee.

2) Organisation

In order to accomplish the tasks given in Committee 4, three Sub-Committees are being formed:

Sub-Committee 4 A, Supplementary Technical Directives.

Tasks: The elaboration of supplementary technical directives in conformity with paragraph b), section 1.

Sub-Committee 4 B, Technical Analysis.

- Tasks: 1) Technical analysis of the draft-documentation of the Committee of Eight Countries.
- 2) Elaboration of a technical expert's opinion on the results of the work accomplished by the Planning Committee.

Sub-Committee 4 C, Drafting Committee.

Task: Final drafting of documents after confirmation of their contents at a Plenary Meeting of the Committee.

The examination of document 284 should begin immediately at a Plenary Meeting of the Committee, inasmuch as it is the accomplished result of a great preparatory work of the Committee of Eight Countries.

REPORT
of Committee 2
(Credentials Committee)

1st Meeting

5 July, 1948

The Chairman, Mr. CORTEIL, opened the meeting at 9.45 a.m.

Mr. J.L.da Silva Dias acted as Vice-Chairman.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee should designate a Reporter.

Mr. Leproux, of the French Delegation, was appointed Reporter.

The Chairman read the list of countries which had announced their intention of taking part in the work of the Committee:

Belgium, Vatican City, Denmark, Egypt, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, Syria, Yugoslavia.

The Delegate of Albania wished to add Albania to the list.

The Chairman pointed out that of the 33 countries invited, 18 had submitted credentials to date, on which the Committee would be called upon to take a decision. The following countries had not yet submitted any credentials to the Secretariat:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Byelorussia, Egypt, France, Greece, Hungary, Morocco and Tunisia, the Ukraine, the United Kingdom, Syria, Turkey.

The Chairman invited these countries to submit their credentials. Continuing, he said that the Committee was holding a purely formal First Meeting. They wished for further information as to the character of the Conference, before they could be in a position to make a decision on the validity of the credentials submitted to it. It would be necessary, therefore, to wait until a decision had been on that issue as a result of the proposals of Committee 3. He suggested that they should make a recommendation in the matter to Committee 3. The Committee would hold its next meeting on Thursday at 11 o'clock.

He added, in reply to the Delegate of the United Kingdom, that the Committee would limit itself on Thursday to examining credentials and verifying their nature, without taking any decisions.

The meeting rose at 10.10 a.m.

R. CORTEIL
Chairman

J.H. LEPROUX,
Reporter

(Tr. 15/R.11/D.27)

Original: English

UNITED KINGDOM DELEGATION

Comments on the Final Report of the Work of the Committee of Eight Countries (Document No. 284-E) and on the plans contained in Document 279 and 281 of the Committee of Eight Countries of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

The United Kingdom Delegation would like to make the following comments on these documents:

General Technical Comments.

Document 284-E

Annex 1 - Frequency Bands.

There appears to be some discrepancy between the Atlantic City documents and the extreme frequencies of the medium wave band quoted. The Atlantic City documents give the extreme frequencies of this band as 525 kc/s - 1605 kc/s per second. The use of the frequency of 520 kc/s per second is, however, covered in paragraph 138 of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations, and it is pointed out that the allocation of this frequency to broadcasting stations will require consideration by this Conference. Should this frequency not be brought into use for broadcasting, the numbers of channels both for the 9 kc/s and 10 kc/s spacing should be reduced by one.

Annex 3 - Ratio of field intensities for shared frequencies.

While this statement of fact is agreed, it must be pointed out that unless the conditions under which the unwanted field is to be measured are clearly stated, it will be impossible of application in the Plans Committee. The question is whether this ratio should be taken under conditions of peak, quasi maximum or median value of the unwanted signal, and a clear definition on this subject is required.

Annex 4 - Ratio of field intensities for adjacent channels.

The British Delegation is of the opinion that this statement as it stands is incomplete and misleading because the conditions are not stated. For example, the ratio of the wanted to the unwanted signals for 9 kc/s and 10 kc/s separation may be equal in two cases if the overall selectivity of the receiving sets is correspondingly adjusted. Admittedly this would cause some loss in quality with the smaller separation, but it is considered that this disadvantage will have to be accepted in order to obtain the essential increase in the number of channels available. Further, it is pointed out that the loss of quality need only occur outside the limits of the primary service area, if a reasonable geographical separation is provided in the plan for neighbouring frequency assignments.

(RD Doc.38-E)

Annex 5 - Maximum power in the medium waveband.

The United Kingdom would prefer to retain the present limit of 120 kW on general grounds but would not oppose the limit of 150 kW should this be generally desired. It must reserve its right to increase the power from that proposed in the schedule of requirements if this higher power is agreed.

Annex 6 - Maximum power for synchronised stations operating on exclusive waves.

It is considered that the maximum power for the whole of the synchronised network should be limited to twice rather than 1.5 times the maximum admissible power of a single station operating on the same frequency.

Documents Nos. 279 and 281.

As regards Document No. 281, the United Kingdom Delegation wishes to comment as follows:

- (1) This plan does not provide sufficient frequencies for the British broadcasting stations which are now working, and this is regarded as essential. In particular, it should be stated that no frequency is provided for one of the oldest broadcasting stations in Europe (the London station), in the service area of which there are over 13,000,000 people and nearly 3½ million licenses. In all, no less than 9 British stations, for which 5 channels are needed, are not even mentioned in the 10 kc/s plan. There are other cogent reasons why this plan as it stands is entirely unacceptable to the United Kingdom. It cannot, therefore, form a basis of discussion unless it is possible to make provision for these additional requirements.
- (2) The British Delegation has made a complete analysis of those stations in the plans which are scheduled to work on a shared basis, and the results are given in the Annex to the present document. It will be seen that although a relatively large number (58) of exclusive channels is provided in the 10 kc/s plan, the total number of channels that can be regarded as obtaining adequate protection from interference is surprisingly small. Thus, 35 db can hardly be regarded as generous protection bearing in mind that median field strengths have been used in the calculations, and yet only 111 allocations offer a better protection ratio under the 10 kc/s plan. Moreover, no fewer than 33 allocations promise to afford protection ratios of less than 25 db.
- (3) It is noted that in both the 9 and 10 kc/s band no uniform upper power limit has been adopted for the long wave band. It is regarded as essential that this should be done and the British delegation suggests the figure quoted in its original statement of requirements, viz 300 kW.

Analysis of Protection Ratios Afforded by the 9 kc/s and
10 kc/s Plans (Documents No. 279 and 281 of the Committee
of Eight Countries.

1. General.

An estimate has been made of the protection ratios ϕ that would be afforded to the various medium wave stations which are allocated shared channels in the two plans submitted to the Conference by the Committee of Eight Countries. In making this estimate, the median value of the indirect wave has been taken for the unwanted station; the ratio calculated being in each case that obtaining where the field strength established by the wanted station is 3 mv/m. Where a directional aerial is specified in either plan the additional protection thus afforded has been taken as 10 db.

2. Plan based on a channel separation of 9 kc/s.

The 9 kc/s plan provides in the medium wave band:

46 exclusive allocations $\phi\phi$
161 shared allocations
3 international common waves.

The protection ratio afforded under the plan has been estimated for each of the 161 shared allocations.

3. Plan based on a channel separation of 10 kc/s.

The 10 kc/s plan provides in the medium wave band:

58 exclusive allocations $\phi\phi$
160 shared allocations
3 international common waves.

The protection ratio has been estimated for each of the 160 shared allocations.

4. Summary of Results.

The results which have been obtained are summarised in the three tables attached, the first of which shows a broad subdivision of the allocations, while the second and third show more detailed analyses into various categories according to the degree of protection afforded.

ϕ The term "protection ratio" is used here to denote the ratio of the field strength established by the wanted station to that established by the interfering station.

$\phi\phi$ The term "allocation" is used here to denote the use of a frequency, either on a shared or an exclusive basis, by one country, either for a station or for a group of stations.

| <u>Table 1. Broad Analysis of Allocations</u> | | 9kc/s plan (Doc.No 279) | 10kc/s plan (Doc.No.281) |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) | Number of exclusive allocations | 46 | 58 |
| (b) | Number of shared allocations affording a protection ratio of 40db or better | 67 | 27 |
| (c) | $= (a)/(b)$. Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of 40 db or better | 113 | 85 |
| (d) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 40 db | 94 | 133 |
| (e) | $= (c)/(d)$. Total number of allocations (excluding International Common Waves) | 207 | 218 |

| <u>Table 2 Detailed Analysis of Allocations</u> | | | |
|---|--|-----|-----|
| (a) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 40 db | 113 | 85 |
| (b) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 35 db | 152 | 111 |
| (c) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 30 db | 199 | 148 |
| (d) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 25 db | 207 | 185 |
| (e) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 20 db | 207 | 204 |
| (f) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 15 db | 207 | 213 |
| (g) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio better than 10 db | 207 | 218 |

| <u>Table 3 Detailed Analysis of Allocations</u> | | | |
|---|---|----|-----|
| (a) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 40 db | 94 | 133 |
| (b) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 35 db | 55 | 107 |
| (c) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 30 db | 8 | 70 |
| (d) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 25 db | 0 | 33 |
| (e) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 20 db | 0 | 14 |
| (f) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 15 db | 0 | 5 |
| (g) | Number of allocations affording a protection ratio of less than 10 db | 0 | 0 |

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No. 39-E

July 6, 1948

Maritime Regional Radio
Conference
København, 1948

MAR Document No. 24-E

July 6, 1948

Submitted in: French

REPORT

of the Combined Executive Committees

(Committees 1)

of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference and

of the Maritime Regional Radio Conference.

First Meeting

3 July 1948

The meeting opened at 10:10 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. N.E. Holmblad.

The Chairman stated that he had convoked the Committees 1 in order that they might establish the work program for the coming week. He suggested naming a Reporter for the meeting, and designated Mr. H. Voutaz, Secretary, for the purpose. He proceeded to read out the names of the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the various Committees, which he had received from the Delegations designated by the Plenary Assembly.

For the Broadcasting Conference, the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees were the following:

Committee 1 : Executive

Committee, composed of the Chairmen and the Vice-Chairmen of the different Committees, sitting under the Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference.

Committee 2 : Credentials

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Chairman : <u>Belgium</u> | : R. Corteil |
| Vice-Chairman : <u>Portugal</u> | : J.L. da Silva Dias |

Committee 3 : Organization

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Chairman : <u>France</u> | : J. Meyer |
| Vice-Chairman : <u>Czechoslovakia</u> | : J. Ehrlich |
| | (Deputy: J. Busak) |

(RD Doc. No. 39-E)
(MAR Doc.No. 24-E)

Committee 4 : Technical

Chairman : U.S.S.R. : M. Kessenikh

Vice-Chairman : Sweden : E. Esping

Committee 5 : Allocation of Frequencies

Chairman : United Kingdom : H. Faulkner

Vice-Chairman : Yugoslavia : M. Popovic

Committee 6 : Drafting

Chairman : Switzerland : E. Metzler

Vice-Chairman: United Kingdom : G.R. Parsons

For the Maritime Radio Conference:

Committee 1 : Executive - Same as for Committee 1 of RD

Committee 2 : Credentials

Chairman : Italy : G. Gneme

Vice-Chairman : Poland : M. Waskiewicz

Committee 3 : Organization

Chairman : U.S.S.R. : M. Shtchetinin

Vice-Chairman : United Kingdom: R.H. Billington

Committee 4 : Allocation of Frequencies

Chairman : Netherlands : J. Kuyper

Vice-Chairman: Norway : O. Moe

Committee 5 : Drafting

Chairman : France : M. Lhermite

Vice-Chairman : Bulgaria : A. Grigorov

The Chairman announced that all the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees were present or represented at the meeting.

He proposed accordingly to schedule the work there and then, and suggested that all the Committees should meet separately on Monday July 5 at the following times, to organize themselves and designate their Reporters:

| <u>Broadcasting Conference</u> | | <u>Maritime Radio Conference</u> | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 9.30 a.m. | Committee 2 | 2.30 p.m. | Committee 2 |
| 10.30 a.m. | Committee 3 | 3.30 p.m. | Committee 3 |
| 11.30 a.m. | Committee 4 | 4.30 p.m. | Committee 4 |
| 2.30 p.m. | Committee 5 | | |

Two rooms, equipped for simultaneous interpretation, would be provided for the meetings.

(D.28)

(RD Doc.39-E)
(MAR Doc.24-E)

Notices in regard to the meetings would appear on the blackboard.

The Drafting Committees of the two Conferences would be able to organise themselves at a later date, there being no occasion for them to meet at present.

The Chairman proposed to fix the date of the next RD Plenary Assembly. There were still many outstanding questions on the Broadcasting Conference, especially the questions of the vote and of the admittance of international organizations. He suggested Friday July 9 as the date of the 2nd Plenary Assembly. That would leave time for the necessary studies.

The Delegate of France agreed to the proposed date. The working group charged with the question of the vote would soon have finished its work, and would be ready to report on Tuesday July 6. Between Monday and Friday the other Committees would work.

The Chairman took it that the Plenary Assembly of the Broadcasting Conference was therefore set for Friday. The Agenda would be published. He proposed that Committees 3 and 4 should begin their work on Tuesday with a view to the Plenary Assembly.

Committee 3 would have to determine if the Broadcasting Conference was an administrative conference or a plenipotentiary conference. As for Committee 4, the Plenary Assembly had charged it with the preparation of a report on the work accomplished by the Preparatory Committee of Eight Countries, which met twice at Brussels.

Committees 3 and 4 would be able to hold meetings next Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, in the morning and afternoon alternately.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom agreed to Committee 4 starting its work; but there was still much information to be received before a report could be presented.

Certain countries had not yet said why they had not seen their way to accept the Brussels proposals. Accordingly he suggested that, for the time being, only one meeting per week should be held by the Planning Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. found it more logical to schedule the meetings for the morning. He asked the Delegate of the United Kingdom with what questions he was planning to begin his work, in order that the Technical Committee could begin with the same questions as the two Committees were so closely related.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom answered that it was too early to determine that. He thought that they might begin by asking all the countries to contribute information, criticisms, and suggestions on the last two Brussels variants with a view to preparing a single plan. The indications which the Technical Committee would furnish later would be helpful in that connection.

The Delegate of France said he would also like to have some details on the work of the Planning Committee. Observations on the first Brussels plans already existed. He understood that the information now to be requested was complementary information to that already given at Brussels by certain countries, as well as information from countries which had not yet supplied any. He

(RD Doc. 39-E)
(MAR Doc. 24-E)

also understood that it was Committee 4 which was to report on the work done at Brussels.

The Delegate of Italy proposed that the documentation on requirements and the observations made in connection with the establishment of the plan should be put at the disposal of the Delegations. In that way, the Delegations would see whether, and to what extent, they could modify their country's proposals.

Mr. Makarov (U.S.S.R.) agreed with the remarks of Mr. Meyer (France).

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that the Planning Committee was sure to ask for comments and criticisms of the 2 variants presented by the Preparatory Committee after the 2nd session. Up to the present, only Italy had made observations. The information might be published at the present Conference in the form of documents. It would be very useful to the Planning Committee in the preparation of its report. They had to find a solution involving a single plan.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. reminded Delegates that the last Plenary Assembly had decided that the consideration of the Report of the Committee of Eight Countries, and the subsequent preparation of a report on it, fell within the competence of the Technical Committee. Consequently, the opinions of countries on the work issuing from the 1st and 2nd session of the Preparatory Committee constituted the organic basis of the work which the Plenary Assembly had referred to the Technical Committee.

When the Planning Committee received on the one hand such complementary information and on the other hand the particulars from the Technical Committee, it would be able to go forward.

The Delegate of Belgium said that the Committee of Eight would put all its documents at the disposal of the different Committees; but he pointed out that Mr. Corteil, Chairman of the Committee of Eight, had received no observations on the second Brussels variants (2nd session).

The Chairman noted that there were as yet no observations on the second plans. It seemed to him that the report which the Plenary Assembly had requested from the Technical Committee should deal only with technical aspects of the question. The Technical Committee had important problems to solve, of which the question of a separation of 9 or 10 kc/s was an example. On the other hand the assignment of definite frequencies to given stations was the duty of the Planning Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. agreed; but he proposed that the replies, observations and criticisms of the countries should be pooled by the Technical Committee to facilitate a more complete analysis and expedite the preparation of its report to the Conference. He asked countries to speed up the sending in of their replies.

The Delegate of France also pressed for observations to be submitted at the earliest possible moment and in writing. In his opinion, the question of kc/s separation for the countries concerned could be divided into two. To a certain extent the separation would govern the allocations. The replies would deal with both subjects. He proposed that the Technical Committee and the Plenary Assembly should debate the question of separation, with a view to the formation of a single plan. After that stage, allocations could be made.

(RD Doc. No 39 - E)
(MAR Doc. No 24 - E)

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that there seemed to be differing conceptions of the duties of the Committees concerned. He would endeavour to promote agreement. He proposed that the Technical Committee should deal with the question of separation, interference, and the quality of broadcasting in the various areas.

From the recent discussion it would seem that all the Planning Committee would have to do would be to ratify the work of the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee should deal with the question of separation; but the Planning Committee with its task of allocating frequencies should be able to avail itself of the results. Moreover the Planning Committee would decide whether to apply the 9 kc/s or the 10 kc/s separation.

The Chairman said it was necessary not to confuse the work of the two Committees. It would be logical that the observations which the countries were asked to send in should be considered by the Technical Committee and by the Planning Committee. The Plenary Assembly had not asked for these observations, but they hoped to have them by July 15, so that the Technical Committee would be able to take them into account in the report it was to submit to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman and the Delegations of the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., Italy, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia then engaged in a long discussion on the delimitation of the competence of Committees 4 and 5, on the presentation of the report of Committee 4 to the Plenary Assembly, and on the observations on the plans drawn up at Brussels for which Delegations were to be asked.

General agreement was eventually reached on the following points:

Proposal of Switzerland (supported by other delegations):

To send a direct invitation to all Delegations to submit their comments on the 2 variants of the Brussels Plan (2nd session) without delay.

Proposal of the U.S.S.R.:

To distribute copies of the observations received to all Committees. The said comments being mainly of interest to the Technical Committee, the latter to proceed to an analysis, and present its report on the work of the Committee of Eight Countries to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman thanked the Delegates who had taken part in that very useful discussion. He would inform Delegations that at that joint meeting of the two Executive Committees, they had been invited to submit their observations on the second variants of the Brussels Plan of the Committee of Eight Countries (2nd session) as soon as possible, in view of the importance of these comments for the work of the different Committees. He proposed to fix a time-limit of a week for the submission of observations i.e. by Monday evening July 12.

(RD Doc. No 39 - E)
(MAR Doc. No 24 - E)

He added that it would be well for the Credentials Committee to meet during the following week in order to determine the position of each Delegate as regards voting.

The Delegate of Belgium suggested that the meeting of Committee 2 of the Broadcasting Conference should be arranged for 11 a.m. on Thursday; and the Delegate of Italy proposed that Committee 2 of the Maritime Conference meet at 11 a.m. on Wednesday.

These suggestions were accepted.

Reverting to the time-table for the week 5 to 10 July, the combined Committees 1 arranged for meetings at the following times:

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Tuesday morning: | Committee 3 RD | Committee 4 MAR |
| afternoon: | " 4 RD | " 3 MAR |
| Wednesday morning: | Committee 4 RD | { Committee 3 MAR |
| | | { " 2 MAR |
| afternoon: | " 3 RD | { " 4 MAR |
| Thursday morning: | Committee 3 RD | Committee 4 MAR |
| | " 2 RD | |
| afternoon: | " 4 RD | " 3 MAR |
| Friday morning: | Plenary Assembly RD | |
| afternoon: | (possibly): Plenary Assembly RD | |
| 4.45 p.m.: | Committee 1 RD | Committee 1 MAR |

Before bringing the meeting to a close, the Chairman reminded Delegates that the visit to the "Maison de la Radio" would take place that afternoon. In reply to a question, he said that interpreters would be available for the Russian-speaking Delegates.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

H. VOUTAZ,
Reporter.

N.E. HOLMBLAD,
Chairman.

(Tr.5/R.11/D.St33)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No. 40 - E

MAR Document No. 25 - E
6 July, 1948

Submitted in: French.

Regional Radio-Maritime
Conference
København, 1948

Admission of the
International Chamber of Shipping

At the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference, held on June 30, (see RD Doc. No. 30), it was decided that the question of the admission of the International Chamber of Shipping should be deferred until the Assembly knew officially whether Spain was a member.

As a result of this decision, the Chairman sent the following telegram to his organisation on July 1:

LOGBOARD ALD

L O N D O N

In order to examine your request admission comma European Regional Broadcasting Conference wishes know officially from you if Spain is member of International Chamber of Shipping STOP Please reply by telegram indicating nature of membership if governmental or other body which represented.

Chairman European Regional
Broadcasting Conference

The organisation replied with the following telegram:

+ CER 5 London K89 73 2 1007=

President European Broadcasting Conference København=

Your telegram received STOP International Chamber of Shipping nominally includes non governmental organisation representing Spanish shipowners formerly represented in International shipping conference now dissolved STOP Spanish shipowners association has taken no active part in International shipping conference or in International Chamber of Shipping since 1928 STOP International Chamber of Shipping entirely non governmental but is technical and commercial policy organisation of shipping industry=

Chairman International Chamber of Shipping +

(Tr. 15/R. 11/D. 27)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD-Document No.41-E

MAR Document No. 26-E

July 6, 1948

Maritime
Regional Radio Conference
København, 1948

Submitted in French

Admission of the
International Radio-Maritime Commission
(C. I. R. M.)

At the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference, held on Wednesday, June 30 (see RD Doc. No. 30), it was decided that the question of the admission of the C.I.R.M. should be deferred until the Assembly knew officially whether Spain was one of its members.

As a result of this decision, the Chairman sent the following telegram to the C.I.R.M. on July 1:

Intramar

Brussels

In order to be able to examine your request for admission comma, European Regional Broadcasting Conference wishes know officially from you if Spain is member of CIRM stop Please reply by telegram indicating nature of membership whether Governmental or other body represented.

Chairman European Regional
Broadcasting Conference

The organisation replied with the following telegram:

Chelmsford K134 96 3 1035 =

Chairman European Regional Broadcasting Conference KH =

Reference your telegram July first Hispano Radio Maritima Itda has applied for membership of CIRM but has not to date been able to pay required dues Stop Ipso facto that company is not a member neither is any other Spanish organisation Stop All members of CIRM are commercial and technical Radio Marine Companies and membership is not open to Government bodies Stop respectfully request in these circumstances you will permit our delegates to attend this Conference which is so important to Marine interests regards =

Vandeveldé

Chairman International
Radio-Maritime Commission.

R E P O R T
of Committee 3
(Organisation Committee)

1st Meeting
5 July 1948

The meeting was opened at 10.40 a.m. by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Jacques Meyer.

The Chairman recalled that during the plenary meeting, the Chairmanship of Committee 3 (Organisation Committee) had been assigned to France, and the Vice-Chairmanship to Czechoslovakia, the Head of which Delegation he was pleased to see at his side.

He stated that the Committee was comprised of the representatives of the following 28 countries:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, the Vatican City, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Morocco and Tunisia, Monaco, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

Two observers had to be added to this list: the United States and the Organisation Internationale de Radiodiffusion (O.I.R.).

He asked the Committee to designate a Rapporteur. Mr. Leproux, of the French Delegation, was appointed Rapporteur.

The Committee intimated to the Secretariat that it would be helpful if one of its members could participate in the Committee's work.

+

+

+

The Chairman quoted the definition in § 3 of Document RD No.2 of the task of the Committee as follows: "proposals concerning problems of organisation relating to the work of the Conference and to the future implementation of the frequency plan, also drafting the convention". He added that it was necessary to correct the last part of the phrase by substituting the words "also preparing the convention" for the words "also drafting the convention", since the drafting of the convention was entrusted to Committee 6. The correction in question would have to be adopted at a meeting of Heads of Delegations.

He said that the Committee should keep in close contact with both the Executive Committee and the Plenary Assembly, which might be in a position to give them directives.

In regard to the Agenda two preliminary questions merited the Committee's attention:

(Tr.15/R.11/D19)

1. They had been charged by the Plenary Assembly with the task of determining the character of the Conference. Did the Committee see any objection to putting this question in the first place on the agenda of the next meeting? Agreed unanimously.

2. The Committee had not been explicitly charged with studying the problems raised by the submission of the requirements of Germany. But if this problem was not rapidly solved, the work of all the Committees would be greatly hampered. Therefore, he thought it advisable to draw the attention of the Chairman of the Conference to what was perhaps an omission on the part of the Executive Committee at its last meeting; and he asked if, in conjunction with the Vice-Chairman, he might be authorised to take the question up with the Chairman of the Conference, as the question was clearly one which might be referred to the Committee.

In reply to the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., he confirmed that the sole purpose of the meeting in progress was to draw up the Agenda of the next meeting.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought the problem of Germany should not be referred to the Organisation Committee. There was no relation between that question and those which were within the competence of the Committee.

The Delegate of Denmark was of the opinion that the question already placed on the Agenda would be sufficient to fill the time of the next meeting of the Committee, and that it would be wise to confine themselves to the study of that item.

The Chairman was inclined to agree. As regards the problem of Germany, the only question at the moment was to know to whom it was going to be referred. He did not agree with the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. as to Committee No. 3 not being qualified to study the question. The first thing to be done was to approach the Chairman of the Conference and, if necessary, the Executive Committee, or even the Plenary Assembly, on the subject.

The Chairman took the opinion of the Committee. The Committee decided:

1. that the question of the nature of the Conference should be the only item on the agenda of its next meeting, and that the meeting should take place on Tuesday July 6 at 9.30 a.m.

2. that the Chairman might consult the Chairman of the Conference on the question of the submission of the requirements of Germany.

J. Meyer

Chairman.

J.M. Leproux

Reporter.

(Tr.2/R.11/D.19)

Submitted in : French

Committee 3
(Organization)

At the meeting on 6 July, it was decided to publish the following texts as documentation for the Committee:

International Telecommunications Convention
(Atlantic City)

Page 13-E
Final Acts (Conv)

ARTICLE 10

Plenipotentiary Conferences

1. The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:
 - a) consider the report of the Administrative Council on the activities of the Union;
 - b) establish the basis for the budget of the Union for the next five years;
 - c) finally approve the accounts of the Union;
 - d) elect the Members of the Union which are to serve on the Administrative Council;
 - e) revise the Convention if it considers this necessary;
 - f) if necessary, enter into any formal agreement or revise any existing formal agreement between the Union and any other international body;
 - g) deal with such other telecommunication questions as may be necessary.
2. The Plenipotentiary Conference normally shall meet once every five years at a time and place fixed by the preceding Plenipotentiary Conference.
3. The time or place of the next Plenipotentiary Conference may be changed:
 - a) when at least twenty Members of the Union have proposed a change to the Administrative Council;
 - b) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

In either case, the Administrative Council, with the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Union, shall fix the new time or the new place, or both, and shall indicate, if necessary, the agenda.

Page 14- E
Final Acts(Conv.)

ARTICLE 11

Administrative Conferences

1. (1) The Administrative Conferences shall:
 - a) revise the Regulations provided for in Article 13 paragraph 2 of this Convention with which they are respectively concerned;
 - b) deal with all other matters deemed necessary within the terms of the Convention and the General Regulations, or in accordance with any directive given by the Plenipotentiary Conference.
- (2) The radio administrative conference shall:
 - a) elect the members of the International Frequency Registration Board;
 - b) review its activities.
2. The administrative conferences shall meet at the same place and at the same time as the Plenipotentiary Conference, in general, every five years.
3. (1) An extraordinary administrative conference may be convened:
 - a) by a decision of the Plenipotentiary Conference which shall determine its agenda and the time and place of its meeting; or
 - b) when at least twenty Members of the Union have made known to the Administrative Council their desire that such a Conference shall be held to consider an agenda proposed by them; or
 - c) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.
- (2) In the cases specified in b) and c) of subparagraph (1) above, the Administrative Council, with the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Union, shall determine the time and place of the Conference as well as its agenda.

Page 27-E
Final Acts(Conv.)

ARTICLE 40

Special Arrangements

Members and Associate Members reserve for themselves, for the private operating agencies recognized by them and for other agencies duly authorized to do so, the right to make special arrangements on telecommunication matters which do not concern

Members and Associate Members in general. Such arrangements, however, shall not be in conflict with the terms of this Convention or of the Regulations annexed thereto, so far as concerns the harmful interference which their operation might be likely to cause to the radio services of other countries.

Page 28-E
Final Acts (Conv.)

ARTICLE 41

Regional Conferences, Agreements and Organizations

Members and Associate Members reserve the right to convene regional conferences, to conclude regional agreements and to form regional organizations, for the purpose of settling telecommunication questions which are susceptible of being treated on a regional basis. However, such agreements must not be in conflict with this Convention.

Page 53-E
Final Acts (Conv.)

Extract from ANNEX 2
(See Article 48)

Definition of Terms used in the
International Telecommunication Convention

Administration: Any department or service of a government responsible for implementing the obligations undertaken in the International Telecommunication Convention and the Regulations annexed thereto.

General Regulations annexed to the
International Telecommunication Convention

Page 60-E
Final Acts (Conv.)

Chapter 1

7. The inviting Government, in agreement with the Administrative Council, may invite non-contracting Governments to send observers to take part in the conferences in an advisory capacity.

to be added to § 1.1, second sentence, of the Directive for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

Page 61-E
Final Acts (Conv.)

Chapter 2

7. The provisions of paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Chapter 1 of the General Regulations are applicable to Administrative Conferences.

Page 112-E
Final Acts (Conv.)

Recommendation

concerning broadcasting

2. The Plenipotentiary Conference recommends that the study and preparation of the various proposals of frequency assignments for high frequency broadcasting which should be considered by

administrative conferences should be undertaken in consultation with the International Frequency Registration Board.

Page 25-E
Final Acts(Radio)

Radio Regulations
(Atlantic City)

131. This band is allocated exclusively to the aeronautical mobile and aeronautical radionavigation services. Nevertheless, in the European Area, subject to authorisation by the regional agreement concluded by the next European Regional Broadcasting Conference and the conditions specified in that agreement, the administrations concerned may place in the bands 325 - 365 kc/s and 395 - 405 kc/s those of the following broadcasting stations which will not cause harmful interference to the aeronautical mobile and aeronautical radionavigation services.

The broadcasting stations now in operation in the whole of the band 325 - 405 kc/s are:

Banska Bystrica
Bergen

Finnmark
Lulea

Page 62-E
Final Acts(Radio)

248 (3) In principle, the previous arrangements referred to in the preceding paragraph are concluded at Broadcasting Conferences of the countries of the European Area. However, if a country desires to establish such a service or to obtain a modification of the conditions fixed by a previous arrangement relating to such a service (frequency, power, geographical position of the stations, etc.) in the interval between two such conferences, it shall so inform the countries of the European Area at least three months in advance through the medium of the Secretary General of the Union. Any country which has not answered within a period of six weeks after receipt of the communication in question shall be considered as having given its consent.

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ORGANIZATION

Technical Centre

Brussels, 25 June 1948
32, Avenue Albert Lancaster

The Chairman of the
European Regional
Broadcasting Conference,
København.

The Secretary-General

Sir,

The International Broadcasting Organization has asked to be admitted as an observer to the European Regional Broadcasting Conference to be held in København from June 25 onwards.

The request for admittance was sent to the inviting Government through the intermediary of the Belgian Government, in conformity with the stipulations of the General Regulations of the Atlantic City Conference, Chapter 2, paragraph 4.

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 6 of the same Chapter, the Copenhagen Conference has to take a decision on the above request for admittance at the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly.

If, as we hope, the said request for admittance is favourably received, we should be obliged if you would be so kind as to have the enclosed document (O.I.R., Memorandum No. 193 of 19 May 1948 and its Annex, Description of the Monitoring Centre, Document C.T. 194 of the same date) distributed to the various national Delegations. x)

We have etc.

L. WALLINBORN H. ANGLES D'AURIAC

(Directors)

x) Chairman's Note:

The number of copies put at our disposal by the O.I.R. does not allow of a general distribution; but each Delegation will receive a limited number.

(Tr.5/R.11/D.34)

Submitted in: French

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ORGANISATION

TECHNICAL CENTER

Brussels, 25 July 1948.
32, avenue Albert Lancaster

The Chairman,
European Broadcasting Conference

C O P E N H A G E N.

Mr. Secretary-General,

In letter No. 1327 of June 25, we forwarded certain documents to you and asked you to be so kind as to distribute them to the various national delegations.

In addition, and with the sole aim of facilitating, if possible, the work of the Conference, the permanent services of our Organisation have prepared : a series of short technical notes which I am sending you today under separate cover, and of which you will find a list enclosed.

In asking you to distribute these documents to the various national delegations⁺, I should like to inform you quite frankly, of the ideas which have guided us in preparing them.

The O.I.R. does not in any way profess to have important new data or ideas regarding this question. It has, however, aimed at the compilation, in a convenient form of the maximum amount of useful information on each question. More often than not it is information which is already known, but which is generally scattered throughout the literature or official documents. Nevertheless we have been able to add here and there, some new data. Furthermore, apart from the data itself, the O.I.R. judged it profitable, in certain cases to undertake the actual study of the question, with the aim, not of proposing definitive solutions, but rather of facilitating the examination of the questions, by endeavouring to phrase them clearly and by suggesting a method of treatment for each of them.

Therefore, all of these documents should be considered rather as "working aids" than as definitive proposals presented by our Organisation.

+) Chairman's Note:

The number of copies put at our disposal by the O.I.R. does not allow of a general distribution. In place of this, each Delegation will receive fewer copies than usual.

The technical documentation mentioned above is not the only documentation prepared by the permanent services of the O.I.R. which might facilitate the work of the Conference. Documentation of a general nature has also been prepared. With regard to the latter, the O.I.R. does not intend to send it to the Conference Office in Copenhagen with a request for its distribution. In

fact, in view of the nature of the information contained therein, and of the fact that the said documentation is not entirely homogeneous and is not equally comprehensive for all of the European countries, plus the fact that the O.I.R. cannot guarantee in all cases the correctness of the figures or of the information therein, an official distribution of these documents would not appear to be desirable.

However, we consider that this documentation may be of considerable interest to the various Delegations participating in the Conference, and we would like you to inform them officially that the said documentation exists, that it contains a certain number of details in the adjoined list, and that it will be placed at the disposal of anyone who is interested and who requests it.

I have etc.

The Director,

(signed) H. Anglès d'Auriac

DOCUMENTATION OF A GENERAL NATURE

prepared by the O.I.R.

This documentation includes:

1. A liberal cartography of the countries of the European region (political, demographic, radiophonic, and physical maps; conductivity maps, etc.)
2. A complete set of descriptive cards giving, for each country of the European region, a variety of information on:
 - _ population
 - _ area
 - _ number of languages
 - _ number of receivers
 - _ etc...etc...
3. A set of tables, graphs, and maps describing the state of the European broadcasting network at the time of the Lucerne Plan (1933), of the Montreux Plan (1939), and on 1 January 1948.

(This documentation will be placed at the disposal of anyone who is interested and who requests it.)

LIST OF TECHNICAL NOTES

- C.T. 186a - Foreword to Document C.T. 186.
- C.T. 186 - Study of Certain Technical Bases Usable for Drawing Up a European Frequency Allocation Plan (and appendices).
- C.T. 187 - Aerials with Increased Horizontal Radiation, so-called "Anti-fading".
- C.T. 188 - Note on Derogations.
- C.T. 189 - Maximum Admissible Powers for Broadcasting Stations (and appendices).
- C.T. 190 - Use of Synchronized Networks.
- C.T. 191 - Frequency Tolerances (and appendices).
- C.T. 192 - Other Transmission Characteristics.
- C.T. 195 - Experiments Relating to the Interference Caused by a Transmitter Operating on an Adjacent Channel.
- C.T. 196 - Measurement Campaign (and appendices).
- C.T. 197 - Direction serials.
- C.T. 198 - Wave Propagation.

Copenhagen, 1948

Submitted in : English

Admission of the State of Israel

to the European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

The Danish Government has received the following two telegrams on this matter:

PARIS K56 195 20 1200 IMPERIAL =
His Excellency the Minister of Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones
of the Danish Government KH =

In my capacity as Minister of Transport and Communications of the Provisional Government of the State of Israel, I have the honour to inform you that my Government is desirous of taking part in the International Broadcasting Conference which is to take place at Copenhagen next month STOP The State of Israel, born of the international decision of 29 November 1947 and recognised already by fourteen states, will thus take the place to which it is entitled in the international organisation which will be your host at Copenhagen STOP

Monsieur Zvi Friedberg M.

= K56 100 =

I E E The Director General of Posts, Telegraphs, Telephones and Radio of the State of Israel is charged by me with the representation of my Government, and is empowered to sign in that capacity all international conventions STOP I should be obliged if you would transmit any communication arising out of the present request to the address of Monsieur Zvi Friedberg, passing through Paris, at the diplomatic agency representing the Provisional Government of the State of Israel, 143 Avenue de Wagram, Paris STOP Respectfully,
David Remez, Minister of Transport and Communications of the Provisional Government of the State of Israel

*

The Danish Minister of Public Works replied to Monsieur Zvi Friedberg on 26 June 1948 as follows:

Referring to § 1, 1 of the Directives for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference, annexed to the Additional Protocol of the Atlantic City Conference, the Danish Government notes that the conditions fixed by the above-mentioned dispositions not being fulfilled, it is beyond the powers of this Government to invite the Government of the State of Israel to this Conference. The matter is a question for the Conference itself, in conformity with the dispositions of the above-mentioned § 1.

*

On 29 June 1948 Monsieur Friedberg asked the Chairman of the Conference by telegram if he proposed to bring before the Assembly the State of Israel's request for admission to the Conference. At the same time Monsieur Friedberg let it be known that the State of Israel had already made a declaration of admission to the I.T.U.

*

(RD Doc. 46-E)

The Chairmans reply was as follows:

Monsieur Zvi Friedberg
Director General PTT
State of Israel
143 Avenue Wagram P a r i s

In receipt your telegram twentyninth STOP Am fully disposed to submit to European Broadcasting Conference any formal demand you may address to me directly in my capacity of Chairman of the Conference for the admission of the State of Israel =

Chairman of the European Regional
Broadcasting Conference:

N.E. Holmblad.

±

On 2 July 1948 the Chairman received the following telegram:

BD 498 Brussels 46 2 1735 =
N.E. Holmblad, Chairman European Regional Broadcasting Conference
Copenhagen

Thanking you your telegram please submit Conference request admission State Israel STOP Please consider telegram as formal demand STOP please reply to undersigned, Jevagency, Paris STOP
2 Friedberg Director General PTT State Israel.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 47

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 63 - Supplement to Document No. 47

København 1948

Submitted in: French

AGENDA

for the Second Plenary Assembly
of the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference

Friday, 9 July 1948, at 10 a.m.

Room No. 4

1. Approval of the Minutes of:
 - a) the meetings of Heads of Delegations (RD Documents Nos. 10, 11, 15 and 18),
 - b) of the formal inauguration of the Conferences (RD Document No. 14),
 - c) the meetings of the First Plenary Assembly (RD Documents Nos. 26, 29, 30 and 31).
2. Working methods (RD Document No. 6).
3. Rules of Procedure, Rule 17 Voting Procedure (RD Document No. 4, as amended by RD Document No. 12: RD Document No. 19 of June 30: RD Document No. 19 of July 1: RD Document No. 19 of July 8: RD Document No. 27: RD Document No. 28).
4. Admission of Organisations (Chamber of Shipping, RD Document No. 40: International Radio-maritime Committee, RD Document No. 41).
5. Invitation of Countries:
 - a) S.S.R. Latvia (RD Document No. 20),
 - b) S.S.R. Moldavia (RD Document No. 21),
 - c) S.S.R. Estonia (RD Document No. 22),
 - d) S.S.R. Lithuania (RD Document No. 23),
 - e) Karelo-Finnish S.S.R. (RD Document No. 24),
 - f) State of Israel (RD Document No. 46: RD Documents Nos. 16 and 17, as amended by 34 and 35 respectively).
6. Miscellaneous.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 48

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 130 - Amendment to Document No. 48

Submitted in: Russian
4th Committee.

Replaces Document RD No. 36-E

Programme of Work and Organisation.

Committee 4 (Technical)

1. Fundamental Tasks

In conformity with paragraph 4 of Document No.2, the Technical Committee is authorised to establish the general technical principles for drawing up a frequency allocation plan.

The technical principles underlying the establishment of a frequency allocation plan have been studied by the Brussels Conference of Eight Countries. The said Conference presented the results of its work in its Document No. 284 and in two alternatives to the frequency allocation plan, (279, 281).

The Plenary Meeting of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference entrusted to Committee 4 - as their first task - the task of furnishing a technical analysis of the work of the Committee of Eight.

Taking the above into consideration, the Technical Committee (Committee 4) should:

- a) examine the proposals concerning technical principles and directives as accepted by the Committee of Eight, and add their recommendations.
- b) submit a technical analysis of the draft documentation elaborated by the Committee of Eight Countries.
- c) draw up and recommend general technical directives concerning questions which have not been decided by the Committee of Eight, viz:
 - 1) The Conditions of frequency allotting to broadcasting stations in the bands of other services.
 - 2) Directives and recommendations concerning the use of directed antennae.
 - 3) Directives and recommendations concerning technical principles with regard to the synchronisation of groups of national broadcasting stations.
 - 4) Separation between adjacent channels.
 - 5) Frequency tolerances for exclusive and shared frequencies.
 - 6) Possible differences in frequencies for transmitters using the same channel.
 - 7) Power limitation in the long wave band.
 - 8) Minimum necessary field intensity for cities and rural districts.

- 9) Characteristics of international common frequencies.
 - 10) Eventual power limitation for shared frequencies.
 - 11) Utilisation of the secondary service zone.
 - 12) Eventual increase of the number of frequencies in use for day time.
 - 13) Eventual different power limits in the medium wave band.
 - 14) Re-examination of the possibilities for use of very high frequencies.
 - 15) Other technical standards.
- d) on the basis of results attained in the elaboration of tasks specified in paragraphs a) and b) - submit recommendations for Committee 5 in a reasonable deadline in order to permit Committee 5 to start its work in due time, but not later than July 15.

II Organisation.

In order to accomplish the tasks given in Committee 4, three Sub-Committees are being formed:

Sub-Committee 4A, Supplementary Technical Standards.

Task: The elaboration of supplementary technical standards in conformity with paragraph c), section I.

Sub-Committee 4B, Technical Analysis.

Task: Technical analysis of the draft-documentation of the Committee of Eight Countries.

Sub-Committee 4C: Technical Drafting.

Task: Technical drafting of documents after confirmation of their contents at a Plenary Meeting of the Committee.

The examination of document 234, should begin immediately at Plenary Meetings of the Committee.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København 1948.

RD Document No. 49 - E

July 6, 1948

Submitted in: Russian

COMMITTEE 4

Proposal on the technical expert opinion of committee 4 regarding the future frequency assignment plan.

Subcommittee 4 B of Committee 4 should give a technical expert opinion on the new frequency assignment plan when its formulation is completed and present the results of this technical expert opinion to the plenary session of the Conference.

The proposal was submitted by the president of committee 4 in document No. 36 (section e) and was supported at the meeting of Committee 4 by the delegations of U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bielorussia.

6 July 1948

Original: French

REPORT
of the
Organisation Committee
(Committee 3)

2nd Meeting
6 July 1948

The meeting was opened at 9.30 a.m. by Mr. Jacques Meyer, Chairman of the Committee.

The Chairman said that the Egyptian and Syrian Delegates had informed him of their desire to take part in the work of the Committee. He asked the Luxemburg Delegate, who was present, if he too desired to join the Committee. On the latter replying in the affirmative, the Chairman noted that 28 of the 31 countries were represented on the Committee.

The sole subject of discussion on the agenda was the question of the character of the Conference. Before opening the discussion on the subject, he reminded the Committee that he had been authorised by them to take up the question of the problem of wave-lengths for Germany with the Chairman of the Conference. The latter had been of the opinion that the question of procedure should be brought up at the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly.

The Committee was proposing to hold three meetings that week. It was to be hoped that they would be able in that time to handle the question in its main outlines, and so make it possible to go on to other items of the agenda.

He proceeded to open the discussion. There were, he said, certain questions of fact which it might be helpful to bear in mind in connection with the question they were considering. There was the question of precedents and the question of texts.

The precedents showed that the Conference of Lucerne, of which the present Conference was a continuation, had concluded agreements, which were signed by persons appointed by their Governments with powers for the purpose. In one sense therefore they were a Conference of plenipotentiaries.

The position was the same at the Conference of Montreux.

As regards the texts, it could not fail to be observed that the Atlantic City documents were not sufficiently precise to settle the matter without further discussion. On the contrary, it was their obscurity which was the origin of the discussion.

He suggested that the Secretariat should distribute at the next meeting a table of the texts with extracts from the documents, all the details of which could not be present to the recollection of all Delegates. There would have to be extracts from the

Convention, from the Radio Regulations and from the Recommendations on broadcasting.

Agreed.

The Chairman, continuing, read and commented on a number of texts, especially those forming part of the Additional Protocol and the document annexed thereto (Directives for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference), with which, he said, all Delegates were familiar.

International Telecommunication Convention. Article 10 (Plenipotentiary Conferences) and Article 11 (Administrative Conferences). Of these two texts, the first was not relevant, because it related only to Conferences with clearly defined attributes having nothing to do with the work of the present Conference (e.g. to the I.T.U. Conferences, which were held every five years). Only the second of the two texts in sub-paragraph b) of paragraph 1 could relate to a Conference like that of Copenhagen. Articles 40 and 41 of the Convention appeared to be applicable to the Copenhagen Conference, and called for special attention. They said in effect that members could conclude regional agreements, but without specifying whether these regional Conferences were of representatives of Administrations or representatives of Governments, i.e. plenipotentiaries. Annex 2 of the Convention (page 53-E) defined the expression "Administration", but without throwing much light on the subject. It was moreover not easy to see how a "department or service of a government" responsible for implementing the obligations of an international Convention could be empowered to conclude a Convention.

General Regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention.

Pages 59-E and 60-E laid down general regulations for invitation and admission to Plenipotentiary Conferences and to Administrative Conferences. Paragraph 7 of Chapter 1 and paragraph 7 of Chapter 2 were worthy of attention. Chapter 3 (Voting at Conferences) and Chapter 6 (Rules of Procedure of Conferences) made no distinction between the two types of Conference.

He further quoted from the Resolutions, Recommendations and Opinions on page 112-E of the Convention, and especially from paragraph 2 (recommendations concerning broadcasting). The Mexico Conference was an Administrative Conference.

He opened the discussion.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia put a new point for discussion. He cited No. 248 of the Radio Regulations, page 62 - E, where no mention was made of Regional Agreements. That might be compared with No. 131 of the same Regulations (page 129-132 - E), where special mention was made of the Regional Agreement to be concluded at the next European Broadcasting Conference. Thus it was Article 41 of the Convention that applied to the present Conference, and not Article 40.

The Chairman welcomed the point. He gathered that the Czechoslovak Delegation was of the opinion that the present was a Regional Conference, governed by Article 41, which the discussion would no doubt do well to take as its starting point.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was not aware that a discussion of this question formed part of the agenda of the Committee. The Soviet Delegation had not sufficient documentation to take a useful part in the discussion; and he suggested that they should confine themselves to an exchange of opinions, and postpone the decision until some later meeting.

After an exchange of views between the Secretariat and the Delegations of the U.S.S.R. and of Yugoslavia, the Chairman proposed the following measures to avoid misunderstanding due to incorrect translation:

1. At the end of each Meeting the agenda for the next Meeting shall be announced by the Chairman, and the Committee shall be invited to make any objections it thinks necessary:
2. The Chairman will inform the Secretariat of the desire expressed by certain members to have the agenda of the Committees posted immediately, even when the Committees meet daily, subject always to considerations of practicability.
3. He will do his utmost to ensure that reports reach the Secretariat within a few hours of the adjournment of a meeting.

The Delegate of Poland asked what was the difference between an Administrative Conference and a Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

The Chairman replied that there was no difference so far as the individual members of the Conference were concerned. The difference lay in the nature of the powers of the persons participating; and in the nature of the Acts resulting from their deliberations. In an Administrative Conference the Agreements adopted were binding only on the Administrations, and the Governments could forbid their Administrations to apply them. On the other hand, the signatures of Plenipotentiaries constituted the beginnings of an engagement of Governments, which the latter sanctioned more or less formally according to the procedure laid down in their respective constitutional laws following on a decision by their Legislative and Executive Bodies.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom (1) said that the matter under discussion seemed to be composed of two elements:

- (1) See the Annex for the complete text of his statement.

first, the Status of the Conference itself and, secondly, the nature of the Convention that would emerge from its deliberations.

It was clear that Article 10 of the Atlantic City Convention referred solely to Conferences held every five years or so for the purpose of revising the International Radio Convention. The present Conference was a Conference governed by Article 41 of the Atlantic City Convention, i.e. it was regional. It was sovereign, the only limitation on its sovereignty being the last phrase of the Article to the effect that no agreement could be concluded by it which was in conflict with the Convention. That being so, Delegates, who knew the character of the Conventions of Lucerne and Montreux, could have no objection to the Copenhagen Convention being of the same character, viz. an agreement subject to ratification by the Governments concerned and signed by the Plenipotentiaries of those Governments.

The Chairman observed that the use of the expression "Conference of Plenipotentiaries" was confined in the Atlantic City texts to bodies with clearly defined attributes. It would be necessary therefore to find another term, if they desired to indicate that the Delegates at the Copenhagen Conference had full powers to sign a Convention constituting the beginning of an obligation on their Governments, and further to enter reservations.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom suggested that the Conference should adopt the title of "European Regional Inter-Governmental Conference".

The Delegate of Roumania said that for the moment his Delegation was not authorised to participate in any Conference that would bind its Government. It would therefore be necessary for him to refer the matter to his Government, and he reserved his position.

The Chairman noted that an adjournment was desired in certain quarters. A pause for reflection would be an admirable thing, if it led to propositions commanding unanimity at the next Meeting.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom pointed out that, even if Delegates had not formal full powers, they could nevertheless sign an inter-governmental Agreement, after a simple notification through the diplomatic channels, or even by telegram to the Governments concerned. The full powers in writing would then be despatched through the Post to regularise the signatures.

The Chairman took the opinion of the Committee on the subject of the adjournment. The Committee being almost unanimously in favour of adjourning, he reminded Members that the next Meeting was due to be held on the following day, viz. Wednesday, at 2,30 p.m. in Room 4. The only item on the Agenda would be the continuation of the day's discussion on the character of the Conference.

(RD Doc. 50-E)

He would be glad, however; if the Meeting could begin at 3,15 p.m. instead of at 2.30 p.m. No objections were raised.

At the request of the Delegate of Czechoslovakia the Agenda for the next Meeting was settled as follows:

1. Continuation of the discussion on the character of the Conference.
2. Settling of the Agenda for the next Meetings.

The Meeting rose at 11,30 a.m.

J.M.LEPROUX,
Reporter.

Jacques MEYER,
Chairman.

(RD Doc. 50 - E)

ANNEX

It seems to us that the question being discussed by this Committee, viz., the character of this Conference, is capable of being considered in two parts:

- a) the status of the Conference itself, and
- b) the resulting convention which will emerge.

In the view of the United Kingdom Delegation, Article 10 of the Atlantic City Convention relates only to the main plenipotentiary conference of the I.T.U., that is to say, the world conference which has the authority to revise at given intervals the I.T.U. Convention. This Conference is sovereign in the I.T.U. and all other conferences on telecommunication matters are in varying degrees bound by its decisions. Thus, in Article 41 of the Convention, regarding regional conferences, it is stated that the agreements concluded thereat must not be in conflict with the main Convention. To that extent our sovereignty can be held to be qualified or limited and in the terminology employed in the Atlantic City documents it would seem appropriate to describe our Conference as "administrative". The word "administrative", in our view, is intended to imply a conference which bears this relationship to the major plenipotentiary conference of the I.T.U. as regards the scope of its agenda and of its decisions. We cannot have two equally sovereign bodies in one world union.

All this, however, relates to the status of the Conference within the I.T.U. and not to the status in international law of the resulting convention.

The resulting convention is a separate matter. I have not heard cited any reference in the Atlantic City documents which bears on this particular aspect of the matter. Since the Delegates present at this Conference were fully aware of the character of the Lucerne and Montreux Conventions, it can perhaps reasonably be assumed that they saw no objection to future conventions being concluded in the same form. The United Kingdom Delegation believes that there is only one decision which can reasonably be taken - viz., that the convention must be inter-governmental in character as was the case at both Lucerne and Montreux. The reasons which have led us to put this view before the Committee are:

- a) the importance of broadcasting, and
- b) the need for the agreements we all expect to reach to be implemented with the full weight of governmental authority.

Our Host Government wisely asked that Chief Delegates should come to this Conference with Full Powers and one imagines that they have done so. But Mr. Chairman, if they have not, it is a matter which can be adjusted easily enough before the time for signing arrives.

The United Kingdom Delegation urges very strongly that the convention which will emerge from this Conference should be in line with the Conventions of Lucerne and Montreux and follow their precedents, that is, it should be signed by plenipotentiaries subject to ratification by their respective governments.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Later: The United Kingdom Delegation suggested that an appropriate title for the Conference might be "The Inter-Governmental European Regional Broadcasting Conference".

July 7, 1948

Submitted in: French

F R A N C E

Observations of

"Radiodiffusion française"

on the Preliminary Draft Plan submitted by the Committee of Eight Countries.

1. "Radiodiffusion française" feels that it should first recall its requirements, which were ~~only~~ submitted to the Committee of Eight Countries. For metropolitan France these are:

1 exclusive long wave
19 medium waves:

11 exclusive (1)
7 shared
1 international common wave type 1

2. "Radiodiffusion française" gladly recognizes that each of the authors of the Preliminary Drafts has made noteworthy efforts to take into account its requirements as stated both in its original application and in the observations submitted by its Delegates at Brussels.

But the preliminary drafts submitted to the Copenhagen Conference do not yet meet our requirements, although the latter had already been deliberately reduced with a view to facilitating the preparation of a plan.

In this connection it is recalled that for a long time (from before Lucerne) the number of frequencies in use by metropolitan France has been continuously 24 or 25. The number today is 25 (1 long wave, 24 medium waves).

Thus in reducing its request to 20 frequencies, "Radiodiffusion française" is making a considerable sacrifice in the interests of international solidarity - a sacrifice it would like to see imitated by the various countries, so that the vital needs of all may be satisfied.

- (1) Some of these frequencies could if necessary be shared, provided always that the contour at 2 mv/m is adequately protected by night and by day.



3. "Radiodiffusion française" points out that, in the preliminary draft with the 10 kc/s separation, four of the frequencies in question are transformed into veritable international common waves, incapable of giving the service required, by the limitation of power and the degree of sharing, although the number of frequencies planned is theoretically in the neighbourhood of that requested. The number of really effective frequencies is thus in practice reduced to 16, which is notably less than the number asked for.

Again it should be noted that, of the 19 frequencies envisaged, 3 are contemplated in the 1500 to 1600 kc/s range.

"Radiodiffusion française" would be prepared, if need be, to accept one of the ten frequencies in this range, but it is not prepared to accept more. In any case, if the allocation of such a frequency to France cannot be avoided, the only transmitter for which it would be acceptable would be that of Nice.

In view of the relatively small distance separating sharing stations, some of the cases of sharing contemplated do not allow of protection sufficient to ensure a satisfactory service.

4. "Radiodiffusion française" notes, with regard to the preliminary draft with the 9 kc/s separation, that the number of frequencies allocated to metropolitan France is noticeably less than that requested, there being at the same time no compensating improvement in the position of the frequencies in the spectrum. The frequencies provided for certain transmitters are even higher than those required.

At the same time, were this compensation accorded, it would still be necessary to allocate a corresponding supplementary frequency for the operation of a synchronised network.

Lastly, although sharing is generally satisfactory, some improvement in this connection is needed in the case of the Marseilles station.

5. With regard to Algeria, each of the 2 preliminary drafts provides the number of frequencies required, which represents a considerable improvement on the original preliminary drafts. Generally speaking, the position of the frequencies in the spectrum would be acceptable, although the frequencies are higher than those desired, but the sharing conditions certainly require revision.
6. The 9 kc/s plan provides for the Saar territory a frequency which will admit of a satisfactory service. Nothing is allocated to this territory in the 10 kc/s plan: this is an omission which should be made good.
7. In the present document, which is intentionally brief, there has been no place for detailed criticism of the suggested allocations to France. There can, and must be, a place for such criticism in the course of the discussions of the various Committees. Similarly, this is not the place for comparing the treatment accorded to the needs of the various countries.

Moreover, pending the conclusions reached as a result of the aggregate discussions of Committee 4, no preference has been indicated for a 9 kc/s or a 10 kc/s separation.

In any case, "Radiodiffusion française" desires to recognize the eminently constructive work of each of the authors of the two preliminary draft plans, and hopes that the substantial improvements on the original preliminary drafts are the precursors of a happy result in the end.

N.B. The French Administration reserves the right to make known its observations with regard to the French zone of occupation in Germany, when the Conference has given its decision on the question of the representation of Germany.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No. 52-E
July 7, 1948

Submitted in italian

San Marino, 2 July 1948/1647 d.f.R.

Republic of San Marino
Department of State for
Foreign Affairs
N. 0489/A/467

Chairman of the European Regional
Broadcasting Conference

Copenhagen

Sir,

The Government of the Republic of San Marino has the honour to apply hereby for admission to the European Regional Broadcasting Conference, meeting at København under your chairmanship. Our Government desires the allocation of a medium wave for its official radio transmissions.

The Republic of San Marino recently made its position clear by adhering to, and ratifying the acts of the Conventions drawn up in the matter of broadcasting at Washington, Madrid, Cairo and Atlantic City.

We have entrusted Mr. d'Ernst, Director of the International Telecommunication Union, with the communication of all information regarding our application and its outcome. In the event of your not having yet received all the explanations requested, you may apply, if you consider it expedient, to Mr. d'Ernst, who will give you all the necessary information.

Maitre Emmanuel Noël, lawyer, living in Brussels (289, Av. Brugmann), our Delegate to the Brussels Conference, will continue to represent the Republic of San Marino, as will Mr. Frode W. Hedorf, Consul General of the Republic in Denmark, who has been asked to participate in the work of the Conference.

We beg you to give our application favorable consideration, so that the Republic of San Marino may not be excluded from the Conference, and so that her request for a broadcasting wave may be met.

It would be appreciated if you would communicate the result of this application directly to the Department of State, and to our delegates, in view of the limited time available.

I have etc.

For the Secretary of State

The Chancellor:

(Tr.15/R.4/d-34)

L. MORGANTI

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948.

RD Document No. 53-E

7 July, 1948

Submitted in: French.

Analytical Table of Contents

Documents of the
Committee of Eight Countries, Brussels ,
sent to the Administrations of the European
Broadcasting Area.

This document is published
in French only.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 54

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 61 - Corrections to Document No. 54

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

Maritime
Regional Radio Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 54 - E
MAR Document No 32 - E

July 8, 1948

Submitted in french.

French Delegation

The Chairman
European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
and Maritime Regional Radio
Conference.

In the name of the Minister of Public Works and Trans-
ports, of the French Republic, I have the honour to request
you to allow a representative of the International Civil Avia-
tion Organization (I.C.A.O.) to participate in the work of the
two Conferences.

The I.C.A.O. has replaced the former C.I.N.A. which
participated, in particular, in the work of the Montreux
Conference. Since the I.C.A.O. Regional Administration for
Europe is situated in Paris, it rests with my Government to
propose its admission to the present Conference.

I hope that you will be able to give a favourable reply
to my request.

I have etc.

signed: Lhermite

Head of the French Delegation

(Tr.15/R.11/D 29)



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 55

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 70 - Corrections to Document No. 55
- Document No. 124 - Replacement to Document No. 55

Drafting of Broadcasting Convention.

The convention now in force is that drawn up at Lucerne in 1933. A revision was undertaken at Montreux in 1939 but the revised Convention was never ratified.

The Convention Committee at Montreux worked from the Lucerne text and reached its conclusions after considering numerous proposals (some put forward as papers by various delegations) for modifications to that text. Much of the revision then agreed upon appears to be equally valid now, and it would tend to reduce work at Copenhagen if the Montreux text could be treated as the basis of discussion. As, however, the Montreux Convention has not been implemented, it may well be decided that the redrafting now in prospect must start from the Lucerne provisions. A decision on this point cannot be taken until the Conference opens and references are therefore made throughout the schedules attached to this paper to the relative portions of both documents.

Plan annexed to the Convention.

Certain general provisions, of a primarily technical nature, appear as a preamble to the Lucerne Plan. At Montreux these provisions were expanded into the form of Articles and in some cases Articles which formed part of the Lucerne Convention appeared at Montreux among the General Provisions introducing the Plan. For this reason it will be convenient to consider the Articles of the Convention and those of the Plan as being essentially parts of the same document, with the distinction that the latter are concerned with the more technical matters on which agreement is required. At Montreux the Convention Committee did in fact deal with the Articles of the Plan, but only after they had been approved in substance by the Technical Committee. While therefore the provisions of the Plan will be dealt with in a separate technical paper, it will be necessary before the Conference opens to ensure proper co-ordination of the two sets of Articles and, after the Conference opens, for the Technical Committee and the Convention Committee delegates to maintain close contact with each other.

The attached schedules set out the amendments to the Lucerne and/or Montreux Convention which appear to be necessary or desirable in a new Convention.

Proposed Convention for Copenhagen Conference

2.

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|--|---|---|
| (List of Countries) | (List of Countries) | | |
| <p>The undersigned, plenipotentiaries of the above-named Governments, being assembled at Lucerne by virtue of the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the International Radiotelegraphic Conference of Madrid (1932), have by common accord and subject to ratification resolved upon the following Convention:</p> | <p>The undersigned, plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the above-named countries, being assembled at Montreux, acting in virtue of the International Telecommunication Convention relating to the conclusion of special arrangements, have by common accord and subject to ratification concluded the arrangement for broadcasting in the European area contained in the following Convention and the Plan annexed thereto.</p> | <p>Replace the Lucerne preamble the following:-</p> <p>The undersigned plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the above-named countries Members of the International Telecommunication Union being assembled in conference at Copenhagen, by virtue of the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the International Radio Conference signed at Atlantic City on the 2nd October, 1947, by the Delegates of the European Area have by mutual consent and subject to ratification, revised the European Broadcasting Convention and the Plan annexed thereto, concluded at Lucerne on 19th June, 1933, to read as follows:-.....</p> | <p>To relate the proposed Convention to the decisions reached at the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City in 1947.</p> |

St:30

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|---|---|--------|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Article 1</p> <p><u>Purpose of the Convention.</u></p> <p><u>Definitions</u></p> <p>§1. The contracting Governments declare that they do adopt, and will apply, the provisions of the present Convention and of the Plan annexed thereto.</p> <p>§2. The Governments agree neither to instal nor to put into operation, in the bands provided for in the Plan, any broadcasting stations other than those mentioned in the Plan, except under the conditions provided for below in Article 5.</p> <p>§3. Until such time as the present Convention shall become effective, the contracting Governments agree to make no changes in their radio-communications services of a nature which would prevent a strict and integral application of the Plan.</p> | <p>(Art. 2)</p> <p>§1. The contracting Governments declare that they do adopt, and will apply, the provisions of the present Convention and of the Plan annexed thereto.</p> <p>§2. The Governments agree not to utilize for their broadcasting stations, on the bands provided for in the Plan, any frequencies other than those mentioned in the said Plan. They undertake furthermore neither to instal nor to put into operation, on the bands provided for in the Plan, any broadcasting stations other than those mentioned in the Plan, except under the conditions provided for in Article 8 below.</p> | <p>As for Lucerne</p> <p>10.</p> <p>60.</p> | |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>§4. The "European area" to which the present Convention is applicable is defined to the North and to the West by the natural boundaries of Europe, to the East by the meridian 40° E. of Greenwich, and to the South by the parallel 30° N., so as to include the western part of the U.S.S.R. and the territories bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, with the exception of the parts of Arabia and of the Hedjaz which are included in this sector.</p> | <p>§2. The "European area" to which the present Convention is applicable is defined to the North and to the West by the natural boundaries of Europe, to the East by the meridian 40° east of Greenwich, and to the South by the parallel 30° north, so as to include the western part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) and the territories bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, with the exception of the parts of Arabia and Saudi Arabia which are included in this sector.</p> | <p><u>Article 1 (4):</u></p> <p>Replace the Lucerne definition by the following:</p> <p>In this Convention the expression "European Area" shall mean the area bounded on the west by a line extending from the North Pole along Meridian 10° West of Greenwich to its intersection with parallel 72° North, and thence by great circle arc to intersection of meridian 50° West and parallel 40° North, and thence by great circle arc to the intersection of meridian 40° West and parallel 30° North; on the East by the meridian 40° East of Greenwich; and on the South by the parallel 30° North, so as to include the western part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the territories bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, with the exception of the parts of Arabia and Saudi Arabia which are included in this sector.</p> | <p>To conform to the definition of European area adopted by the International Radio Conference of Atlantic City. If this definition is accepted in the form proposed, it would be desirable to insert elsewhere in the Convention a separate provision to the effect that the proposed Convention shall apply only to the European region.</p> |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>§5. In the present Convention:</p> <p>the word "Administration" denotes a government administration of a contracting country of the European area, on which the technical operation of a broadcasting service depends;</p> <p>the words "Bureau of the Union" denote the Bureau of the International Telecommunications Union.</p> | <p>(Article 1 § 1)</p> <p>§ 1. In the present Convention:</p> <p>the word "Administration" denotes a Governmental administration of a contracting country of the European area; the words "Bureau of the Union" denote the Bureau of the International Telecommunications Union;</p> <p>the words "International Telecommunication Convention" denote the International Telecommunication Convention of Madrid 1932, or any revision thereof which may be substituted therefor;</p> <p>the words "General Radio Regulations" denote the General Radio Regulations of Cairo 1938, or any revision thereof which may be substituted therefor;</p> <p>The word "Plan" denotes the Plan of Montreux annexed to the present Convention, or any revision thereof which may be substituted therefor...</p> | <p>Replace Lucerne article by the following which it is suggested should be included in paragraph 4. If so the proposed wording of that paragraph should be slightly amended:-</p> <p>In the present Convention:</p> <p>the words "International Telecommunication Convention" denote the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City 1947 or any revision which may be substituted for it.</p> <p>The words "Radio Regulations" denote the radio regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City 1947 or any revision which may be substituted for it.</p> <p>The word "Plan" denotes the Plan of Copenhagen annexed to the present Convention or any revision which may be substituted for it.</p> <p>The word "administration" denotes a government administration of a contracting country of the European area.</p> <p>The words "General Secretariat of the Union" denote the General Secretariat of the International Telecommunication Union.</p> | <p>5.</p> <p>These and any other definitions used in the proposed Convention will have to be drafted in the light of the Atlantic City Conference documents and of decisions taken by the Copenhagen Conference, 1948.</p> |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>§5. In the present Convention: the word "Administration" denotes the governmental administration of a contracting country in the European area, responsible for the technical operation of the broadcasting service;</p> | <p>(Art. 1. §1.)</p> <p>§1. In the present Convention: the word "Administration" denotes a governmental administration of a contracting country in the European Area.</p> | <p>Replace Lucerne article by the following which it is suggested should be included in paragraph 4. If so the proposed wording of that paragraph should be slightly amended:-</p> | <p>These and any other definitions used in the proposed Convention will have to be drafted in the light of the Atlantic City Conference documents and of decisions taken by the Copenhagen Conference, 1948.</p> |
| <p>the words "Bureau of the Union" denote the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union.</p> <p>(no equivalent)</p> | <p>The words "Bureau of the Union" denote the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union.</p> <p>The words "International Telecommunication Convention" denote the International Telecommunication Convention of Madrid 1932, or any revision thereof which may be substituted therefor.</p> <p>The words "General Radio Regulations" denote the General Radio Regulations of Cairo 1938, or any revision thereof which may be substituted therefor.</p> | <p>In the present Convention:</p> <p>the words "International Telecommunication Convention" denote the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City 1947 or any revision which may be substituted for it.</p> <p>The words "Radio Regulations" denote the radio regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City 1947 or any revision which may be substituted for it.</p> | |
| <p>D.35</p> | <p>The word "Plan" denotes the Montreux Plan annexed to this Convention or any revision thereof which may be substituted therefor.</p> | <p>The word "Plan" denotes the Plan of Copenhagen annexed to the present Convention or any revision which may be substituted for it.</p> <p>The word "administration" denotes a government administration of a contracting country of the European area.</p> <p>The words "General Secretariat of the Union" denote the General Secretariat of the International Telecommunication Union.</p> | |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|--|---|---|
| Article 2. | (Art.3) | | |
| <p><u>Ratification of the Convention</u></p> <p>The present Convention shall be ratified by the signatory Governments, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited through the diplomatic channel and in the shortest delay, in the archives of the Swiss Confederation. The Swiss Confederation shall notify the other signatory Governments of the ratifications as and when they are received.</p> | <p><u>Ratification of the Convention</u></p> <p>The present Convention shall be ratified by the signatory Governments, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited, through the diplomatic channel and as soon as possible, in the archives of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, which shall notify the other signatory Governments and acceding Governments as they come in. Ratification includes approval of the Montreux Plan.</p> | <p>Replace Lucerne article by the following:-</p> <p>This Convention shall be ratified by each of the signatory Governments. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited, in as short time as possible, with the Government of which shall notify the other Governments parties to the Convention of each deposit of ratification.</p> | <p>It is suggested that the amended text would be an improvement on the corresponding Article in the Lucerne Conventions.</p> |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p><u>Accession to the Convention</u></p> <p>§1. The Government of a country of the European Area, not a signatory of the present Convention, may accede to it before the date of its entry into force. Such accession must be without reservations.</p> <p>§2. The instrument of accession shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, which shall inform all the other contracting Governments.</p> | <p><u>Accession to the Convention</u></p> <p>§1. The Government of a country of the European Area, not a signatory of the present Convention, may accede to it at any time. Such accession, which shall be notified through the diplomatic channel to the Government of the Swiss Confederation, shall extend to the Plan and shall be without reservations.</p> <p>§2. The instrument of accession shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, which shall inform all the other signatory Governments and acceding Governments.</p> | <p>Replace Lucerne article by the following:-</p> <p>The Government of a country, which is a Member of the International Telecommunication Union, but not a signatory of this Convention, and the whole or a part of the territory of which lies within the European Area, may accede to this Convention by depositing an instrument of accession with the Government of Unless otherwise specified therein, it shall become effective upon the date of its deposit. The said Government shall notify the other Governments parties to the Convention of each accession when it is received and shall forward to each of them a certified copy of the instrument of accession.</p> | <p>It is suggested that the amended text would be an improvement on the corresponding Article in the Lucerne Convention.</p> |

LUCERNE CONVENTION

MONTREUX CONVENTION.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

REASON

It is proposed that there should be a new Article as follows:-

Article 3 bis

Application of this Convention to Dependent Territories:

A Government, party to this Convention, may, at the time of signature, ratification, accession or at any time thereafter by notification given to the Government of declare that this Convention shall extend to any of the territories, wholly or in part within the European Area, for the international relations of which it is responsible, and this Convention shall, from the date of the receipt of the notification, or from such other date as may be specified in the notification, extend to the territory or territories named therein.

It is considered desirable to provide in terms for the extension of the proposed Convention to any dependent territories within the European Area by means of a declaration by the Government of the country responsible for the international relations of the dependent territory, cf. Article 18 of the International Telecommunication Convention.

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|--|---|---|
| Article 4 | (Article 6) | Article 4 | |
| <u>Revision of the Convention and of the Plan</u> | <u>Revision of the Convention</u> | Replace Lucerne article by the following:- | In order that the Copenhagen Convention may last as long as possible, it is thought desirable to provide a flexible procedure for its amendment. In the proposed Article two methods are provided for: one by securing agreement between all the Governments concerned without resort to a Conference; the other by means of a conference of Plans. It will be noted that provision is made in the latter for amendment of the Convention when a substantial majority of the parties to it so desire. The figure of the number of Governments which shall be required to make a request for a Conference to be called has not been inserted, it being left for decision at the Copenhagen Conference. |
| <p>§1. The present Convention shall be in force until the date of the coming into force of the decisions to be taken by the first International Administrative Conference on Radio-communication, which takes place after the Madrid Conference of 1932.</p> <p>§2. In the course of the said Administrative Conference, or in the three months following its closure, the Administrations shall arrange for the convocation of a new European Conference charged with the examination of possible modifications to the present Convention.</p> <p>§3. European Administrative Conferences may take place at any time for the revision of the Plan, if the request is made by one or more Administrations to the Bureau of the Union, and if such request is agreed to by a third of the Administrations within the time-limit fixed by the said Bureau.</p> | <p>The revision of the present Convention shall be undertaken by Conferences of Plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the countries of the European area, when it has been so decided by an international radiocommunication conference of plenipotentiaries, or when at least ten contracting Governments make such request to the Government of the Swiss Confederation.</p> <p>(Article 9)</p> <p><u>Revision of the Plan</u></p> <p>§1. The revision of the Plan will be effected by the Conferences for which provision is made in Article 6.</p> <p>It may also be effected by administrative conferences of delegates of the Governments of the countries of the European area, when it has been so decided by an international radiocommunication conference, or upon the request of one or more Administrations to the Bureau of the Union, on condi-</p> | <p>1. This Convention or the Plan annexed hereto may be amended by agreement between all the Governments parties hereto.</p> <p>Upon the request of any Government party hereto, a proposed amendment to this Convention or the said Plan, or upon the recommendation of an administrative Conference of delegates of Governments parties hereto, a proposed amendment to the said Plan shall be communicated by the Government of to all the other Governments parties hereto for acceptance under this paragraph, which shall be communicated to the Government of That Government shall notify all such other Governments of any acceptance made under this paragraph, and any amendment which has obtained the acceptance of all the Governments parties hereto shall come into force between them three months after the date of such acceptance.</p> <p>2. (a) A plenipotentiary Conference to consider the amendment</p> | |
| Should none of the Con- | | | |

ferences referred to above
take place before 13 January
1936, an Administrative Confe-
rence shall be convoked auto-
matically immediately after
that date.

/§4.

tion that within a period fixed
by the said Office, at least ten
Administrations have proclaimed
themselves in favour of the
revision.

/§2.

of this Convention or the
Plan annexed hereto proposed
by any Government party hereto
shall at any time be convened
by the Government of
..... upon the
request of of
the Governments parties
hereto.

/(b)

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|---|--|--------|
| <p>§4. The provisions of the present Convention or of the Plan annexed thereto shall be respectively abrogated between all the contracting parties at such date as a new Convention or Plan is put into force.</p> | <p>§2. For the approval of a new Plan, the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention relating to the approval of regulations shall be applicable.</p> <p>(Separate Article 7):</p> <p><u>Abrogation of the Convention and of the Plan</u></p> <p>§1. The present Convention and Plan shall be abrogated between all the signatory and adherent parties from the date on which a new Convention enters into force. The Plan shall be abrogated from the date on which a new Plan enters into force.</p> <p>§2. In the event of a contracting Government not approving a new Plan, the Convention shall be abrogated in relation to such Government from the date on which the new Plan enters into force.</p> | <p>(b) Such proposed amendment shall be communicated by the Government of to all other Governments parties to this Convention at least six months before it is considered by such Conference.</p> <p>(c) Every amendment adopted by such Conference by a simple majority of the delegates of Governments present and voting shall be communicated by the Government of to all the other Governments parties to this Convention for their acceptance.</p> <p>(d) Any amendment communicated to Governments parties to this Convention under paragraph 1(c) of this Article shall come into force for all the Governments parties hereto, except those which, before it comes into force, may make a declaration that they do not accept the amendment, three months after the date on which two-thirds of the Governments parties hereto have notified their acceptance of it to the Government of, which shall notify all other Governments parties hereto of each acceptance made under this paragraph.</p> <p>3. A Conference convened under paragraph 2(a) of this Article may by a two-thirds majority of the delegates of Governments present and voting determine at the time of its adoption that the amendment is of such a nature that any Government party to this Convention which</p> <p style="text-align: right;">/has</p> | |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| | | <p>has made a declaration under paragraph 2(d) of this Article, and which does not accept the amendment within a period of one year after the amendment comes into force, shall, upon the expiry of this period, cease to be a party to this Convention.</p> | |

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON 13. |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Article 5</u> <u>Amendment of the Plan</u></p> <p>§1. Any administration wishing to alter the characteristics (frequency: power, in the case of a maximum specially provided in the list of stations in the plan: geographical position, etc.) of one of the stations in the Plan, or to set up new broadcasting stations in the bands provided by the Plan, shall inform those Administrations which it considers are directly interested.</p> <p>§2. If the aforesaid Administrations reach an agreement, this shall be notified to the Bureau of the Union, which shall inform the other Administrations.</p> <p>§3. If any of these latter Administrations consider that such agreement may react unfavourably on their own services, they shall have six weeks, from the date of reception of the notification from the Bureau of the Union, in which to convey their observations through the intermediary of the Bureau.</p> <p>The proposed measure cannot be put into effect before the expiry of this period.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Article 8</u> <u>Amendment of the Plan</u></p> <p>§1. Any Administration wishing to alter the characteristics (frequency, power, geographical position, etc.) laid down for one of its stations in the Plan, or to set up a new broadcasting station, or to use a frequency allocated to it in the establishment of a network of synchronised stations shall conform:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) in the case where the frequency which it wishes to use is in one of the bands which are allocated exclusively to broadcasting by the General Radio Regulations, and which appear in the Plan, either with the provisions inserted in the Plan, or with the procedure laid down in the following paragraphs of this article:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) in the case where the frequency which it wishes to use is outside the bands mentioned in (a), with the provisions of the said Regulations</p> <p>§2. The Administration shall notify its desire to those Administrations which it considers are directly interested. If the aforesaid Administrations reach an agreement, this shall be notified to the Bureau of the Union, which shall inform the other Administrations.</p> | <p>1. Any Administration wishing to alter the characteristics (frequency, power, position, etc.) laid down for one of its stations in the Plan, or to install a new station, or to use one of its frequencies for a network of synchronised stations shall conform:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) If the frequency is in a band exclusively reserved for broadcasting by the Radio Regulations and which figures in the Plan, either to the conditions which would be inserted in the Plan or to the procedure laid down in the following paragraphs.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) If the frequency is outside the bands indicated under (a) to the conditions of the Radio Regulations.</p> <p>2. The Administration shall advise those other Administrations which it considers to be directly interested. If agreement is reached the General Secretariat of the Union is notified and informs other Administrations.</p> <p>2. These Administrations who consider that such agreement may react unfavourably on their own services have six weeks in which to notify their objections through</p> | <p>The Montreux text appears to be more suitable than the Lucerne.</p> |

LUCERNE CONVENTIONMONTREUX CONVENTIONSUGGESTED AMENDMENTSREASON

the General Secretariat of the Union. The change cannot be put into effect until after the expiry of this period.

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>§ 4. In case of dispute, or if no agreement is reached, the Administrations concerned shall appeal, in accordance with the procedure settled among themselves, to expert bodies and, if necessary, shall resort to conciliation.</p> <p>If no agreement can be reached, the provisions of Article 12 § 2 of the present Convention shall apply.</p> | <p>§ 3. If any of these latter Administrations consider that the said agreement may react unfavourably on their own services, they shall have six weeks from the date of receipt of the notification from the Bureau of the Union, in which to intimate their observations through the intermediary of the Bureau.</p> <p>Any Administration, which does not reply before the expiry of this period, shall be considered to have given its assent.</p> <p>The proposed measure cannot be put into effect before the expiry of this period.</p> <p>After the expiry of the period (of six weeks), the proposed measure may be put into effect, if no objection has arisen or if all the Administrations concerned have been able to agree.</p> <p>§ 4. If agreement is not reached along the lines set out in § 2 and § 3 above, the contesting Administrations</p> | <p>After the expiry of the same period the proposal may be carried out if no objection has been raised, or all interested Administrations are in agreement.</p> <p>Replace Montreux Article 8 (4) by:-</p> <p>§ 4. Where agreement is not reached under the provisions of paragraph 2 and 3 hereof the administrations in disagreement may refer the dispute to an expert or experts acceptable to all parties to the disagreement, or may adopt any other method of settlement mutually agreed upon.</p> <p>If none of these methods of settlement is adopted, any Member or Associate Member party to a dispute may submit the dispute to arbitration in accordance with the procedure defined in Annex 3 to the Atlantic City Convention.</p> | <p>It is considered desirable to make use of the machinery worked out at Atlantic City for the settlement of differences.</p> |

LUCERNE CONVENTION

MONTREUX CONVENTION

shall appeal, in accordance with the procedure settled among themselves to expert bodies and, in case of need, shall resort to conciliation.

If no agreement can be reached the provisions of Article 14, § 2 of the present Convention shall apply.

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON 15. |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Article 6.</p> <p><u>Denunciation of the Convention</u></p> <p>§ 1. Each Contracting Government shall have the right to denounce the present Convention by a notification addressed through the diplomatic channel to the Government of the Swiss Confederation, and subsequently circulated by the said Government to all the other Contracting Governments.</p> <p>§ 2. Such a denunciation shall take effect after the expiry of one year from the date of reception by the Government of the Swiss Confederation of the notification thereof.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Article 5.</p> <p><u>Denunciation of the Convention</u></p> <p>§ 1. Each Contracting Government shall have the right to denounce the present Convention and Plan by a notification addressed through the diplomatic channel to the Government of the Swiss Confederation, who shall circulate it to all the other Contracting Governments.</p> <p>§ 2. Such a denunciation shall take effect after the expiry of one year from the date of reception of the notification thereof by the Government of the Swiss Confederation.</p> | <p>Replace Lucerne article by the following:-</p> <p>(1) Each Government which has ratified, or acceded to, this Convention shall have the right at any time to denounce it by a notification given to the Government of....., which shall advise the other Governments parties to this Convention thereof.</p> <p>(2) A Government which has made a declaration under Article.... extending this Convention may at any time thereafter by notification given to the Government of..... declare that this Convention shall cease to extend to any territory named in the notification.</p> <p>(3) The Government of..... shall advise the other Governments parties to this Convention of any notification received by him in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) - hereof.</p> <p>(4) Each denunciation contemplated in paragraphs (2) and (3) hereof shall take effect at the expiration of a period of one year from the day of the receipt of the notification of it by the Government of.....</p> | <p>It is suggested that the amended text would be an improvement on the corresponding Article in the Lucerne Convention; and in order to provide for denunciation in respect of dependent territories - see proposed new Article 3 bis.</p> |

| <u>LUCERNE CONVENTION</u> | <u>MONTREUX CONVENTION</u> | <u>SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS</u> | <u>REASON</u> |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <p><u>Article 7.</u></p> <p><u>Notification of the Frequencies laid down by the Plan.</u></p> <p>§1. Amendments in the list of frequencies resulting from the application of the Plan <u>must be</u> notified to the Bureau of the Union as soon as possible.</p> <p>§2. Frequencies allocated by the Plan shall bear, as the date of notification to be inserted in the list of frequencies, the date of signature of the present Convention in the following form:</p> | | | |

LUCERNE CONVENTION

MONTREUX CONVENTION

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

REASON

ments declare that the
present Convention shall
not impair any of the rights
of countries not included
in the European area.

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASON |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p align="center"><u>Article 10</u></p> <p align="center"><u>Interferences</u></p> <p>§1. When the use of a frequency by a broadcasting station causes interferences which had not been foreseen at the time of signing of the present Convention, the Administrations concerned shall endeavour to reach agreements with a view to eliminating such interferences.</p> <p>§2. In this event, the following provisions shall be observed:</p> <p>a) Broadcasting stations in the band 240 - 265 kc/s (1250 - 1325m) shall not impede services not available for public correspondence or aeronautical services. These services shall take steps to avoid interference with the reception of broadcasting stations in this band, within the limits of the national territories of such stations.</p> | <p align="center"><u>Article 12</u></p> <p align="center"><u>Interferences Between Stations</u></p> <p>§1. When the use of a frequency by a broadcasting station causes interferences which had not been foreseen at the time of the signing of the present Convention or Plan, the Administrations concerned shall endeavour to reach agreements with a view to eliminating such interferences, taking into account any provisions in this regard which may be inserted in the Plan.</p> <p>§2. In the case of interferences caused by a broadcasting station in a band other than those reserved by the General Radio Regulations for broadcasting, either exclusively or in company with other services, the services to which this band is allocated by the said Regulations shall take precedence over the broadcasting service.</p> | <p>As for Lucerne.</p> <p>do.</p> | <p align="right">18.</p> |

LUCERNE CONVENTIONMONTREUX CONVENTIONSUGGESTED AMENDMENTSREASON

b) Broadcasting stations in the 540 to 550 kc/s (556 to 545 m) band shall not interfere with either the mobile services in the 485 to 515 kc/s (619 to 583 m) band, or with the services not open to public correspondence in the 515 to 550 kc/s (583 to 545 m) band. Services not open to public correspondence shall take steps to avoid interference with the reception of broadcasting stations so placed, within the limits of the national territories of such stations.

c) As far as cases of derogation determined in the Plan outside the bands enumerated in the two preceding sub-paragraphs are concerned, the authorized services shall take precedence over the broadcasting service.

d) In the case of interference between the U.S.S.R. broadcasting stations of the Lucerne Plan, whose frequencies are situated in bands in regard to which reservations were made in the Madrid Convention, and stations of the services to which these bands are allocated, it shall be for the parties concerned, negotiating on an equal footing to arrive at a solution.

As. for Lucerne

do.

do.

LUCERNE CONVENTIONArticle 11Relations with the International
Broadcasting Union (U.I.R.)

§1. In all technical questions regarding the application of the present Convention, and in all questions concerning the broadcasting service exclusively, the U.I.R. shall be called in as an expert.

§2. To enable the U.I.R. to act as an expert, its statutes shall grant to all State Organizations of the European Area operating a broadcasting service admittance to its deliberations at all times, as of right, and with the same rights as the other members.

Under the said statutes, all organizations of the U.I.R. shall admit in a consultative capacity such Representatives of the Bureau of the Union and of the Administrations not adhering to the U.I.R. as may express a wish for admission.

§3. The U.I.R. shall carry out measurements and periodical observations of the technical characteristics of broadcasting stations in the European Area. It shall communicate the results to all the Administrations through the intermediary of the Bureau of the Union.

MONTREUX CONVENTIONArticle 13International Bodies of Experts
and Collaborating Organizations

§1. One or more International Organizations shall act as experts both on technical issues concerning the application of the present Convention and Plan, and on the work preparatory to the preparation of agreements between Governments or Administrations which concern only the broadcasting service.

§2. The rules for the application of the above paragraph will be given in the Plan.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

Omit.

REASON

20

The U.K. has no representation on any existing broadcasting organization,

LUCERNE CONVENTIONMONTREUX CONVENTIONSUGGESTED AMENDMENTSREASONS

21

On the request of an Administration, the U.I.R. shall further carry out special measurements and observations and shall communicate the results directly to the parties concerned.

Should technical difficulties arise, the measurements taken by the U.I.R. shall be considered by the Administrations concerned.

§4. An agreement may be made between Administrations, with a view to seizing the U.I.R. through the intermediary of the Bureau of the Union with the preparation of work preliminary to collective action on the part of such Administration. In this case, the representatives of the Administrations, whether adhering or not to the U.I.R., shall take part in the meetings of the body to which the U.I.R. refers the task of preparing the works in question, on an equal footing.

In the meetings under the previous sub-paragraph, the vote of each country represented shall belong to the Administration. If the Administration of a country is not represented, the vote shall belong to the broadcasting enterprise, or group of enterprises, of the said country, when such enterprise or group is a Member of the U.I.R.

LUCERNE CONVENTIONMONTREUX CONVENTIONSUGGESTED AMENDMENTSREASONS

21a

The report, prepared by a body of the U.I.R., shall be transmitted to the Administrations through the intermediary of the Bureau of the Union.

Article 10.

Expenses of Conferences

§1. Without prejudice to the special provisions which may be inserted in the Plan, the expenses of the European Broadcasting Conferences shall be borne by the participating Governments and the international organizations admitted to Conferences.

§2. As regards the sharing of expenses, participants shall be divided into four classes, each contributing units in the following proportion:

- 1st class: 25 units,
- 2nd class: 20 units,
- 3rd class: 15 units,
- 4th class: 10 units.

The first three classes shall include the Governments incorporated in the first three classes under the article on the payment of the expenses of the Bureau of the Union in the International Telecommunication Convention.

The fourth class shall comprise Governments which are included in the last three classes of the said article of the International Telecommunication Convention, and further international organizations.

§3. Contributions shall be paid according to the provisions of the said Convention.

Replace Montreux Article by the following:

Expenses:

1. The expenses of European Broadcasting Conferences are a charge on participating Governments and international organizations admitted to the Conferences.

2. The final apportionment of expenses of such Conferences shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Article 14 of the International Telecommunication Convention.

To conform with Section 11 (f) of the directives annexed to the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the Atlantic City Radio Conference.

LUCERNE CONVENTIONMONTREUX CONVENTIONSUGGESTED AMENDMENTSREASONS

23

It is proposed that there should be a new Article as follows:-

Article _____

Abrogation of the Lucerne Convention and of the Plan annexed thereto:

This Convention and the Plan annexed hereto shall abrogate and replace, in relations between the Government parties to this Convention, the European Broadcasting Convention and the Plan annexed thereto signed at Lucerne on 19th June, 1932.

It is desirable that the proposed Convention should contain clear provisions abrogating the Lucerne Convention as between the parties to the proposed Convention.

LUCERNE CONVENTIONMONTREUX CONVENTIONSUGGESTED AMENDMENTSREASONSArticle 12Application of the International Telecommunication Convention of Madrid (1932)

§1. As regards questions which are not regulated by the present Convention, but which are relevant to its purposes, the International Telecommunication Convention of Madrid (1932), the General Radio Regulations annexed, and the Final Protocol to the said Regulations shall remain in force even for those Governments which have not signed or ratified the said three Acts, albeit they have ratified or adhered to the present Convention.

§2. In particular, in the case of a dispute which cannot be settled in any other fashion, Article 15 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Madrid (1932) shall be compulsorily applicable to Governments which have ratified or adhered to the present Convention.

Article 14Application of the International Telecommunication Convention.

§1. As regards questions which are not regulated by the present Convention or by the Plan, but which are relevant to their purposes, the International Telecommunication Convention, the General Radio Regulations and the Final Protocol to the said Regulations shall be respected even by those Governments which albeit they have ratified or adhered to the present Convention, have not signed or ratified the said three Acts.

§2. In particular, in the case of a dispute which cannot be settled in any other fashion, the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention relating to arbitration shall be compulsorily applicable to Governments which have ratified or adhered to the present Convention.

Omit.

Under the Atlantic City Convention all Members of the I.T.U. are obliged to accept all the Regulations annexed thereto, including the Radio Regulations. Thus this Article is no longer necessary.

| LUCERNE CONVENTION | MONTREUX CONVENTION | SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS | REASONS 25 |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Article 13</p> <p><u>Entry into Force of the Convention</u></p> <p>The present Convention and the Plan annexed thereto shall enter into force on 15 January 1934 at 0001 hours (Greenwich Mean Time).</p> <p>In faith whereof the Plenipotentiaries of the above-mentioned Governments have signed one copy of the Convention, the which shall remain in the archives of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, and of which one copy shall be sent to each Government.</p> <p>Done at Lucerne, 10 June 1933</p> | <p>Article 15</p> <p><u>Entry into Force of the Convention.</u></p> <p>The present Convention shall enter into force on 4 March 1940, at 0001 hours (Greenwich Mean Time).</p> <p>It abrogates and replaces, with effect as from this date, the European Broadcasting Convention of Lucerne (1933)</p> <p>In faith whereof, the Plenipotentiaries of the above-mentioned Governments have signed one copy of the present Convention, the which shall remain in the archives of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, and of which one copy shall be sent to each signatory Government.</p> <p>Done at Montreux 15 April 1939.</p> | <p>10. <u>Article 13?</u></p> <p>Replace by the following</p> <p>The present Convention and the Plan annexed thereto shall enter into force at 0001 hours (Greenwich Mean Time) on the _____ of 194_ between the Governments of countries and territories, in respect of which instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited before that date.</p> | <p>For greater precision..</p> |

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No. 56 - E

July 8, 1948

Maritime
Regional Radio Conference
København, 1948

MAR Document No 33 - E

July 8, 1948

Submitted in: French

Admission of
the International Broadcasting Union
(U.I.R.)

At the Plenary Assembly of the European Broadcasting Conference, First Meeting, Wednesday, June 30 (see RD Doc. No. 30), it was decided to adjourn the question of admission of the U.I.R. until such time as the Assembly knew officially whether Spain was a member thereof. Moreover the Assembly expressed a desire to have a list of those countries that were at present members, and of those that were members during the war.

Following on this decision, the Chairman sent the following telegram to the U.I.R. on July 1.

INTERADIO GENEVE

To be able consider your request admission COMMA european broadcasting conference wishes first be informed officially by you whether Spain member uir second to have list of members your organisation during war third list of members of your organisation at present STOP please telegraph reply in detail as concerns type of membership whether government or other organ is represented

Chairman European Broadcasting Conference

Having received no reply, the Chairman reminded Mr. Comus, Chairman of the U.I.R., of the above telegram on July 7.

Mr. Comus replied as follows on July 7.

SD288 Geneva 199 7 1909

Holmblad Broadcasting Conference KH =

Confirm nonreception your telegram first july STOP reply as follows your telegram seventh july QUOTE radiodiffusion espagnole founder member uir in 1925 as private broadcasting company STOP affiliation radiodiffusion espagnole will be reconsidered when unified european broadcasting association constituted STOP on first january 1940 broadcasting organisations following countries were active members uir QUOTE algeria germany belgium bohemia and moravia bulgaria denmark egypt spain estonia france great-britain greece hungary ireland italy latvia lithuania norway palestine netherlands poland portugal roumania slovakia sweden switzerland tunisia turkey yugoslavia STOP moroccan and albanian organisations joined 1941 STOP BBC and palestine

- 2 -

(RD Doc. 56 - E)

(MAR Doc. 33 - E)

organisation suspended collaboration 1941 egypt 1942 STOP by notification 25 february 1941 peoples commissariat for postal and electric communications of ussr annulled affiliation estonia latvia lithuania STOP present active members uir are broadcasting organs following countries QUOTE austria denmark spain greece ireland italy norway portugal sweden switzerland turkey STOP broadcasting organisations themselves are considered members, not governments STOP in interest of and to facilitate eventual unified organisation european broadcasting earnestly insist on admission uir as observer european conference in conformity decision atlantic city radio conference STOP Best regards =

Comus chairman uir.

(Tr.Hobden/R 4/D 29)

July 8, 1948

Submitted in: French

R E P O R T
of COMMITTEE 2
(Credentials Committee)

2nd Meeting

Thursday, 8 July 1948

The meeting was opened at 11.15 a.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Corteil, assisted by the Vice-Chairman, Mr. da Silva Dias.

The Chairman recalled that the Secretary had stated at the Committee's first meeting that, of the 33 countries invited to the Conference, 18 had submitted documents which the Committee would have to examine. Since that meeting, other Delegations had submitted documents accrediting them, so that at the moment only the following countries represented at the Conference had not done so:

Albania (P.R.), Austria, Byelorussia (S.S.R.) and Luxemburg.

Of all the countries invited, only Greece and Lebanon were not yet represented at the Conference.

He suggested that the Committee should begin its examination of each Delegation's credentials, and should take into account the suggestion which the Chairman of Committee 3 had made to him, viz. that the Committee should examine the credentials submitted in the order of the list of countries annexed to the Atlantic City Convention, and should draw up a preliminary list of countries which had sent one or more delegates to the Conference provided with full governmental credentials permitting them to participate in the work and to sign Acts resulting from it.

This suggestion being adopted, the Committee proceeded to examine the documents submitted to the Secretariat in the order of the list as far as Yugoslavia. The following Delegations were recognized as having credentials which qualified them to participate in the work of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference, and empowered one or more or all of them to sign all Acts resulting from the work:

Belgium, Bulgaria, Vatican City, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Monaco, the Netherlands, Poland, Yugoslavia.

(RD Doc.No.57-E)

The Committee was unable to make a definite decision in the case of Norway and Portugal, as no translations had accompanied their documents. The Committee found that the Delegate of Egypt had been furnished with an official letter which was sufficient to accredit him, but did not constitute full credentials. (The Egyptian Delegate has since applied to his Government for the necessary credentials). The position was the same in the case of the Representative of Morocco and Tunisia in regard to Tunisia.

At the end of the meeting, as a result of a remark made by the U.S.S.R. Delegate with regard to the credentials of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R., the question arose as to whether the credentials submitted by the two countries, which apparently applied only to the right to participate in the Conference, should be considered as limiting those countries to this right alone, or should be considered as also permitting of the signature of diplomatic Acts. It was felt that a decision on the question might more usefully be taken when the Committee came to examine the credentials of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and U.S.S.R. Delegates at a later meeting.

The Chairman apologized for having to close the meeting for reasons beyond his control. The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

J.M. Leproux,

Reporter.

R. Corteil,

Chairman.

(Tr.15/R.11/D.15/St.28)

København, 1948

8/7/48

Submitted in FRENCH

R E P O R T
of
C O M M I T T E E

(Organisation Committee)

3rd Meeting

Wednesday, 7 July 1948.

The Meeting was opened at 3.15 p.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Jacques MEYER. The Minutes of the first Meeting had been distributed only in French, and approval of them was therefore postponed. Regarding the Minutes of the second Meeting, it was agreed that the Document relating to the proposal of the United Kingdom which had been read at that Meeting, should be annexed to them.

The Secretariat was requested to lose no time in the translation of the Documents, especially Document RD No. 43, into the three languages. The translation into Russian of this latter Document had not yet been distributed. He asked those Delegates who had not received this Document in their own language whether they considered it possible to proceed with the Agenda.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was prepared to accept this suggestion. The Conference had to draw up a Plan and a Convention, and it had the right to invite other countries to take part. In view of the fact that the Atlantic City texts had given it no definite title, it should be called a "Conference of Plenipotentiaries".

The Delegate of Italy, referring to the Atlantic City text considered that, as the Conference had to revise the Lucerne Plan, signed by Plenipotentiaries, it should be composed of persons having the necessary legal capacity to commit their Governments, subject to ratification. It should therefore be a Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

The Delegate of Poland said that his Delegation was furnished by the Head of his State with full powers. He had no doubt that the Conference was, in fact, a Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia was of the opinion that the European Broadcasting Conference should be an Inter-Governmental Conference. Its members should be furnished with full powers giving them the right to sign, in their Governments' name, a Convention subject to ratification.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Roumania considered that the Conference was a Conference of Plenipotentiaries, i.e. of Governments. It could be seen from the Atlantic City Documents, page 326, §5 & §7, that it was "Governments" which were concerned in it.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, referring to the Danish Government's invitation and to the basic texts, held the same view. However, he was astonished to note that not all the countries of Europe were taking part in a European Conference of Plenipotentiaries, the Baltic States being a notable exception.

The Delegate of Albania said that Document RD No. 43 could not give any idea of the nature of the Conference. Simply by considering the role of the Conference it could be seen that it should be a Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked if there were any Delegations opposed to calling the Conference a "Conference of Plenipotentiaries".

The Chairman then summed up. The question of admission of countries which had not been invited, which was on the Agenda of the Plenary Assembly on Friday, should be left out of the discussion. Everyone was in agreement on the fundamentals, and the divergencies of opinion related only to questions of form. It was understood that a Conference entrusted with the revision of texts drawn up by representatives of Governments could be composed only of Delegates of Governments. They might well hesitate, however, over the title "Conference of Plenipotentiaries", for in the Convention of the I.T.U. this title was reserved for a universal Conference, meeting normally every five years and having higher powers. For this reason he was readily disposed to support the proposal of the Czechoslovak Delegate.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought that his proposal was the most suitable because of the special status conferred on the Conference by the Atlantic City text. It would distinguish the Conference from other conferences, of, e. g. a commercial nature, the Delegates to which were furnished with full power.

The Delegate of the Vatican City, Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom, Poland, and the U.S.S.R. made proposals. After an exchange of views in which the Delegates of Italy and the Netherlands joined the Chairman pointed out that the point under discussion was whether the title should contain the word "plenipotentiaries". The Montreux and Lucerne Plans had not mentioned it. He read the titles and preambles of these Acts and proposed to stick to the traditional formula.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was also of the opinion that the whole question bore on the word "plenipotentiaries". As everyone agreed on the plenipotentiary status of the Delegates, all further discussion seemed superfluous, and the Meeting might well proceed with the Agenda.

The Delegate of Yugoslavia asked for specific mention in the text of the desires of the Conference and that this be made clearly in the three languages.

The Delegate of Ireland thought that, in view of the stipulations of the Atlantic City text, it was not possible to call the Conference a "Conference of Plenipotentiaries".

There was an exchange of views between the Chairman, and the delegates of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. The last named withdrew his proposal, but it was raised again by the Delegate of the Netherlands, supported by the Delegate of Ireland.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Roumania proposed the constitution of a Working Group, - a proposal which met with some surprise.

The Chairman observed that the Committee was unanimously agreed that the Conference was a Conference of Governmental Delegates with full powers.

The Delegates of Yugoslavia and the Netherlands reaffirmed their respective points of view on the application of the title "Plenipotentiaries" to the Conference.

Other Delegates having asked to speak, the Chairman consulted the Committee, which decided that the debate should be closed after the Delegates on his list had been heard. He went on to sum up the reasons for the opposition to the addition demanded by certain Delegates. Those were: fear of ambiguity and of contravening the I.T.U. Acts. He recalled the precedents and said that the Report would be drawn up in such a way that there could be no doubt as to the nature of the Conference. He suggested that the Committee might be called upon to vote on the two formulae proposed.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. reminded them that the Conference was considered by a large majority as a Conference of Plenipotentiaries. He did not see the necessity for a vote; the alternatives could be put before the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman, and the Delegates of Yugoslavia, Ireland, and the United Kingdom exchanged views on the question of procedure.

The Delegate of Norway proposed that a vote be taken.

At the instigation of the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., further discussion took place on the form of the question to be put to the Committee. The Chairman decided to ask for a show of hands on the following question:

Is the Copenhagen Conference an Administrative Conference?

This Motion was defeated unanimously.

The Committee having decided that the Conference was not an Administrative Conference, the Chairman posed the following question:

Is the Conference a Conference of Government Delegates with Full Powers?

By a show of hands 26 Delegates pronounced themselves in favour of this formula.

The Chairman then passed to the question of a title and posed the following question:

Which Delegations are inclined not to vote in this Committee but to refer decision between the two proposed titles to the Plenary Assembly.

By a show of hands only 8 Delegations were seen to be in favour. It was therefore for the Committee itself to decide in the title to be proposed to the Plenary Assembly.

Which Delegations agreed to the title, "European Broadcasting Conference"?

17 Delegations were in favour.

He then put to the vote the title "Conference of Plenipotentiaries for European Broadcasting". This proposal was accepted, by a show of hands, by 8 Delegations.

He would announce to the Plenary Meeting that the Committee had accepted the title "European Broadcasting Conference" by 17 votes to 8.

Before adjourning the Meeting, he reminded the Committee that

1. they had decided by 26 votes that the Conference was a Conference of Government Delegates with Full Powers.
2. they were in favour of the title "European Broadcasting Conference" by 17 votes to 8.

He then proposed that the next day the Committee should begin by discussing the Agenda of its subsequent Meetings. He suggested a general discussion of the underlying principles of the future Convention. In this way the points to be brought out in the new Convention would become clear.

No objections were made and this Agenda was adopted.

The Meeting was adjourned at 1.15 p.m.

J.M. Leproux
Rapporteur

Jacques Meyer
Chairman

ICELAND

Preliminary Observations on Documents
Nos. 279, 281 and 284 presented by the Committee
of Eight Countries of the European
Regional Broadcasting Conference

1. The Delegation of Iceland agrees to the following principles:
 - a) A channel separation of 9 kc/s both in the long wave and the medium wave band.
 - b) A ratio of 100 between the field intensities of the Wanted and Unwanted signals, for shared frequencies.
 - c) A ratio of .5 between the field intensities of the Wanted and Unwanted signals, for adjacent channels with 9 kc/s separation.
 - d) A maximum power of 150 kW for stations in the medium wave band.
2. The Delegation of Iceland can under no circumstances agree to the sharing of Reykjavik with Kiev on 245 kc/s as proposed in Doc. 279, for the following reasons:
 - a) The ratio between Wanted and Unwanted signals on the shared frequency would only be 4 instead of 100 at the eastern boundary of the service area to be covered by Reykjavik.
 - b) The ratio between Wanted and Unwanted signals on the adjacent frequencies would be 1/4 instead of 4.
 - c) The first harmonic (490 kc/s) would be too close to the maritime distress frequency at the Reykjavik coast station (in 6 miles distance).
3. The sharing between Akureyri and Ljubljana on 574 kc/s could be accepted, but not the sharing between Eidar and Wien I on 592 kc/s as proposed in Doc. 279.
4. The Delegation of Iceland could accept the sharing between Reykjavik and Ankara on 182 kc/s with Moskva and Leningrad on adjacent frequencies, as proposed in Doc. 281.
5. The sharing between Eidar and Monte Ceneri on 660 kc/s, and between Akureyri and Helsinki on 640 kc/s is not considered satisfactory. Instead thereof it is proposed, that Eidar shares 560 kc/s with Rostov s/Don, and Akureyri shares 650 kc/s with Charkov.

Original: French

Report of Committee 3
(Organizing Committee)

4th Meeting
8 July 1948.

The meeting was opened by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Jacques Meyer.

The Chairman said that the Russian text of the Report of the First Meeting would be distributed during the course of the meeting. Approval of the Report would therefore have to wait.

He asked the Rapporteur to read the end of the Report of the Third Meeting on the subject of the decisions taken the preceding day concerning the nature of the Conference, with a view to the recording of Delegates' observations before the Report went to the Secretariat. No observations.

He pointed out that, as the Report was without value until the Committee had approved it, and the Committee's decisions had been ratified by the Plenary Assembly, it was not possible for the Credentials Committee regularly to express an opinion on the decision taken. It would be helpful, however, to inform its Chairman, Mr. Corteil, by means of a document, that the Committee had agreed unanimously that Delegates should be supplied with full credentials. No objections.

He passed to the agenda: General Discussion on the principles governing the future Convention.

It would be necessary for the Conference to revise the Lucerne Convention. It must therefore use the 1933 texts. But, although the texts drawn up at Montreux in 1939 were not put into practice, their documentary value was undeniable. It would seem then that the Committee should be interested in taking the two Conventions into consideration. No objections.

On the fundamental issues it would seem, upon reading the two texts, that the Montreux Convention did not adequately differentiate between questions relating solely to the Convention and questions relating only to the Plan. The latter should not deal merely with questions of general organisation, in such a way as to be little more than a table with explanatory notes and additional technical data. It was for the Committee therefore to say whether it did not consider that questions going outside the scope of the Plan should be referred to the Organisation Committee.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom asked to be allowed to consult his colleague, the Chairman of the Plan Committee, before expressing an opinion.

The other Delegates expressed no opinions.

(Tr.15/R.11/D.16)

The Chairman, continuing, said that study of the Lucerne Plan showed that, apart from a certain number of articles which could be reproduced mutatus mutandis in a new text, there were others which called for discussion. First of all, there was Article 4 ("Revision of the Convention and of the Plan") and Article 5 ("Modification of the Plan"). That constituted an important subject for the Committee to deal with in the first instance. Another would be found in Article 11 ("Relations with the Union Internationale de Radiodiffusion"). This last question obviously could not be approached at present. It would seem sufficient to restrict consideration for the moment to the first question; and he accordingly invited the Committee to make known its opinions as to the permanent character of the Convention, and the procedure with a view to its revision or amendment.

The Delegate of Italy drew attention to the difference between the Convention and the Plan. A number of forms of procedure for revision, which applied only to the Plan, had been provided at Montreux.

The Chairman pointed out differences between the procedures contemplated in regard to revision in the Lucerne and Montreux Conventions respectively. The first provided for automatic revision of the Plan as a result of international broadcasting administrative conferences. The second established no connection between the revision of the European Convention and the International Broadcasting Conference except in the event of the latter deciding upon the necessity for revision. The Montreux Convention could also be revised under certain conditions at other times. The Montreux procedure was accordingly the more flexible.

Had the Committee any preference between the two texts?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom was in favour of the Montreux procedure. The U.K. Delegation had drawn up a 4 column document showing in the first two columns parallel texts of Lucerne and Montreux and in the third column amendments proposed by the United Kingdom Government, while the fourth column set forth the reasons for the proposed changes.

Following an exchange of views between the Chairman, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., and the Delegate of the United Kingdom it was agreed that the U.K. document would be distributed by the Secretariat in the three languages, as a possible basis for the work of the Committee.

The U.S.S.R. Delegation offered to furnish the Interpreting Service with the Russian texts of the Lucerne and Montreux Conventions.

The Chairman noted that the United Kingdom Delegate supported the Montreux provisions for the revision of the Convention. Were any delegations of a contrary opinion? No objections being forthcoming, he took it that the Committee was in favour of the provisions of Article 6 of the 1939 Montreux Convention.

He again referred to the differences in the procedure for revision envisaged in the two Conventions. Did the Committee think the Plan could be revised without the Convention?. No objections being raised, he took it that the Committee thought it could.

They had then to consider how to convoke a Conference on the Plan, which would have nothing to do with the Convention. The Lucerne and Montreux texts both stated that such a Conference must be administrative; but the position had changed since then, and the Committee might prefer some other wording.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that, apart from basic revisions with which only plenipotentiaries could deal, it should be possible to make slight changes in the Plan without having recourse to such a complicated procedure. The U.K. document about to be distributed contained precise suggestions in this connection, which might assist discussion.

The Chairman observed that Article 5 of the Lucerne text and Article 8 of the Montreux text had already envisaged a particular procedure for changes of detail. He presumed the Committee would admit that, even in the event of the Plan being modified separately from the Convention, the Delegates taking part in the meeting should be furnished with full credentials by their Governments. No objections.

What did the Committee feel as to how such an extraordinary Conference of Delegates of Governments should be convoked?

(At this point, the place of Mr. Leproux, Rapporteur, who was obliged to go to a meeting of Committee 2, was taken by Mr. Leo Wallenborn, with the assent of the Committee.)

The Delegate of Switzerland proposed that all countries should be authorized to apply, through the I.T.U. Bureau, for the revision of the Convention and Plan: the application to be admissible, if one-third of the countries, duly consulted by the I.T.U. Bureau, supported it. In support of his proposal he instanced the difficulty of preliminary consultation of countries desirous of revision.

The Chairman and the Delegate of France pointed out, that this was precisely the procedure proposed in the Lucerne and Montreux Conventions for the revision of the Plan.

The Chairman added that, while Montreux had fixed the necessary quorum at 1/3, Lucerne had put the number at 10.

The Delegate of Italy agreed with the Swiss Delegate's proposal, but insisted on the fact that it was not a question of Administrations, but of Governments.

The Chairman welcomed the distinction made by the Italian Delegate, and attempted to draw a conclusion from the discussion. The Committee seemed to be in agreement over the Swiss proposal; but the question was whether to fix a quorum in fractions or in numbers. If the former, should the fraction be 1/3 of the Governments who signed the Convention or adhered to it? It had been recently demonstrated that the question was not a simple one. It was essential therefore that the question should be clearly put.

The Delegate of Italy thought the quorum should be based on the number of countries who were signatories, or had adhered at the time when the application for revision was made.

The Chairman observed that, if the question of new States was easy to deal with, the question of States which ceased to exist was very much more complicated.

The preceding remark led the Delegate of France to propose that the quorum should be fixed as in the Montreux Convention.

The Chairman summarized the discussion. The more recent observations of Delegates had all been concerned with the eventuality of a total revision of the Convention. The possibility of private arrangements between States had not been mentioned.

The discussion on the question of revision being finished, there yet remained another important question of principle, viz. that of the application of the Convention; and it would be untimely to begin the discussion of such a complex question at that point. In view of the fact that certain Delegates were faced with the necessity of participating in the C.C.I.R. Conference at Stockholm, the discussion would necessarily be interrupted. He proposed accordingly to adjourn the discussion of this extremely important question, arising in connection with Article 11 of the Lucerne Convention, Article 13 of the Montreux Convention and Article 8 of the Montreux Plan. He suggested that the Committee should suspend its work during the following week, which would provide time incidentally for its members to study the United Kingdom Delegation's document.

The Delegate of Italy, while agreeing with the Chairman's suggestion for an adjournment, suggested the appointment of a Working Group to put together the decisions already taken by the Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. did not wish to discredit the work accomplished by the Committee during the course of the present meeting; but he could not agree to the proposed adjournment. He considered the appointment of a Working Group premature. The question which had arisen was not, in his opinion, of general or first class importance. He reserved the right, for the Soviet Delegation, of returning to each one of the points discussed. Accordingly he proposed that no decisions should be taken until such time as each Delegate had the opportunity of studying the U.K. document.

The Chairman did not find any conflict between the Italian proposal and the proposal of the Soviet Delegation. What the Committee was discussing at the moment was its time-table for the following week. If all the Delegations constituting the Committee could not meet at that time, why not attempt - since they had in any case to await the distribution of the United Kingdom document - to gain time by drafting texts on questions on which the Committee was in agreement.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., in order to avoid any misunderstanding, said that he wished to reserve the right to return, alike in matters of substance and of form, to questions discussed before he had had the opportunity of studying the U.K. document.

The Chairman, having noted the Soviet reservation, put the question to the vote. The Committee decided by 8 votes - the other Delegations abstaining - to appoint a Working Group charged with preparing a general draft of Articles for the new Convention, corresponding to Articles 4 and 5 of the Lucerne Convention, and Articles 6 to 8 and 9 of the Montreux Convention.

At the suggestion of the Chairman, the Committee appointed the Delegate of Italy as Chairman of the Working Group, with the Delegates of France, Poland, the United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia, & Yugoslavia as members.

The Secretariat to be requested to provide a room with simultaneous interpretation equipment for the Working Group's meetings. The Chairman of the Working Group to propose a time-table for the Group, after consultation with the other Group members.

The Chairman said that the only item on the Agenda of the next meeting of the Committee would be the Report of the Working Group.

The Committee itself would not meet before July 19th. He adjourned the meeting at 11.45 a.m.

J.M. Leproux,
Leo Wallenborn,
Rapporteurs.

Jacques Meyer,

Chairman.

European Regional Broadcasting
Conference.

RD Document No. 61-E

Maritime Regional Radio
Conference.

MAR Document No. 37-E

København, 1948

July, 9. 1948

Submitted in french

C O R R E C T I O N

to

Document RD No. 54-E - MAR No. 32-E

Replace the signatures of the Document by the following:

J. MEYER Head of the French Delegation to the
European Regional Broadcasting Conference

M. LHERMITE Head of the French Delegation to the
Maritime Regional Radio Conference

12 July 1948

Submitted in: French

A d m i s s i o n
of the United Nations Educational
Scientific and Cultural Organisation
(U.N.E.S.C.O.)

On 7 July 1948, the Danish Administration received the following telegram from the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union at Berne:

"Service Burinterna to Gentel
Copenhagen.

"Following on instructions of the second session of the UNESCO General Conference, Mr. Julian Huxley, Director-General UNESCO, 19 Avenue Kléber Paris wishes to know whether possible for UNESCO to be represented at Copenhagen by an observer stop Please inform whether we can give affirmative answer to this specialised organisation."

The above telegram has been passed by the Danish Administration to the Chairman for submission to the Conference, pursuant to the provisions of the Directives for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference annexed to the Additional Protocol of Atlantic City, § 1. 4.

(Tr.5/R.4/D.19)

Submitted in: French

Supplement to the Agenda

of the 2nd Meeting of the Plenary Assembly

Meeting of Monday, 12 July 1948
at 10 a.m.

Add following items to Document RD 47 - E:

- to Item 4 Admission of International Broadcasting Union (U.I.R.)
(RD Document No. 56).
- Admission of International Civil Aviation
Organisation (O.A.C.I.)
(RD Document No. 54).
- Admission of United Nations Organisation for
Education, Science and Culture (U.N.E.S.C.O.)
(RD Document No. 62).
- to Item 5 Invitation of the Republic of San Marino
(RD Document No. 52).

COMMITTEE 4

Sub-Committee 4B

Data for an analysis of the draft
documentation of the Committee of Eight
Countries.

Arrangement to satisfy the claims of different countries with
regard to two alternative plans submitted by the Committee of
Eight Countries.

Table No. 1

| No. | Country | Number of frequencies according to the Soviet Plan | | | | Number of frequencies according to plan of Messrs. Hayes & Van der Pol | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--------|--------------------|-------|---|--------|--------------------|-------|
| | | not shared | shared | inter- national | total | not shared | shared | inter- national | total |
| 1 | Albania | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | Algiers | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 3 | Germany | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 11 |
| 4 | Austria | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 5 | Belgium | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 6 | Byelorussian SSR | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 7 | People's Rep. of Bulgaria | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 8 | Karelo-Finnish SSR. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 9 | Vatican | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 10 | Denmark | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 11 | Egypt | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 12 | Spain | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| 13 | Esthonian SSR | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 14 | Finland | 1 | 8 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 |
| 15 | France | 8 | 10 | 1 | 19 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 18 |
| 16 | United Kingdom | 3 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 15 |
| 17 | Greece | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 |

- 2 -
(RD Doc. No. 64-E)

| No. | Country | Number of frequencies according to the Soviet Plan | | | | Number of frequencies according to plan of Messrs. Hayes & Van der Pol. | | | | T 0 T A L |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|--------|----------------|-------|---|--------|----------------|-----|-----------------------|
| | | not shared | shared | inter-national | total | not shared | shared | inter-national | | |
| 18 | Hungary | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | |
| 19 | Ireland | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| 20 | Iceland | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | |
| 21 | Italy | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 11 | |
| 22 | Latvian SSR. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 23 | Lebanon | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 24 | Lithuanian SSR | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | |
| 25 | Luxemburg | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| 26 | Lybia | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 27 | Morocco | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | |
| 28 | Moldavian SSR | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| 29 | Monaco | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| 30 | Norway | 2 | 10 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 9 | |
| 31 | Palestine | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | |
| 32 | Holland | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | |
| 33 | Poland | 5 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 | |
| 34 | Portugal | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 9 | |
| 35 | People's Rep. of Rumania | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | |
| 36 | U.S.S.R. | 7 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 15 | |
| 37 | Sweden | 3 | 7 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 10 | |
| 38 | Switzerland | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | |
| 39 | Syria | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| 40 | Czechoslovakia | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | |
| 41 | Tunis | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | |
| 42 | Turkey | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | |
| 43 | Ukrainian SSR | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 | |
| 44 | Fed. People's Rep. of Yugoslavia | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 9 | |
| 45 | Andorra | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | |
| 46 | Cyprus | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 47 | Tangier | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 48 | Trieste | | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 72 | 162 | 15 | 249 | 58 | 167 | 25 | 250 | |

The Chairman of Sub-Committee 4B

G. Likkouchine

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København 1948.

RD Document No. 65-E

July 9, 1948.

Submitted in: French.

UNITED KINGDOM

This document is an amendment to document RD
No. 38, and concerns the French text only.

(D35)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København 1948.

RD Document No. 66-E-
July 11, 1948.

Submitted in: French.

ICELAND

This document is an amendment to RD Doc. No. 59,
and does not concern the English text.

July 11, 1948

Submitted in: French

LEBANON

LEBANESE REPUBLIC

Minister of Posts
& Telecommunications

Beyrouth, 6 July 1948.

No. 17/48-2ET

AIRMAIL

The Chairman,

European Broadcasting
Conference

COPENHAGEN, Denmark

Mr. Chairman,

Referring to the Final Report of the work of the Committee of Eight and its Annexes (2nd session, Brussels May-June 1948), I should like to make the following observations relating to the frequencies allocated to Lebanese broadcasting.

The preliminary draft of the Netherlands Plan (1st session) provided for two frequencies for Lebanon: 691 and 1294 kc/s.

The preliminary draft of the U.S.S.R. Plan provided for only one frequency: 1560 kc/s.

My Administration had accepted, in principle, the preliminary draft of the Netherlands Plan, while pointing out that the frequency 1294 kc/s was slightly too high in view of the orography of the country, and that it wished to have it replaced, if possible, by one that was more suitable, (see Document 230).

The two variants which accompany the Final Report of the Brussels Committee (2nd session) provide for the following frequencies for Lebanon:

- a) variant with separation of 9 kc/s (Document 279):
a frequency of 970 kc/s;
- b) variant with separation of 10 kc/s (Document 281):
two frequencies: 860 and 1010 kc/s.

Thus it will be seen that the provision of the 2nd session for the allocation of frequencies to Lebanon are clearly unfavourable in comparison with those of the preliminary draft of the Netherlands Plan.

Lebanon, in view of its orographic conditions, requests that two frequencies be reserved for it: one, that of 691 kc/s allocated to it by the Netherlands Plan, and the other to be chosen in the neighbourhood of the 1000 kc/s band.

(RD Doc. 67-E)

The Lebanese Administration, which regrets its inability to participate in the work of the Conference, would be very much obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, if you would be so kind as to examine its very modest claims in the most favourable possible light.

I have, etc.....

The Director of Posts and
Telecommunications.

(Tr 42/R4/D)

St : 30



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 68

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 77 - Corrections to Document No. 68

July 12, 1948

Submitted in: Russian

COMMITTEE 4

Sub-Committee 4B

Table 2

Comparison between the number of exclusive frequencies contained in the Plans in Documents Nos. 279 and 281.

| Number of exclusive frequencies | | | | Number of exclusive frequencies | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| No | Country | Doc.No. 281 | Doc.No. 279 | No. | Country | Doc.No. 281 | Doc.No. 279 |
| 1 | Albania | 1 | 0 | 23 | Lebanon | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Algeria | 0 | 0 | 24 | Lithuania | | |
| 3 | Germany | 4 | 4 | | (S.S.R.) | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | Austria | 1 | 2 | 25 | Luxembourg | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Belgium | 2 | 1 | 26 | Libya | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Bielorussia (S.S.R.) | 2 | 1 | 27 | Morocco | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Bulgaria (P.R.) | 1 | 1 | 28 | Moldavia | | |
| 8 | Carelo-Finnish S.S.R. | 0 | 0 | | (S.S.R.) | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | 29 | Monaco | 0 | 1 |
| 9 | Vatican City | 0 | 0 | 30 | Norway | 2 | 1 |
| 10 | Denmark | 2 | 2 | 31 | Palestine | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Egypt | 1 | 0 | 32 | Netherlands | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | Spain | 0 | 0 | 33 | Poland | 5 | 3 |
| 13 | Estonia (S.S.R.) | 1 | 0 | 34 | Portugal | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Finland | 1 | 1 | 35 | Roumania (P.R.) | 2 | 1 |
| 15 | France | 8 | 7 | 36 | U.S.S.R. | 7 | 3 |
| 16 | United Kingdom | 3 | 4 | 37 | Sweden | 3 | 2 |
| 17 | Greece | 0 | 0 | 38 | Switzerland | 2 | 2 |
| 18 | Hungary (P.R.) | 1 | 2 | 39 | Syria | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | Ireland | 0 | 0 | 40 | Tchecoslova- | | |
| 20 | Iceland | 0 | 0 | | kia | 4 | 4 |
| 21 | Italy | 4 | 5 | 41 | Tunisia | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | Latvia (S.S.R.) | 1 | 0 | 42 | Turkey | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | 43 | Ukraine (S.S.R.) | 6 | 3 |
| | | | | 44 | Yugoslavia | | |
| | | | | | (F.P.R.) | 5 | 5 |

Total 72

58

Countries to which no exclusive frequencies
have been assigned in any of the plans.

1. Algeria
2. Carelo-Finnish S.S.R.
3. Vatican City
4. Spain
5. Greece
6. Ireland
7. Iceland
8. Lebanon
9. Libya
10. Morocco
11. Palestine
12. Portugal
13. Syria
14. Tunisia
15. Turkey

Countries to which the Plan of Doc.279 assigns
fewer exclusive frequencies than the Plan of Doc.281.

1. Albania
2. Belgium
3. Bielorussia (S.S.R.)
4. Egypt
5. Estonia (S.S.R.)
6. France
7. Latvia (S.S.R.)
8. Lithuania (S.S.R.)
9. Norway
10. Poland
11. Roumania (P.R.)
12. U.S.S.R.,
13. Sweden
14. Ukraine (S.S.R.)

Countries to which the Plan of Doc.279 assigns :
more exclusive frequencies than the Plan of Doc.281.

1. Austria
2. Hungaria
3. Italy
4. Luxemburg
5. Monaco
6. United Kingdom

Countries to which both Plans assign the same
number of exclusive frequencies.

1. Germany
2. Bulgaria (P.R.)
3. Denmark
4. Finland
5. Moldavia (S.S.R.)
6. Netherlands
7. Switzerland
8. Tchechoslovakia
9. Yugoslavia (F.P.R.)

(Signed) Likhouchine,

Chairman of
Sub-Committee 4B

EUROPEAN REGIONAL
BROADCASTING CONFERENCE
KØBENHAVN, 1948

RD Document No.69-E
12 July 1948

Submitted in: French

MOROCCO and TUNISIA

Delegation of Morocco
and Tunisia

Copenhagen,

9 July 1948.

The Chairman of the
European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
KØBENHAVN

Sir,

I have the honour of enclosing herewith the Observations
on the second variants of the draft frequency allocation Plan,
concerning:

1. Morocco
2. International Zone of Tangier
3. Tunisia.

I have etc.

Pierre Schaeffer,

Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia.

MOROCCO

OBSERVATIONS

of the Moroccan Broadcasting Service
on the Preliminary Draft Plan sub-
mitted by the Committee of Eight Countries.

- I -

In the new wording of each of the two Plans the Moroccan Broadcasting Service has noted with satisfaction the praiseworthy efforts made to take into account the observations submitted by its representative at Brussels.

But the Moroccan Broadcasting Service had itself agreed to considerable reductions in its list of requirements in order to contribute towards a new draft of these Plans, and had further shown itself accommodating in the matter of sharing, considering its geographical position.

The Moroccan Broadcasting Service cannot consider the Plans in their latest form without recalling in the clearest possible way the bases of the compromise envisaged at Brussels. These constituted a minimum below which it was in no circumstances able to go, and which it was prepared to accept only on the strength of explicit guarantees.

-II-

Concession of the Moroccan Broadcasting Service since the original list of requirements:

a) The Moroccan Broadcasting Service originally requests ^{submitted} for the allocation of the necessary frequencies for the transmission of 3 programmes to serve the following 4 language groups:

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| French-speaking group | | |
| Arabic- | " | " |
| Berber- | " | " |
| Spanish | " | " |

As the Moroccan Broadcasting Service prefers quality of transmission to the number of hours of broadcasting it reduced its requirements to 2 programmes only when appearing before the Committee of Eight Countries. But in view of the necessity of serving 4 language groups with 2 programmes only, it desires compensation in the quality of the frequencies allocated to it.

b) Morocco, as an outlying country of the European Area, seems well fitted to give the lead in sharing with remote countries. In order to expedite discussion, Morocco is willing to renounce claims to one or more exclusive waves, subject to compensation in the matter of sharing as specified below.

c) With regard to the number of frequencies necessary, it is clear that Morocco - more than other countries whose technical equipment is of long standing - is likely to accelerate its economic and social development in the near future, which

would justify a programme of requirements for the years to come considerably larger than the programme at present operating.

In no circumstances could Morocco reduce the number of frequencies required to less than the present number, nor could she accept the allocation of frequencies, whose position in the spectrum was unfavourable by comparison with the frequencies at present operating.

Minimum claims.

In face of the need for economic and social development which must be met, Morocco asks only for:

1. considerable increases in power, as indicated below;
2. the use of international common waves, over and above the waves allocated.

In order to facilitate the preparation of a plan, Morocco simply indicates the extent of the frequencies required. Morocco leaves the determination of the specific numerical value of the frequencies to the Conference, with adequate protection in the case of sharing.

Taking into account the orographical situation and the unfavourable ground conductivity, especially in the Southern and Eastern parts of the country, Morocco has provided for each of the two above-mentioned programmes:

- 1 - a powerful transmitter (120 Kw) of fairly low frequency at Rabat;
- 2 - a synchronised network in South Morocco of three times 20 Kw, in the districts of Oudja, Marrakesh and Agadir.

- IV -

The following table summarizes the requirements of the Moroccan Broadcasting Service:

| <u>Place</u> | <u>Power</u> | <u>Extent of frequencies in kilocycles</u> | <u>Observations</u> |
|---------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Rabat I Rabat II | 120 KW | 600 | The protection required for each of these two allocations is 40 db. For one at least of these stations, the sharing stations should be few, and of considerably inferior power (less than 50 KW).) |

(RD Doc. No.69-E)

| <u>Place</u> | <u>Power</u> | <u>Extent of frequencies in kilocycles.</u> | <u>Observations</u> |
|--------------|--------------|---|--|
| Oudja I | 20 KW) | frequency (x) | A minimum protection of 35 db. is required for these two allocations. For at least one of them, the sharing stations should not be of a very high power. |
| Marrokesh I | 20 KW) | between | |
| Agadir I | 20 KW) | 800 and 1200 | |
| Oudja II | 20 KW) | | |
| Marrakesh II | 20 KW) | frequency (x) | |
| Agadir II | 20 KW) | between 800 and 1200 | |

(x) average of these two frequencies: about 1,000.

- V -

Criticism of the Plans.

As already indicated at Brussels, the Moroccan Broadcasting Service does not wish to express theoretical preference for either a 9 or a 10 kilocycle system.

But, although the 10 kc/s Plan constituted a great advance on the first version, which was quite unacceptable for Morocco, the 9 kc/s Plan remains more satisfactory from the point of view of the quality of the allocations and of the conditions of sharing.

The quality of the frequencies allocated to Morocco under the 10 kc/s Plan is even less than those now in operation, and the conditions of sharing are not sufficiently protected. The protection, it is recalled, must be such as to compensate for its willing surrender of claims to one or more exclusive frequencies.

- VI -

Reservation.

The Moroccan Broadcasting Service has preferred to submit its minimum needs in the form of a synopsis, in order to facilitate the work of the Conference. However, in view of the short time given for the present statement of its position, it reserves the right to make any corrections it may consider necessary, and also to come back to the detailed criticism of Documents 279 and 281 in the different Committees.

Copenhagen, 9 July 1948.

M O R O C C O

INTERNATIONAL ZONE OF TANGIER

The Delegation of Morocco has the right to submit the allocation requirements of the Tangier Territory.

The Delegation of Morocco recalls that the allocation of at least one frequency of a power of 20 KW was required for the International Zone of Tangier.

The Delegation of Morocco observes that provision was made for such an allocation (in the high part of the spectrum, it is true) in the 9 kc/s Plan, but was not mentioned in the 10 kc/s Plan.

It goes without saying that the Town of Tangier and the International Zone need the use of a local broadcasting station for which a minimum allocation is indispensable by reason of its international character, its population and its important role as a centre of traffic.

Copenhagen, 9 July 1948

RD Document No. 69-E

T U N I S I A

REMARKS

of the Tunisian Broadcasting Service
relating to the Draft Plans submitted by
the Committee of Eight

-I-

The Tunisian Broadcasting Service remarks with satisfaction that a commendable effort has been made to take the observations presented by its representative at Brussels into account.

The Tunisian Broadcasting Service notices however, that neither of the two Plans, even in their new version, contains any answer to the point put at Brussels by its representative. It therefore thinks well to recapitulate the principal points of the discussion

-II-

Tunisia, though it has, like Morocco, to serve a number of different language-groups confined itself nevertheless at the outset to asking for the frequencies necessary for two programmes. It still adheres to that demand. In addition to the zone of Tunis, the Tunisian Broadcasting Service has to serve South Tunisia. It has, therefore, arranged for two systems of frequencies of the following type:

TUNIS I : 120 KW

TUNIS II : 120 KW

SFAX I)
GABES I) 5 KW

SFAX II)
GABES II) 5 KW

The Tunisian Broadcasting Service, when appearing before the Committee of Eight, took up a position somewhat different from that of Morocco, for the following reasons:

1. The situation of Tunisia lends itself much less easily to sharing than Morocco.
2. The radiophonic equipment of Tunis, which is more advanced than that of Morocco, does not allow of the same latitudes as to the concession of frequencies of any given numerical value.

If and in so far as the Conference is prepared to take into account the above special circumstances, and the difficulties which would result from any extensive alteration of the present situation, the Tunisian Broadcasting Service would be ready to offer, as it did before the Committee of Eight, to abandon its demands in respect of South Tunisia on condition that (a) the two transmitters now operating in Tunis can be maintained on frequencies at least approximating to those at present in operation with adequate powers, and (b) that at least one of the two frequencies is exclusive.

-III-

If these conditions are accepted, the requirements of Tunisia can be reduced to the following minimum:

TUNIS - 120 KW - 823 kc/s (existing)

DJEDEIDA - 20 KW at present - 583 kc/s (frequency allocated since Lucerne)
(About to be increased to 120 KW)

at least one of these frequencies being exclusive.
South Tunisia would be served by the use of common international waves.

-IV-

An examination of the two Plans, even in their new version, shows that the frequencies allocated to TUNIS I and TUNIS II are shared frequencies, without any adequate compensation having been accorded for South Tunisia.

In effect in the two Plans one of the frequencies accorded is 1564 or 1550 (a type practically unusable in view of the difficulties in the way of the radiophonic equipment of the indigenous population), while the other is for 1348 or 1390 (which in practice is used as a common international wave).

If Tunisia agrees to reduce its demands to only two frequencies, it is because it counts on utilising common international waves for South Tunisia. It considers, therefore, that the two Plans have not taken into account either the concessions it has made or the present state of its equipment.

In regard to the quality of the allocations, the mean of the two frequencies now in use is 703 kc/s; the mean of the frequencies provided for Tunis in the Plan at 9 kc/s is 772 and in the Plan at 10 kc/s, 805.

Tunis, like Morocco, cannot in view of its impending economic and social development accept a situation inferior to the status quo.

Copenhagen, 9 July 1948.

(Tr.42/R.11/D.34)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 70 - E
July 12, 1948

Correction to Document RD No 55 - E

Between heading and text, add the title:

UNITED KINGDOM

July 12, 1948

Submitted in: English

N E T H E R L A N D S

Comments on the final report of the work
of the Committee of Eight Countries

1. As Doc. RD 33 invites the delegations to comment on the second Brussels variants, the Netherlands delegation confirms the views expressed in the letter of May 10th to the Committee of Eight Countries, in which for general reasons preference was given to the 9 kc/s plan. As other delegations dealt already with the general and the technical aspects of the relative merits of both variants, we want to limit ourselves to a short statement on the allocations proposed for the Netherlands, in addition to the remarks made in said letter of May 10th.
2. With regard to the 9 kc/s variant, the proposed exclusive frequency of 844 kc/s is the same as contained in the first draft, as is also the case with the shared wave of 655 kc/s. The protected field strength of that wave may perhaps be considered as very slightly improved. The proposed common international frequency of 1564 kc/s is higher than that of the first draft of 1519 kc/s. Besides our objection regarding the small service area, already made in quoted letter, this higher frequency has an additional disadvantage if consideration is given to the frequency limit of a large number of existing broadcast receivers. Furthermore the high protected field strength on this wave may cause difficulties in view of the limited power.
3. With regard to the 10 kc/s variant although not recommended by the Netherlands delegation for general reasons, our comments on the proposed frequencies are as follows:

The proposed 740 kc/s exclusive wave is a suitable one and would therefore be acceptable.

The proposed 860 kc/s shared frequency is however not acceptable in view of its very unfavourable sharing conditions.

The common international frequency of 1390 kc/s would be acceptable as far as the frequency itself is concerned. The sharing with other stations is however so unfavourable that it will make it impossible to use this frequency for the purpose intended.
4. In conclusion we may state that the 9 kc/s Brussels variant does not fully meet our minimum requirements. We regret again that it does not provide us with the 2 exclusive frequencies which we insisted upon, in sacrificing the long wave of 160 kc/s. If however on the basis of this plan or its improved modifications it would be possible to get the general acceptance, the general advantages for European broadcasting resulting from such acceptance would be so great that we could in the spirit of cooperation reluctantly withdraw our objections. No plan could however be considered by us which would go beyond the bare minimum of the present 9 kc/s plan.

J. van der Toorn.

S W I T Z E R L A N D

Observations of the Swiss Delegation on the
two preliminary draft Plans

(Documents 279 and 281 of Brussels)

Mr. Chairman,

The Swiss Delegation has carefully examined the two drafts above-named, and has the honour of communicating to you the following:

The allocations provided for the Swiss stations in the two variants are nearly equivalent as regards the quality of the frequencies. We propose to examine below in detail the situation accorded to each of our stations.

Beromünster Station

The Plan at 9 kc/s, exclusive frequency of 556 kc/s, power of 150 KW. This frequency is the one which was allocated to Switzerland by the Lucerne Plan and is in operation at present. Acceptable, if the allocation of neighbouring channels is revised. Of these, the powerful Rome station (150 KW) at only 680 km. distance is bound to produce intolerable interferences in a large part of the receiving zone of the Beromünster station.

The Plan at 10 kc/s, exclusive frequency of 530 kc/s, power of 150 KW. This frequency is slightly lower than the present frequency. Acceptable, if the 540 kc/s channel were occupied by a station geographically more remote (e.g. if Vilnas were substituted for Budapest).

Sottens Station

The Plan at 9 kc/s, exclusive frequency of 673 kc/s, power of 150 KW. Frequency slightly lower than the present frequency. Acceptable, if Madrid was replaced by a station geographically more remote on the neighbouring channel of 682 kc/s.

The Plan at 10 kc/s, exclusive frequency of 710 kc/s, power of 150 KW. Frequency higher than the present frequency, and for that reason less favourable from the point of view of broadcasting. On the other hand, the Rome (150 KW) frequency on the 720 kc/s channel at a distance of only 680 km. is bound to produce intolerable interferences. It is also to be feared that in a part of the country the Poznan station, on the neighbouring channel of 700 kc/s, may cause considerable interference.

Monte Ceneri Station

The Plan at 9 kc/s, shared frequency of 538 kc/s, power of 100 KW with directed aerial. The Monte Ceneri transmitter is situated in the middle of a broadcasting territory, which has an elongated form with the axis North-South. The territory is very mountainous. For these reasons, the operation of a directed aerial necessitating a reduction in radiation to the North is excluded.

Sharing of the frequency with Helsinki (100 KW, 1900 km) could only be accepted, if the latter operated an effective directed aerial, protecting the Monte Ceneri listening zone. In addition, the frequency stability of Helsinki would have to be much higher than that prescribed by the Atlantic City Regulations.

In regard to the neighbouring channels, the allocations accorded to Rome (547 kc/s, 150 KW) and to Budapest (529 kc/s, 135 KW) will certainly produce intolerable interferences.

Plan at 10 kc/s, shared frequency of 660 kc/s, power of 50 KW. The power provided is too feeble. The other stations sharing the frequency, viz.

| | | |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| Petrosavodsk | 100 KW | 2350 km |
| Damas | 50 KW | 2700 km |
| Eidar | 5 KW | 2480 km |

will all produce too strong field intensities in the receiving region of Monte Ceneri. On the 670 kc/s channel the presence of Madrid (120 KW, 1200 km distance) will produce considerable interference.

Common Swiss Wave

The solutions provided in the two Plans would be acceptable from the point of view of the allocated frequency. The common Swiss wave having to broadcast different programmes, it is indispensable that the stations operating on this frequency should maintain a rigorous synchronism, which should also extend to foreign stations required to share the frequency. This solution being practically unrealisable, the retention of an exclusive frequency would alone permit Switzerland to continue to operate its synchronised network. This network with its many programmes is indispensable for the various language regions of Switzerland owing to the fact that the medium frequencies provided for in the two variants do not make it possible to reach vast areas of the mountainous regions of the country.

Plan at 9 kc/s, shared frequency of 1402 kc/s, power of 0.25 KW per station. Shared with a common Swedish wave of a power of 1 KW per station, and in addition with the Portugese station of Coimbra, operating on a power of 1 KW. For the reasons cited above on the one hand, and in view of the fact that the fields produced in Switzerland by these stations largely exceed the tolerable values on the other hand, the proposed sharing is not acceptable. On the neighbouring channels the presence of Bordeaux on 1393 kc/s (100 KW) and of Brussels III on 1411 kc/s (20 KW) will produce intolerable interference.

Plan at 10 kc/s, shared frequency 1310 kc/s, total power 10 KW. The Plan envisages sharing with Kursk (U.S.S.R., 20 KW, 2000 km) and with Bergen II (Norway, 5 KW, 1600 km). For the reasons given above on the one hand, and in view of the fact that the fields produced in Switzerland by these two stations would far exceed the permissible values on the other hand, Switzerland cannot accept the proposed sharing. The station of Toulouse in the neighbouring channel (1300 kc/s with a power of 100 KW and 550 km distance) would cause intolerable interference.

General Considerations

As none of the variants of the Plan provide a frequency of between 150 and 285 for Switzerland, we should like to point out that an exclusive common wave between 1300 and 1500 kc/s is indispensable to ensure adequate reception on medium frequencies on Swiss territory. This constitutes an indispensable condition in the minimum claims of Switzerland as submitted to the Committee of Eight Countries (Loc. Br. 2,234). Should these requirements not receive sufficient consideration, Switzerland would be compelled to claim the right granted by the Prague Plan to the use of a long wave, a right which she never renounced, and which was the subject of explicit reservations in the Acts of the Conferences of Lucerne and Montreux.

The question of the wave of 442 kc/s allocated in derogation to the Geneva station will be the subject of a later communication.

We request your kind attention for our observations and have etc.

(signed) Dr. E. METZLER,
Head of the Swiss Delegation.

July 12, 1948

Submitted in English

UNITED KINGDOM

SYNCHRONISATION OF BROADCASTING TRANSMITTERS

As early as 1926 it became necessary in Great Britain to seek a method of compensating for a serious reduction in the number of channels used by British broadcasting stations at that time, so that the Geneva Wavelength Plan of the International Broadcasting Union could be implemented.

It became necessary to accomodate some 11 stations transmitting the same programme on only 2 frequencies. A series of experiments was carried out, and apparatus was devised with this end in view. Initially tuning forks were used and the drive frequency was passed over telephone lines from a central point to the transmitting stations, there to be multiplied in frequency up to the desired carrier frequency. This system, initially applied in 1926 to low-power stations, was later on applied to high-power stations. A large number of practical difficulties were encountered but considerable success was achieved in the sense that it was possible to keep transmitting stations on the air which otherwise would have had to close down owing to lack of wavelengths. With the gradual progress of technique in the design and manufacture of quartz crystal drives, the tuning fork and the telephone line has given place to a separate quartz crystal drive at each transmitting station, sufficient stability now being obtained in practice to make it unnecessary to have any connection between the stations synchronised on one channel other than the music circuit (which can be either a physical circuit or a radio circuit) for the transmission of the programme. This circuit is used for frequency checking purposes at times when normal broadcast transmission is not taking place, usually for a short period during the night.

The present use of synchronisation in Great Britain is shown by the following list of transmitters:

| <u>Frequency</u> <u>in kc/s.</u> | <u>Name of Station</u> | <u>Power</u> <u>in kW</u> | <u>Programme</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 767 | Westerglen | 60 | Scottish Home Service |
| | Burghead | 60 | " " " |
| | Redmoss | 2.5 | " " " |
| 804 | Washford | 60 | Welsh Home Service |
| | Penmon | 10 | " " " |
| | Wrexham | 1 | " " " |
| 1013 | Droitwich | 60 | Midland Home Service |
| | Norwich | 1 | " " " |
| 1050 | Stagshaw | 100 | North of England and |
| | Lisnagarvey | 100 | Northern Ireland |
| | Londonderry | 1 | Home Services |
| 1149 | Brookmans Park | 60 | Light Programme |
| | Moor side Edge | 60 | " " |
| | Westerglen | 60 | " " |
| | Burghead | 20 | " " |
| | Lisnagarvey | 10 | " " |
| | Stagshaw | 10 | " " |
| | Redmoss | 2 | " " |
| | Redruth | 2 | " " |
| | Londonderry | 1 | " " |
| | Plymouth | 1 | " " |
| 19384 | Clevedon | 20 | West of England |
| | Bartley | 10 | Home Service |
| 1474 | Aberdeen (Redmoss) | 1 | Third Programme |
| | Belfast | .1 | " " |
| | Bournemouth | .25 | " " |
| | Brighton | .1 | " " |
| | Bristol | 1 | " " |
| | Cardiff | 1 | " " |
| | Dundee | .25 | " " |
| | Edinburgh | 2 | " " |
| | Exeter | .1 | " " |
| | Fareham | 1 | " " |
| | Glasgow | 1 | " " |
| | Hull | .25 | " " |
| | Leeds | 2 | " " |
| | Liverpool | .1 | " " |
| | London | 2 | " " |
| | Manchester | 1 | " " |
| | Middlesbrough | .1 | " " |
| | Newcastle | 1 | " " |
| | Plymouth | 2 | " " |
| | Preston | .25 | " " |
| | Redruth | 1 | " " |
| | Sheffield | .1 | " " |

It will be seen that there are 45 transmitters on 7 frequencies.

Practical experience has shown that with the independent crystal drives installed at each station and with the checking arrangements provided, stations normally keep their frequencies within a tolerance of the order of one part in 10^7 . In present B.B.C. practice, the normal maximum beat frequency between stations is of the order of one beat in 10 seconds. If the beat becomes more frequent than one beat in 5 seconds, action is taken to correct but the correction needed is infrequent. It is emphasised that extra circuits are not needed to convey any synchronising frequency.

The Committee of Eight Countries has recommended that for the simultaneous operation of broadcasting stations on the same channel when different programmes are radiated, the ratio of 40 db (100/1 in field) is necessary to secure freedom from interferences.

Experience with synchronised stations in Great Britain shows that when the same programme is radiated this ratio can be reduced to approximately 6 db to 10 db (2/1 to 3/1 in field). It follows that in a group of synchronised stations each of the stations will be surrounded by a service area and there will be an area in between stations where poor quality reception is experienced. It is sometimes possible by suitable siting of the stations for this interference area, or 'mush' area as it is called, to fall in a very sparsely populated area. Alternatively a second wavelength, and if necessary a third wavelength, must be used for further groups of synchronised stations which can be interleaved with the first group so as to ensure complete coverage. It follows that it is possible to cover any desired size of territory with one programme by using not more than three wavelengths.

If the distance between stations in a synchronised group is sufficiently great, it is, of course, possible to radiate different programmes from those stations, but in most countries in Europe this may be impossible except by day.

The United Kingdom Delegation believes that it is only by the maximum possible use of synchronised stations where the conditions permit that it will be possible to draw up a wavelength plan which is likely to be acceptable to all European countries. Without synchronisation, the United Kingdom would need 22 wavelengths for medium and high power stations and a number of channels to accommodate 31 low power stations. With synchronisation it is possible to reduce the total number of channels to 15.

A reference to the list given above of B.B.C. stations working in synchronised groups will show that the system is applicable to high power as well as to medium and low power stations.

(D.19)

LWH/DT
9.7.48.

MONACO

Observations of the Administration of
Monaco on the second variants of the plan.

PRINCIPALITY OF MONACO

Copenhagen, 10 July 1948

The Chairman of the
European Broadcasting
Conference,
Copenhagen.

Sir,

I have the honour of enclosing herewith the Observations of the Administration of Monaco, on the subject of the second draft variants of the frequency allocation plan.

I have etc.

(Signed) Crovetto

MONACO

OBSERVATIONS

of the Administration of MONACO
on the second variants of the Plan

The Administration of Monaco has given careful consideration to the second variants, one of which was drawn up by Professor Kotelnikov, and the other by Messrs. Hayes and Van der Pol.

The Administration of Monaco wishes above all to repeat its most grateful thanks to the Committee of Eight Countries, and to the authors of these preliminary drafts of a frequency allocation Plan, for their important and constructive work. The observations of the various countries on the first variants of the Plan drawn up by Professors Kotelnikov and Van der Pol respectively have also made possible a still fuller appreciation of the numerous technical and other difficulties.

From the persual of all these documents it seems apparent that the ultimate aim is no longer only to assign to each station an exclusive channel of 9 or 10 kc/s, but rather to see that each country has the means of reaching its listeners in a suitably audible manner.

Actuated by these motives, the Plan prepared by Messrs. Hayes and Van der Pol allocates to Monaco a frequency of 601 kc/s to operate exclusively by day, and an exclusive frequency of 1420 kc/s, to operate in practice only by night. The logical

aim of this solution is to provide good direct transmission by day in a region where conductibility is bad by means of a relatively low frequency, and good indirect transmission by night by means of a much higher frequency.

This solution is in theory satisfactory; and the Administration of Monaco is much obliged to Messrs. Hayes and Van der Pol for proposing it. It has, however, the disadvantage of necessitating very extensive and expensive modifications to the existing transmitter, to the aerial feeder, and to the omnidirectional aerial. Moreover it makes the operating of the station considerably more difficult. Indeed it may be as well to recall in this connection that the Radio Monte Carlo transmitter now works on a frequency of 730 kc/s, with a pylon 150 metres high, fed by an aerial feeder about 1,100 metres long situated in the mountains at a height of between 800 and 1100 on very difficult ground. The power is at present 120 kW, but can normally be increased to 150 kW without modification of the equipment.

The application of the second Hayes-Van der Pol variant would therefore necessitate the modification of this transmitter, which has just been completed after more than three years of work, and would involve considerable expense, if it is to be able to work on 1420 kc/s by night and 601 kc/s by day. The deviation between these two frequencies is very great, and specialists know that the technical solution of this problem is not of the easiest, especially if the security and simplicity of operating indispensable for a transmitter in high mountainous country is to be preserved.

The Administration of Monaco would appreciate action by the Conference to amend the second Hayes-Van der Pol variant in such a way that the modifications to be made to the existing transmitter and pylons are less considerable, the ideal solution being, of course, one which would enable Radio Monte Carlo to use day and night a wave-length near to that at present in use (410 m, 830 kc/s) with its total power of 120/150 kW. The Administration recognizes however that a general plan acceptable to all can doubtless only be prepared if all countries are willing to make some sacrifices to facilitate European agreement. This being so, the Administration of Monaco would accept the Hayes-Van der Pol draft with as extensive improvement as possible in the light of the above indications.

On the other hand, the Administration of Monaco cannot accept the second variant of the Plan prepared by Professor Kotelnikov, because this does not take sufficient account of the present position, and is far from giving Monaco the indispensable minimum for which application was made before the Committee of Eight Countries in accordance with the Directives of the Atlantic City Conference.

Such are the chief observations which the Monacan Administration has to submit. The Delegate of Monaco may have occasion to make further observations on specific secondary points, within the framework of a General European agreement on a satisfactory allocation plan, during the working meetings of Committees. As an example we need only mention the desirability of exchanging channel No. 100 (1411 kc/s) for channel No. 99 (1402 kc/s)

Copenhagen, 10 July 1948
(signed) Crovetto

SAN MARINO

Application for admission to the Conference
(sequel to Doc. RD No. 52)

Copenhagen, 12 July 1948.

The Chairman,
European Telecommunications Conference,
Copenhagen.

Mr. Chairman,

In pursuance of the application submitted by the Government of the Republic of San Marino for an invitation to the Copenhagen Conference (the which application was published by you on 7 July 1948 in the form of Document RD No. 52), it appears to me desirable to give further particulars with regard to the scope of the application in question.

In applying for an invitation, the Government of San Marino had no other object in view than to obtain a common international wave for its very limited local requirements (the extent of its territory being only 60 square kilometres) with a power of 200 watts only.

The Government of San Marino is of opinion that under these conditions a technical solution satisfying its requirements without injuring anyone should be easily attained.

San Marino, being anxious to regularise her position in the matter of international Conventions, has ratified the Agreements of Madrid, Cairo and Atlantic City. It may not be superfluous to add that the sole reason for the absence of San Marino at Atlantic City was the delay in notifying the Republic of the date of the Conference. It was only this fortuitous circumstance which prevented the adhesion of San Marino to the Atlantic City Convention at an earlier date, which would have made it possible for the Bureau of the International Telecommunications Union at Berne duly to inform States Members accordingly.

In view of the extreme moderation of her application, San Marino begs to be invited as a new member of the Conference, and undertakes not to go beyond the proposals put forward by her in her first Note.

On behalf of the Government of San Marino, I should be greatly obliged, Mr. Chairman, if you would be good enough to communicate the present letter to the members of the Conference,

I have etc.

(signed) Emmanuel Noel,

Delegate of the Republic
of San Marino.

(Tr.11/R.11/D.St.33)

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No. 76-E
12 July 1948

Replacing RD Doc. No. 4 of 22 June 1948

Original: French

RULES OF PROCEDURE

for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference
(København, 1948)

(With the exception of Rule 17 (Voting Procedure) which had not yet been adopted, and which will be published in a supplementary document after adoption)

Rule 1

Definitions

§ 1. In these Rules, the term "delegation" denotes a group of delegates from the same country.

- a) Only delegations from countries within the European Broadcasting Area x) have the right to vote.
- b) Persons representing extra-European countries have the rights of observers only.

§ 2. Each delegation may be assisted by one or more aides, by one or more advisers, and by one or more interpreters.

§ 3. The term "observer" shall denote:

- a) Persons representing countries outside Europe which have signed or adhered to the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City, 1947;
- b) Persons representing the United Nations who are present at the Conference;
- c) Persons representing the International Frequency Registration Board (I.F.R.B.);
- d) Persons representing international bodies who have asked to be admitted to the Conference and whose request has been approved by a plenary meeting of the Conference.

x) Definition of the European Broadcasting Area: The "European Area" is bounded on the West by the Western boundary of Region 1, on the East by the meridian 40° East of Greenwich and on the South by the parallel 30° North so as to include the Western part of the U.S.S.R. and the territories bordering the Mediterranean, with the exception of the parts of Arabia and Saudi-Arabia included in this sector.

Rule 2

Admission to the Conference

§ 1. As a general rule, only the following shall take part in all the deliberations of the Conference: delegations from countries within the European area, observers from countries outside Europe, from the United Nations, and from the I.F.R.B.

§ 2. The first Plenary Assembly shall lay down the limits within which observers from the bodies cited in Rule 1, para 4 d) may attend, and take part in, in an advisory capacity, the deliberations either at sessions of the Plenary Assembly, or at all or some of the Committees.

Rule 3

Order of Seating

At sessions of the Plenary Assembly, delegates, aides, advisers, interpreters, and observers shall be grouped by delegation and by country and agency. These delegations and observers shall be seated in the alphabetical order of French names of the countries and agencies represented.

Rule 4

Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Conference shall be elected at the first session of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference.

Rule 5

Presentation of Credentials

§ 1. Each delegation shall present to the Secretariat of the Conference credentials giving it authority to sign all the agreements entered into by the Conference.

§ 2. These credentials shall be examined by a committee during the first week of the Conference.

§ 3. No delegation shall enjoy the right of vote under Rule 17 unless and until the above committee has declared its credentials to be in order.

§ 4. Observers shall present to the Secretariat an official note from their organization accrediting them to the Conference.

Rule 6

Powers of the Chairman

The Chairman shall open and close the sessions of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, direct the deliberations, and announce the results of the voting.

He shall also have the general direction of all the work of the Conference.

Rule 7

Secretariat of the Conference

At the first session of the Plenary Assembly a Secretariat of the Conference shall be constituted. It shall be composed of personnel of the Secretariat of the International Telecommunications Union and, if necessary, of personnel of the Danish Government's administration.

Rule 8

Appointment of Committees

The Plenary Assembly may appoint committees to examine questions submitted for the consideration of the Conference. These committees may in their turn appoint sub-committees or working groups.

Rule 9

Composition of Committees

§ 1. Committees shall be composed of delegations from countries in the European Broadcasting Area which have made known their intention to participate.

§ 2. The following may be present at, and take part in, the deliberations of the committees, in a consultative capacity:

- a) Observers from non-European countries.
- b) Representatives of the United Nations.
- c) Representatives of the International Frequency Registration Board (I.F.R.B.).
- d) Representatives of international organizations, as laid down by the first Session of the Plenary Assembly.

Rule 10

Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, and Reporters of Committees and Sub-Committees.

The Chairman of the Conference shall submit for the approval of the Plenary Assembly the choice of chairman and of vice-chairman or vice-chairmen of each committee.

The Chairman of each committee shall propose to his committee the nomination of the reporters and the choice of the chairmen, vice-chairmen and reporters of the sub-committees.

Rule 11

Summons to Sessions

The sessions of the Plenary Assembly and of the committees and sub-committees shall be announced either by letter or by notice posted in the meeting place of the Conference. This information should be given at the earliest moment and as a general rule at least two days before the meeting takes place.

Rule 12

Order of Discussion

§ 1. Persons desiring to speak may do so only after having obtained the consent of the Chairman. As a general rule, they shall begin by announcing the name of their country or of their organization.

§ 2. Any person speaking must express himself slowly and distinctly, separating his words and pausing frequently, so that all his colleagues may be able to follow his meaning, and so that the interpreters can translate his speech.

Rule 13

Proposals Presented before the Opening of the Conference.

Proposals presented before the opening of the Conference shall be allocated by the Plenary Assembly to the appropriate committees.

Rule 14

Proposals Submitted during the Conference.

§ 1. No proposal or amendment may be submitted unless it is countersigned or supported by the Head of the Delegation of the country from which the proposal or amendment originated, or by his deputy.

§ 2. The Chairman of the Conference shall decide whether the proposal or amendment shall be announced to all delegations by distribution of copies or merely by oral statement. Should the delegation from which the proposal or amendment originates wish copies of it to be distributed, this shall be done.

§ 3. At sessions of the Plenary Assembly, any authorized individual may read or request to be read any proposal or amendment presented by him during the Conference, and may be allowed to explain his reasons therefor.

Rule 15

Proposals Presented to Committees during the Conference.

§ 1. Proposals or amendments submitted after the Conference has opened must be delivered to the Chairman of the appropriate committee, or, in case of doubt as to the appropriate committee, to the Chairman of the Conference.

§ 2. Every proposal or amendment shall be submitted in the definitive form of words to be included in the documents.

§ 3. The Chairman of the committee concerned shall decide whether the proposal or amendment shall be announced to all members of the Conference or committee by distribution of copies or merely by oral statement to the members of the committee. Should the delegation from which the proposal or amendment originates wish copies of it to be distributed, this shall be done.

Rule 16

Postponed Proposals

When a proposal or amendment has been reserved or when its examination has been postponed, the delegation sponsoring it shall be responsible for seeing that it is not subsequently overlooked.

Rule 17

Voting Procedure

Postponed.

Rule 18

Minutes of the Sessions of the Plenary Assembly

§ 1. The minutes of the sessions of the Plenary Assembly shall be drawn up by the secretariat of the Conference.

§ 2. 1) The minutes shall contain only the proposals and conclusions with the chief reasons for them in concise terms.

2) However, each delegate or observer shall have the right to require the insertion in the minutes, either summarized or in full, of any statement which he has made. In such a case, he must himself supply its text to the secretariat of the Conference within two hours after the end of the session. It is recommended that this right shall only be used with discretion.

Rule 19

Reports of Committees

§ 1. (1) The debates of the committees and sub-committees shall be summarized, session by session, in reports in which shall be brought out the essential points of the discussion, the various opinions which are expressed and which it is desirable that the Plenary Assembly should know and the proposals and conclusions which emerge.

(2) However, each delegate or observer shall have the right to require the insertion in the report of any statement which he has made (either summarized or in full). In such a case, he must himself supply to the reporter the text to be inserted within two hours after the end of the session. It is recommended that this right shall only be used with discretion.

§ 2. If circumstances warrant, the committees, sub-committees or working groups shall prepare at the end of their work a final report in which they shall recapitulate in concise terms the proposals and conclusions which result from the studies which have been entrusted to them.

Rule 20

Adoption of Minutes and Reports

§ 1 (1) As a general rule, at the beginning of each session of the Plenary Assembly or of each session of a committee or of a sub-committee, the minutes, or the report, of the preceding session shall be read.

(2) However, the Chairman may, if he considers such procedure satisfactory, and if no objection is raised, merely ask if any members of the Plenary Assembly, the Committee or the sub-committee, have any remarks to make on the contents of the minutes or of the report.

§ 2. The minutes or the report shall then be adopted or amended in accordance with the remarks which have been made and which have been approved by the Plenary Assembly, or by the Committee or sub-committee.

§ 3. Any final report must be approved by the respective committee or sub-committee.

§ 4. (1) The minutes of the closing session of the Plenary Assembly shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the Conference.

(2) The report of the last session of a committee or of a sub-committee shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the committee or sub-committee.

Rule 21

Languages

The final documents of the Conference shall be drawn up in the languages mentioned below, in versions equivalent both in form and content:

English, French and Russian.

In case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic. All other documents shall be drawn up in:

English, French and Russian.

At meetings, there shall be an efficient system of interpretation in:

English, French and Russian.

Other languages may be used in the debates provided that the delegations using them make arrangements themselves for oral translation into any one of the languages mentioned in the first subparagraph above. Similarly, delegates may, if they wish, arrange for speeches to be translated orally into their own languages from one of the languages mentioned above.

As to the share to be taken by each country in the expenses attributable to the use of these languages, the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention, Article 15, paragraph 5, shall apply, by courtesy of the I.T.U.

Rule 22

Editorial Committee. Numbering

§ 1. The texts of the agreement or of the frequency allotment plan, which shall be worded so far as practicable in their definitive form by the various committees, following the opinions expressed, shall be submitted to an editorial committee charged with perfecting their form without altering their sense, and with combining them with those parts of the former texts which have not been altered.

§ 2. The whole of the revised texts shall be submitted for the approval of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, which shall decide on them, or refer them back to the appropriate committee for further examination.

§ 3. The numbers of the chapters, articles and paragraphs of the texts subjected to revision shall be preserved until the first reading at a session of the Plenary Assembly. The passages added shall bear provisionally the numbers bis, ter, etc., and the numbers of deleted passages shall not be used.

§ 4. The definitive numbering of the chapters, articles, and paragraphs, shall be entrusted to the Editorial Committee after their adoption following the first reading.

Rule 23

Final Approval

The texts of the agreement and of the frequency allotment plan shall not acquire final status until they have been read a second time and approved.

Rule 24

Signature

The final texts approved by the Conference shall be submitted for signature to the delegates provided with the necessary powers in the alphabetical order of the French names of the countries.

Rule 25

Publicity

§ 1. Plenary meetings of the Conference shall be open to the public unless otherwise decided by a majority vote.

§ 2. Official releases to the press about the work of the Conference shall be issued only as authorized by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Conference. However the official release at the end of the Conference shall require the approval of a Plenary Meeting.

Rule 26

Documents

The General Secretariat of the International Telecommunication Union shall be entrusted with the publication of all documents relative to the Conference, and with their distribution to all the delegations and observers taking part in the Conference.

Rule 27

Franking Privileges

§ 1. The delegates and observers, as defined in Rule 1, shall be entitled to postal, telegraph and telephone franking privileges to an extent arranged by the Danish Government in agreement with contracting governments and the private operating agencies concerned. These franking privileges shall start two days before the opening of the Conference, and shall come to an end two days after the Conference ends.

§ 2. Telegraph and telephone franking privileges shall be limited to communications exchanged between delegates and observers and their respective governments, administrations, and agencies, and between them and their families.

§ 3. The staff of the Conference Secretariat shall also benefit by these privileges.

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 77 - E

July 13, 1948.

Submitted in : French.

A M E N D M E N T
TO DOCUMENT RD No 68

In pages 1 and 2,

instead of "U.S.S.R.", read " Russia (S.F.S.R.).

E G Y P T and S Y R I A

Remarks on the two suggested frequency allocation Plans.

In the opinion of the Egyptian and Syrian Delegations, the two proposed frequency allocation plans are generally unsatisfactory.

It is an agreed fact that the service given by a shared wave is inferior to that given by an exclusive wave, especially in areas which are somewhat away from the transmitters.

We cannot understand how it is considered logical in the plans suggested to give some countries 5 or more exclusive waves, while some others are not given any exclusive wave.

We insist that the fundamental rule should be that every country should be given an exclusive frequency to ensure at least one main national programme of good quality in accordance with the directives of Atlantic City Article 4.

To economise in the number of channels, the number of exclusive frequencies allotted to any country should not exceed the number of simultaneous main programmes. In any case the number of exclusive frequencies should not exceed the number of main ethnic groups in the country. Additional frequencies required should be of the shared category.

In our opinion this rule, in addition to being a fair one, will lead most of the countries to utilise synchronised working on the exclusive wave or waves allotted to them, if they are not satisfied with the service from the shared waves.

Egypt and Syria always stressed the fact that due to the big areas of their countries, scattered population and bad conductivity in their desert areas, they cannot find any way for serving the population scattered in these areas, other than the utilisation of secondary waves from the main transmitters at night, which gives a variable field of an average intensity 0.5 mV/m over these areas.

For this special condition, the Egyptian and Syrian Delegations cannot, under any circumstances, agree to any plan unless it includes at least one exclusive frequency for the main national service.

The Russian plan includes an exclusive frequency for Egypt, but it does not include any exclusive frequency for Syria. The other plan does not include any exclusive frequency for either Egypt or Syria.

For this reason the Egyptian and Syrian delegations consider both plans unacceptable.

From the point of view of the order of frequencies allotted to both countries, we consider that the plan of Van der Pol - Hayes is more suitable for our needs.

As far as the other additional frequencies we require are concerned, we are ready to accept shared frequencies based on a signal to interference ratio of 40 dbs., the signal being 3 mV/m..

Delegate for Egypt and Syria

Ibrahim Hamed

Saleh

July 13, 1948.

Submitted in: English.

UNITED KINGDOM

WAVE PROPAGATION DATA

In 1937, the Sub-Committee on Wave Propagation of the C.C.I.R. met in London and subsequently published a series of curves, which have since been widely used, providing a basis for the calculation of field strengths in the bands between 150 kc/s and 1605 kc/s. These curves show:-

- (a) Ground wave field strength as a function of distance, power and frequency for a conductivity of 10-13 E M U.
- (b) Sky wave field strength as a function of distance and power;
 - (i) for paths passing near to the magnetic pole, and
 - (ii) for paths distant from the magnetic pole.

Since 1937, somewhat similar data has been prepared by other organisations. In particular, the F.C.C. has published in "Standards of Good Engineering Practice Concerning Standard Broadcasting Stations" (October 1947 Revision) a series of curves which show:-

- (a) Ground wave field strength as a function of distance, power, frequency and conductivity.
- (b) Sky wave field strength as a function of distance, power and the latitude of the mid-point of the transmission path.

Bearing in mind:-

- (i) that 11 years have elapsed since the publication of the C.C.I.R. report referred to above, and
- (ii) the importance of having agreed propagation data available for use during the present Conference and in particular the importance of having generally accepted curves of sky wave field strength to serve as a basis in assessing the possibilities of frequency sharing, +)

the United Kingdom Delegation proposes that a small Working Group be formed at the first opportunity to prepare recommendations on this important question.

- +) In this connection see also the United Kingdom Delegation's comments in RD Document No. 38 on Annex 3 of the Report of the Committee of Eight Countries.

July 13, 1948

Submitted in: ENGLISH

= IRELAND =

In reply to the Communication from the Chairman of the Conference in RD Document No.33 of 5 July 1948, asking for comments on the second variants of the plan drawn up by the Committee of Eight, at Brussels, during its second session, the Delegation of Ireland, while reserving full liberty of action during the discussions at the Conference, makes the following observations.

The 9 kc/s separation plan prepared by Messrs. Hayes and Van de Pol is reasonably satisfactory in meeting the broadcasting needs of Ireland. Discussion will be necessary about the possibilities of interference by Palermo with Athlone I.

The 10 kc/s separation plan prepared by Professor Kotelnikof does not meet the requirements of Ireland. The proposed sharing of Athlone I's frequency by three other high power stations, as well as the unsatisfactory provision made for Athlone II, in the form of low power on a frequency shared by two other stations, would prevent an adequate broadcasting service being given in Ireland.

(D.19)

NORWAY

Comments from the Norwegian Delegation on the two Frequency Allocation Plans of the Committee of Eight, Documents No.'s 279 and 281.

1. The Norwegian Frequency Requirements.

The minimum frequency requirements to give a reasonably satisfactory one-program service in Norway, were stated at Brussels on the 18th of May this year by the head of the Norwegian delegation, Mr. O. Moe, Chief Engineer of the Norwegian Radio Bureau. For reference, these requirements are repeated below:

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--|---------|---|
| 1 | exclusive | long wave | for Oslo | 100 kW. | |
| 1 | " | medium wave | " Stavanger | 100 " | |
| 1 | " | " | " Vigra | 100 " | |
| 1 | " | " | " a synchronised group, Kristiansand-Bergen- Trøndelag, each | 20 " | |
| 1 | shared | long wave | " Tromsø | 10 " | |
| 1 | " | medium wave | in the lower part of the frequency band for Bodø | 10 " | |
| 1 | " | " | for Fredrikstad | 10 " | |
| 2 | common | national waves of not too high frequency | | | - |
| 2 | " | international waves, type 1, for low power transmitters to cover local regions with high noise level and/or very low field strengths from the main transmitters. | | | |

It is presumed that the shared waves should not be materially disturbed within the normal service area. It is also presumed that Finmark, 10 kW., may retain its frequency 347 kc/s and Bergen II., 1 kW., its frequency 355 kc/s, similarly Hamar, 1 kW., its frequency 519 kc/s, (see Radio Regulations, Atlantic City, points 131 and 138).

If these requirements are fulfilled, a field strength of 1 mV/m or more will be obtained over about 50 % of the surface of Norway. Provided the shared waves will allow an undisturbed reception down to the level mentioned, a satisfactory broadcasting service can be ensured over approximately half our area.

Consequently our requests are very moderate, and below what would really be needed for suitable reception over the whole country.

II. Comments on the 9 kc/s separation plan, Doc. 279.

According to this plan, the following frequencies are allocated to Norway:

RD Document No. 81-E

| | | |
|--|--------|---|
| 155 kc/s for Bodø, | 10 kW, | shared with Brasov, Roumania, 150 kW. |
| 164 " " Tromsø, | 10 " | } synchronised group, sharing with Ankara, Turkey, 120 kW. |
| " " Trøndelag, | 10 " | |
| " " Bergen, | 10 " | |
| 218 " " Oslo, | 100 " | exclusive. |
| 646 " " Vigra, | 100 " | shared with Rabat, Morocco, 100 kW Istanbul, Turkey, 100 kW Vatican City, 100 kW, the latter day time only. |
| 790 " " Stavanger, | 100 " | shared with Korca, 20 kW, and Skodra, 20 kW, both Albania. |
| 1150 " " Kristiansand | 20 " | dir. aerial, shared with Bari, Italy, 20 kW. |
| 1348 " " Fredrikstad | 2 " | International common wave, shared with 14 countries, among them Denmark, |
| 1519 " " Norwegian re-lay stations, each | 2 " | shared with Beograd II, Yugoslavia, 20 kW and Portuguese relay stations, 2 kW. |

Our remarks on this plan are the following:

1. It will be extremely difficult to synchronise Tromsø with transmitters in the southern part of Norway, and, in the synchronised group, Kristiansand therefor should be exchanged for Tromsø.
2. The power of Bergen and Trøndelag is given as 10 kW. This must be due to a misunderstanding as the actual power is 20 kW.
3. It would be preferable if another station than Leningrad, SSR Russia, 100 kW, could have the channel adjacent to Oslo. Disturbances may be encountered in the secondary reception areas for Oslo in the northern Norway due to Leningrad, as the distance from these areas to Oslo is greater than to Leningrad.
4. It is a great disadvantage that Vigra and Stavanger, each 100 kW, have not been allocated exclusive wave lengths, this being of great importance for the following reasons:

Due to the technical difficulties of obtaining high quality line connections in Norway, many of the small relay transmitters have to be supplied with programmes via radio. This can only be achieved in a satisfactory manner when the secondary fields from the larger transmitters are undisturbed.

The sharing will also considerably reduce the normal service area of the two transmitters. Our minimum requirements (see sect. 1) are based on service areas being defined as having a field strength equal to or larger than 1 mV/m, but with the allocations and sharing now proposed for these two transmitters, satisfactory reception will hardly be possible under the 3 mV/m limit, and consequently the efficiency of the transmitters is greatly reduced.

5. The proposed shared frequency of 1150 kc/s for Kristiansand will reduce the service area of this transmitter to the town of Kristiansand and its nearest environments, and it is more efficient

to synchronise this transmitter with Bergen and Trøndelag instead of Tromsø, as proposed under II,1. In that case, Tromsø should not be given the frequency of 1150 kc/s, as a much lower frequency is needed. Frequencies above 1000 kc/s are very inefficient in Norway, and Tromsø has a vast area to cover.

6. Fredrikstad now has a power of 10 kW, and if, as proposed, the power is brought down to 2 kW and the wavelength is shared with 14 other countries, the reception area will be reduced to a very small fraction of the present. We particularly wish to object to the proposed sharing with Denmark.

7. Only one national common frequency of 1519 kc/s has been provided for the many local transmitters established to serve particularly difficult regions. In addition, this frequency is also to be shared with other countries. These small relay stations are of considerable importance, and we must refer to our minimum requirements for this service, as stated under point 1. The two national common waves asked for, should preferably be placed in the 1200-1400 kc/s region.

8. Among the Norwegian frequencies in the derogation bands, only Hamar on 520 kc/s is mentioned. The frequencies 347 kc/s for Finnmark and 355 kc/s for Bergen II. should be added.

III. Comments on the 10 kc/s separation plan, Doc. 281.

According to this plan, the following frequencies are allocated to Norway:

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------|--|
| 272 kc/s for Oslo | 100 kW, | exclusive broadcasting, shared with other services. |
| 820 " " Trøndelag | 20 " | shared with Limoges, France, 100 kW, and Aleppe, Syria, 20 kW. |
| 880 " " Stavanger | 100 " | exclusive. |
| 1050 " " Kristiansand | 20 " | } synchronised, sharing with Corfou, Greece, 20 kW, and Lisboa I, Portugal, 120 kW.. |
| " " " Vigra | 100 " | |
| 1490 " " Tromsø | 10 " | shared with Split, Yugoslavia, 50 kW, and Portugal. |
| 860 " } | | } for small transmitters, all frequencies shared with other countries. |
| 1100 " } | | |
| 1310 " } | | |
| 1330 " } | | |
| 1390 " } | | |
| 1540 " } | | |
| 1550 " } | | |
| 1580 " } | | |

Our remarks on this plan are the following:

1. Oslo should have an entirely non-shared long wave; due to the importance of reception in the secondary regions.

2. The reception area of Trøndelag will be seriously reduced, due to the sharing with Limoges. The limiting field strength (i. e. the field strength where the ratio between wanted and unwanted signal still is better than 100:1) is 11 mV/m.

3. Synchronisation of Vigra and Kristiansand has been tried and

found unsatisfactory. In addition the service area of Kristiansand will be reduced to a small region around the town itself, due to the sharing with Greece and Portugal (limiting field strength 6 mV/m). Also Vigra will suffer considerably from the sharing (limiting field strength 3 mV/m).

4. Tromsø, because of the high frequency of 1490 kc/s, will only be able to serve a very restricted region. The higher part of the medium frequency band, as mentioned under II, 4, is badly suited for Norwegian conditions because of the low conductivity of the ground and also because of the population being scattered over large areas around fairly small towns. This especially is the case in the northern Norway.

The sharing for Tromsø will cause a limiting field strength of about 2 mV/m.

5. Although Bergen, 20 kW - Bodø, 10 kW, and Fredrikstad, 10 kW, are important transmitters, they are not included in the plan.

6. The plan provides a fair number of frequencies for smaller transmitters, but being mainly assigned in the upper end of the band, only few can be used with advantage under Norwegian conditions.

7. In the derogation bands, only Hamar on 520 kc/s is mentioned in the plan. Finmark on 347 kc/s and Bergen II. on 355 kc/s, should also be included.

IV. Conclusions.

To illustrate the above statements, three charts have been drawn up, showing the service area of the different Norwegian transmitters for the 3 alternatives:

Chart A shows the situation according to the Norwegian minimum requirements, as stated in section I.

Chart B shows the situation according to the 9 kc/s separation plan.

Chart C shows the situation according to the 10 kc/s separation plan.

A short technical description is appended to the charts.

It emerges clearly from the charts that none of the two allocation plans fulfills our minimum requirements. Of the two, the 9 kc/s separation plan doubtlessly offers the better solution.

Only one set of charts has been made, and these will be submitted later to Committee 5.

Copenhagen the 12th July 1948.

I T A L Y

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LAST DRAFT PLANS OF
FREQUENCY ALLOCATION TO EUROPEAN BROADCASTING
STATIONS

The Italian Delegation has given careful consideration to the new plans prepared by the Committee of Eight Countries at Brussels at its last session, taking into account the observations of the European Administrations.

The Italian Delegation is in favour of the plan based on a separation of 9 kc/s for reasons which the Italian Administration has always put forward clearly, and again stated at length at Brussels during the second session of the Committee of Eight Countries.

Moreover the Italian Delegation is inclined to prefer the said Plan because it goes further towards meeting the requirements of Italian Broadcasting.

Considering therefore only the new Plan drawn up by Mr. Hayes and Professor Van der Pol, the Delegation has great pleasure in recognizing that the observations made in May before the above Committee have to a certain extent been taken into account. Certain modifications are however still necessary either for reasons of organization or for technical reasons, or in order to include in the Plan a few Italian stations previously omitted --but in all cases without impairing the broadcasting of other countries.

Moreover, the Italian Delegation must maintain its request for some frequency allocations to the Bolzano and Cagliari stations. These have to transmit different programmes, the first for reasons of local autonomy, the second by reason of the lack of liaisons with other Italian stations. Accordingly the Bolzano station cannot be synchronized either with the stations of Florence and Bologna, or with any other station of the Italian network.

As regards Cagliari, it should be pointed out that this station does not appear in the Plan.

The Italian Delegation is of the opinion that the stations of Bolzano and Cagliari could be placed on certain shared frequencies allocated to other countries in such a way as without impairing the service of stations of other countries, at the same time to ensure an adequate, if not first class, service to Italian listeners.

(signed) Pennetta Antonio,

Head of Delegation.

I T A L Y

Proposed amendment to the new preliminary draft
presented by the Delegates Mr. Hayes and Professor
Van der Pol.

| Frequency in kc/s | Station | Country | Power in KW | Remarks |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 547 | Rome | Italy | 200 | exclusive |
| 565 | Palermo | " | 10 | |
| | Catania | " | 5 | |
| | Athlone | Ireland | 100 | |
| 619 | Turin I | Italy | 80 | exclusive |
| | Florence | " | 100 | |
| | Naples | " | 100 | |
| 799 | Milan | " | 100 | exclusive |
| 1150 | Bologna | " | 50 | |
| | Bari | " | 50 | |
| | Kristiansand | Norway | 20 | directed aerial |
| 1231 | Genoa I | Italy | 50 | exclusive |
| | Venice I | " | 25 | |
| | Rome II | " | 5 | |
| 1258 | Pescara | " | 25 | |
| | Caltanissetta | " | 25 | |
| | Turi | Estonia | 20 | |
| 1348 | Verona | Italy | 1 | common international wave |
| | Udine | " | 1 | |
| 1357 | Turin II | " | 20 | exclusive |

| Frequency in kc/s | Station | Country | Power in KW | Remarks |
|----------------------|---------------|----------|----------------|---------|
| | Milan II | Italy | 10 | |
| | Venice II | " | 5 | |
| | Genoa II | " | 5 | |
| | Florence II | " | 3 | |
| | Naples II | " | 5 | |
| | Ancona | " | 25 | |
| 1492 | Bologna II | " | 1 | |
| | Bari II | " | 1 | |
| | Messina | " | 5 | |
| | Aquila | " | 0.25 | |
| | Cosenza | " | 0.25 | |
| | Finnish Relay | Finland | 1 | |
| | Faeroe | Denmark | 5 | |
| 1528 | San Remo | Italy | 5 | |
| | Catanzaro | " | 0.25 | |
| | Potenza | " | 0.25 | |
| | La Spezia | " | 1 | |
| | Swedish Relay | Sweden | 1 | |
| | Porto Reg. | Portugal | 5 | |
| ? | Bolzano | Italy | 20 | (o) |
| ? | Cagliari | " | 10 | (o) |

(o) The stations of Bolzano and Cagliari might be put on certain shared frequencies allocated to other countries in such a way as, without impairing the service of stations of other countries, at the same time to ensure an adequate, if not first class, service to Italian listeners.

T U R K E Y

Comments on the Final Report of the work of the Committee of Eight (Document No. 284) and on the Plans contained in Documents 279 and 281 of the Committee of Eight of the European Regional Broadcasting Conference.

The Delegation of Turkey desires to offer the following observations on the above-mentioned Documents:

Technical comments of a general nature,

Document No. 284:

Annex 3 - Field ratio for shared frequencies:

The ratio of the field intensity of the wanted station to the quasi-maximum intensity of the unwanted signal should be at least 100.

Annex 4 - Field ratio for adjacent routes:

The Delegation of Turkey considers the text to be incomplete. Because the ratio wanted-signal/unwanted-signal depends primarily on the quality of the receivers, especially of their total selectivity. In this case, it is better to explain clearly the quality of the receiver which will be used.

Annex 5 - Limit of power for medium waves:

A maximum power of 150 KW for stations operating on medium waves.

Annex 7 - Separation between channels:

The Delegation of Turkey would prefer the frequency separation to be connected with the essential characteristics of the transmitters (power, frequency, geographic separation between transmitters, etc.). For this reason it would be better to provide for a mixed separation of 9 and 10 kc/s.

Documents No. 279 and 281:

In regard to Document No. 279, the Delegation of Turkey would like to submit the following comments:

- 1) The Plan does not allocate any exclusive wave to the Turkish stations. In particular Turkey has been allocated another frequency shared with three Norwegian stations of 164 kc/s at the national post of Ankara. All changes altering the present frequency of the Ankara transmitter of 182 kc/s, or modifying the system of aerial, would involve great expense and long delays, would be contrary to the Atlantic City directives, and

would further considerably retard the application of the new Plan.

- 2) Document No. 279 allocates to the Istanbul station a frequency of 646 kc/s and a power of 100 KW. But the newly constructed radiating pylon, and the Istanbul transmitter now in process of erection with a power of 150 KW which cannot be reduced, do not permit of operation outside of the 680 - 760 kc/s. range. It is for these reasons, as also for the reasons cited in RD Document No. 32, that we press earnestly for an exclusive frequency in the 680 - 760 kc/s. band for the Istanbul transmitter.
- 3) The frequency of 718 kc/s., which is allocated to the station of Malatya in the Plan, is acceptable.
- 4) The frequency of 1276 kc/s, which is allocated to the Smyrna station in the Plan is not acceptable because, for the reasons cited in RD Document No. 32, it is absolutely necessary to operate the Smyrna transmitter on frequencies inferior to 750 kc/s.

The Plan, in its present form, is absolutely unacceptable to Turkey.

Regarding Document No. 281, the Delegation of Turkey would like to present the following observations:

In this Plan also there are no exclusive frequencies allocated to the Turkish stations. On the other hand, this Plan makes no change in the present frequency of 182 kc/s for the Ankara station, which constitutes an appreciable improvement on Plan No. 279.

For the other three frequencies, we wish to repeat that there is good reason for taking the same legitimate and reasonable precautions as are indicated above.

The Delegation of Turkey could accept the sharing of the frequency of 182 kc/s between Ankara and Reykjavik, with 10 kc/s of separation with Moscow I and 9 kc/s with Leningrad occupying the adjacent channels.

Plan No. 281, in its present form, is also absolutely unacceptable to Turkey.

July 13, 1948

Submitted in: Russian

Sub-Commission 4 B of the Commission 4 (Technical)

Table No. 3

Date for an analysis of the draft-documentation of the Commission of 8 countries.

Analysis of the quality of exclusive channels within the reach of medium waves.

| No. | Country | Station | Frequency | | Neighbouring Stations which are interfering | |
|-----|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | doc. 281 | doc. 279 | doc. 281 | doc. 279 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | Albania | Tirana | 1100 | | Kosice | |
| 2 | Germany | | 770 960 1190 1280 | 1591 826 1330 1465 | Milano Bologna The stations of France Ottingham | Kaliningrad Paris |
| 3 | Austria | Doblgraz Graz Vienna | 920 | 952 1285 | Marseilles | Rennes Crowborough |
| 4 | Belgium | Brussels Brussels | 680 1130 | 925 | Belgrad Nice | Wroclaw |
| 5 | S.S.R. of Byelorussia | Mogileff | 1220 | | Prague | |
| 6 | The People's Rep. of Bulgaria | Sofia | 870 | 817 | Hilversum | Munich |
| 7 | Denmark | Copenhagen | 1410 | 1483 | Gliwice | United Kingdom |
| 8 | Egypt | Cairo | 610 | | Istambul | |
| 9 | Esthonian S.S.R. | Tallin | 750 | | Hilversum | |

Range and area of the station with protection of 40 db

| | doc. 281 | | doc. 279 | |
|---|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| | Range in km | Area in thousands of km | Range in km | Area in thousands of km |
| | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 1 | 70 | 15 | | |
| 2 | 150 90 150 | 70 25 70 | 90 55 | 25 10 |
| | 60 | 11 | 40 | 5 |
| 3 | | | 70 35 | 15 3,9 |
| | 600 | 1100 | | |
| 4 | 500 70 | 800 15 | 70 | 15 |
| 5 | 70 | 15 | | |
| 6 | 400 | 500 | 125 | 49 |
| 7 | 250 | 200 | 200 | 125 |
| 8 | 180 | 100 | | |
| 9 | 500 | 800 | | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|----|----------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 10 | France | Lyons Marseilles Paris Toulouse Synchr. net of France Strassbourg Lille Nancy Nice | 630 910 800 1300 1200 1260 1520 | 637 1006 1123 1204 898 1546 | Stockholm Vienna Lvov Synchr. net of Switzer- land American zone of Germany Ottingham Copenhagen | Droitwich Cracow Ottingham Zagreb Tunis Spain |
| 11 | United Kingdom | Synchr. net of U.K. Synchr. net of U.K. London Ottingham Brookman's Park | 1180 1560 | 880 1132 1186 | American zone of Germany Norway | Lisbon Strassbourg |
| 12 | Hungary | Budapest Budapest | 540 | 529 1213 | Beromünster | Monte Ceneri Lille |
| 13 | Italy | Milano Florence (Firenze) Naples Turino Synchr. net Rome Turino Milano | 760 1160 1430 1590 | 799 619 547 1231 1357 | Germany Belgrad Synchr. net of France Greece | Westford Brussels Monte Ceneri Strasshev Sigmaringen |
| 14 | Latvian S.S.R. | Riga | 590 | | Prague | |
| 15 | Lithuanian S.S.R. | Vilnyus | 550 | | Budapest | |
| 16 | Luxemburg | Luxemburg | | 1438 | | Skoplje |
| 17 | Moldavian S.S.R. | Kishineff | 780 | 1078 | Soviet zone of Germany | Koblenz |
| 18 | Monaco | Monte Carlo | | 1420 | | Brussels |
| 19 | Norway | Stavanger | 880 | | Kaliningrad | |
| 20 | Holland | Hilversum | 740 | 844 | Tallin | Lvov |

(RD Doc. No 84 - E)

| | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 10 | 800 300 450 200 70 70 200 | 2000 290 620 125 15 15 125 | 90 70 60 60 100 100 | 25 15 11 11 31 31 |
| 11 | 80 200 | 20 125 | 270 65 | 15 13 |
| 12 | 150 | 70 | 120 60 | 45 11 |
| 13 | 150 70 200 400 | 70 15 125 500 | 80 110 90 50 30 | 2,9 38 25 8 29 |
| 14 | 180 | 100 | | |
| 15 | 150 | 70 | | |
| 16 | | | 80 | 20 |
| 17 | 250 | 200 | 80 | 20 |
| 18 | | | 100 | 8 |
| 19 | 300 | 290 | | |
| 20 | 500 | 800 | 150 | 70 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| 21 | Poland | Poznan Cracow Wraclaw Gdansk (Danzig) Poznan | 700 980 1250 1380 | 997 727 | Sottens Bologna Strassburg Cettinje | Paris Tallin |
| 22 | The People's Rep. of Rumania | Bucarest | 950 | 835 | Hamburg | Munich |
| 23 | U.S.S.R. | Rostov Leningrad Moscow Simferopol | 560 790 830 900 | | Vilnyus Kishineff Kluj Kaliningrad | |
| 24 | Sweden | Stockholm Hörby | 620 1350 | 1168 | Lyon Graz | France |
| 25 | Switzerland | Beromünster Sottens | 530 710 | 556 673 | Budapest Rome | Rome Madrid |
| 26 | Czechoslo- vaquia | Prague Bratislava Banska- Bystrica Brno | 580 1040 1530 | 763 1060 979 | Riga Kaunas Lille | Westerglen Toulouse Langenberg |
| 27 | The Ukrainian S.S.R. | Charkov Kiev Lvov Odessa Ushgorod Charkov Odes- sa, Lvov | 650 730 810 1000 1290 | 916 1249 853 | Petrozavodsk Rome Paris Saloniki French zone of Germany | Banska Bystrica Kaunas |
| 28 | Fed. People's Rep. of Yugo- slavia | Belgrad Lubliana Skoplje Zagreb Belgrad Sarajevo Cettinje | 690 850 1020 1080 1170 | 700 1447 1195 1303 1582 | Poznan Hilversum Kaunas Thorn (Torun) Firenze (Florence) | Limoges Luxemburg British zone of Germany Crowborough Munich |
| Total: | | | 58 | 46 | | |

Please note: In order to establish the range of Radio Stations use has been made of the tables of O.I.R. for the medium values of the nocturnal field (O.I.R. 956) and for the straight beam (O.I.R. 1051).

signed: Likhouchine
13.VII. 48.

- 3a -
(RD Doc. No 84 - E)

| | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|----|--|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 21 | 100 300 70 200 | 31 290 15 125 | 70 85 | 15 22 |
| 22 | 500 | 800 | 80 | 20 |
| 23 | 400 400 700 500 | 500 500 1500 800 | | |
| 24 | 600 250 | 1100 200 | 80 | 20 |
| 25 | 200 150 | 125 70 | 80 200 | 20 125 |
| 26 | 400 70 60 | 500 15 11 | 100 80 55 | 31 20 10 |
| 27 | 300 500 400 250 70 | 290 800 500 200 15 | 100 50 | 31 8 |
| 28 | 400 180 250 120 70 | 500 100 200 45 15 | 170 65 70 60 50 | 100 13 15 11 8 |

July 13, 1948

Submitted in: English

UNITED KINGDOM

SEPARATION IN KILOCYCLES PER SECOND

BETWEEN ADJACENT CHANNELS

1. Point 4 on the Agenda of Sub-Committee 4A deals with the separation in kc/s between adjacent channels. Annexes 3 and 4 of the Final Report of the Committee of Eight Countries must also be taken into account when considering this question. The United Kingdom Delegation has read with interest the reservation made by some of the members of the Committee of Eight contained on Page 33 of the 40th Plenary Meeting of the Committee of Eight. The countries which have favoured a 10 kc/s separation have appeared to do so on the basis of being able to cover a larger surface area with a 10 kc/s separation than could be covered with a 9 kc/s separation and in their calculations have relied on the figures of 5:1 and 2:1 as the ratios between wanted to unwanted fields with separations of 9 kc/s and 10 kc/s respectively. It was accordingly felt necessary to carry out a number of experiments in an endeavour to secure some further information on the subject. These experiments were carried out both in the Research Department of the General Post Office and in the Research Department of the British Broadcasting Corporation.
2. In considering this question of the separation between channels, the United Kingdom Delegation believes that purely from the point of view of giving the best possible quality in a broadcasting service, there can be no difference of opinion whatever between any of the Delegations assembled at Copenhagen that a 10 kc/s separation is preferable to any smaller figure. Indeed, if the best quality is to be obtained, then a desirable separation would be 16 or even 20 kc/s. It is obvious that so large a separation would not provide enough channels for European broadcasting, and the point at issue is what is the compromise which should be adopted between quality and number of channels. Some of the European Administrations have declared themselves in favour of a 10 kc/s separation, others in favour of a 9 kc/s separation.
3. The experiments referred to above were first of all applied to determining the quality of service obtainable with the 5:1 and 2:1 ratios mentioned above. It was established that the application of these figures results in a high quality service, the grade of interference being between what may be called "perceptible" and "just perceptible", which corresponds to a signal to interference of between 50 and 60 db - that is a considerably higher figure than the 40 db adopted by the Committee of Eight for "wanted to unwanted" signal for stations working on the same frequency (Annex 3 of their final report, Brussels document 284). It is suggested that it is not justifiable to

(RD Doc.No.85-E)

apply these "high quality" figures to the outer limit of the primary service area or to a secondary service area where high quality is not obtainable in any case. It must be emphasised that adjacent channel interference would normally be limited to these areas since A can be minimised by the choice of a suitable geographical separation between stations on adjacent channels.

4. These experiments were made using several typical commercial broadcast receivers and with various types of programme on both the wanted and interfering carriers. Different levels of signal were used and the strength of the unwanted carrier was adjusted successively at 9 kc/s and 10 kc/s separation until a pre-determined degree of interference was experienced. The levels of interference chosen were:

1. "Just perceptible", which was the smallest noticeable level and corresponded to a programme to interference level at audio-frequency of approximately 60 db.
2. "Perceptible", which corresponded to a 50 db programme to interference ratio.
3. "Slightly disturbing", which corresponded to a 40 db programme to interference ratio.

The following results were obtained: For 40 db programme to interference ratio (the value which is equivalent to the "wanted to unwanted" signal ratio for stations working on the same channel adopted by the Committee of Eight (See Annex 3, Brussels Document 284)), and using receivers of the typical three valve plus rectifier super-heterodyne type, the ratios of wanted to unwanted signal were 2:1 with 9 kc/s separation and 1:1 with 10 kc/s separation. Using a better quality receiver, the ratio of wanted to unwanted signal was 1:1 for 9 kc/s separation and 0.5:1 for 10 kc/s separation. Although this receiver was more selective than the cheaper receivers, nevertheless it gave better quality because the overall pass-band approximated more closely to the ideal square filter characteristic.

5. It will be noticed that the ratio of 2:1 found from this experiment for a 9 kc/s separation is the same as the ratio put forward by the Committee of Eight for a 10 kc/s separation, and indeed the experiment demonstrated clearly that fairly wide differences in ratio could be obtained with the same receiver by changing its selectivity either by use of the "VARIABLE SELECTIVITY" control (where fitted), or by use of the "TONE" control which is almost universally fitted. This confirms clearly the view expressed in Document 38 - comment by the United Kingdom Delegation on Annexe 4 of the report of the Committee of Eight.

It would not seem unreasonable to expect listeners on the fringes of the primary service area or in a secondary service area to adjust their receivers so as to obtain adequate protection against the adjacent channel - particularly when it is realised that limitations in programme to noise ratio other than those imposed by the station on the adjacent channel will be experienced in these areas in addition to which there will

(RD Doc.No.85-E)

be a severe deterioration of quality due to fading. Such limitations will not be experienced in areas of higher signal strength where listeners can take advantage of the higher ratios of wanted to unwanted signal available (5:1 or even greater) and thus obtain the full range of quality of which their receivers are capable. This will generally be possible for the majority of listeners since it is usual to site broadcasting stations in or near large centres of population.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The United Kingdom Delegation believes that the above argument effectively disposes of the advantages which have been claimed for a 10 kc/s plan. The overwhelming advantage of the 9 kc/s plan in present European broadcasting conditions is that it provides 12 more channels than the 10 kc/s plan, which, with judiciously arranged sharing, can provide for a minimum of an additional 24 satisfactory allocations. The sacrifice of these valuable frequencies is far too great a price to pay for an improvement in reception conditions on the fringes of the primary service area and in the secondary service area where high quality is unobtainable in any case. The adoption of a 9 kc/s separation does not rule out the possibility of high quality reception in areas of higher field strength where ratios of wanted to unwanted signal of 5:1 and greater will be provided. It should be borne in mind that broadcasting transmitters are generally sited in or near areas of high population density so that the majority of listeners can take advantage of these high ratios and obtain high quality reception if suitable receivers are used.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 86

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 102 - Corrigendum to Document No. 86
- Document No. 86 is cancelled

EUROPEAN REGIONAL
BROADCASTING CONFERENCE
KØBENHAVN, 1948

RD Document No. 87 E

July 13, 1948

Submitted in: ENGLISH

The Chairman of the European Broadcasting Conference received the following communication:-

American Embassy,
Copenhagen, Denmark.
July 12, 1948.

Sir:

I have the honor to refer to Document RD 33 of July 5, 1948 by which the Executive Committee invites the countries of the European Area to comment on the frequency allocation plans drawn up by the Committee of Eight Countries at Brussels during its second session.

Inasmuch as the written comments of extra-European countries were not invited at this time, the United States Delegation of Observers reserves the privileges accorded it by the Directives for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference annexed to the Additional Protocol of the Final Acts of Atlantic City, to comment at the appropriate time on such questions as may be of interest to the United States.

Very truly yours,

Robert R. Burton
Chairman
United States Delegation.

July 13, 1948

F I N L A N D

The Finnish Delegation would like to make the following comments on the second variants of the plan drawn up by the Committee of Eight Countries at Brussels.

The Finnish Delegation regrets that the Committee has not succeeded in making a single plan which could serve as a base for the final allocation plan. Regarding the frequencies allocated to Finland, we beg to make the following remarks:

In the 10 kc/s plan there are at Finland's disposal 10 frequencies, of which one is exclusive, eight shared and one a common frequency. Correspondingly, the 9 kc/s plan allows the use of seven frequencies, of which one is exclusive and six shared frequencies.

As to the quality of the allotted frequencies in both plans, we wish to add the following:

The 9 kc/s Plan

Helsinki

Helsinki shares the frequency with Monte Ceneri. Both stations would use a directional aerial. The Swiss Delegation has, however, informed us that Monte Ceneri cannot use a corresponding aerial. In this case the power of the Swiss station is to be reduced considerably below the proposed 100 kW in order to avoid bad interference in the service zone of Helsinki. Correspondingly, the power of Helsinki will also be limited to a lower figure until the necessary directional aerial has been completed.

Oulu

The Delegation considers it desirable that Oulu could use a derogation frequency. If that is not possible, a suitable frequency must be reserved for that station. As there are only a few stations in the North of Finland, the service zone of Oulu must be fairly large.

The Finnish Relay Stations

Two frequencies have been reserved for the Finnish low power stations. One of these is too high for the receiving sets now used in Finland. Therefore that frequency ought to be changed to a lower one.

(RD Doc. 88-E)

Rovaniemi

The Rovaniemi station, which was destroyed by the Germans during the war, will start its transmissions again this year with an aerial power of 2 kW. It is situated in the Arctic Circle far from other Finnish stations. A fairly low frequency is required for this station.

The 10 kc/s Plan

Turku

Turku shares the frequency with Rome. The interference caused by Rome is very bad and the minimum field strength required for a reliable service zone of Turku is above 8.5 mv/m. Since Turku is the most important station in the bilingual area, it is of great necessity to have an exclusive frequency allotted to this station, or at least to share the frequency with a more favorable station.

Rovaniemi

See the corresponding remarks in the 9 kc/s plan.

Copenhagen, 8 July 1948.

Hella Wuolijoki

D E N M A R K

Preliminary observations on Documents Nos. 279, 281
and 284 of the Committee of Eight Countries.

The following observations are intended to indicate - after brief and provisional examination - the extent to which the frequency allocation plans given in Documents Nos 279 and 281 can be considered to meet Denmark's specific frequency requirements.

As regards the viewpoint of the Danish Administration on the more general question of the 9 kc/s or 10 kc/s frequency spacing, and the detailed observations on the particular frequencies proposed, the comments of Denmark, first published by the Committee of Eight Countries (see Brussels Document No. 226), should be consulted.

Document No. 281.

Kalundborg 236 kc/s (60 kW)

This frequency may be considered satisfactory provided that power is not limited to 60 kW, but fixed at the maximum value in current use in the long-wave bands. In any case the allocation of the neighbouring frequency of 245 kc/s to Prague is to be deprecated, as the distance is too small to avoid reciprocal interference. Thus the Prague station will give a field intensity on the island of Bornholm reaching about 3 mV/m while the field intensity of Kalundborg is only approximately 4 mV/m.

Kalundborg 1510 kc/s (5 kW)

This frequency is quite unacceptable for the purpose of a second programme, since it has to be shared with several nearby countries and since the range for reception without interference after nightfall would only be about 10 km.

København 1410 kc/s (50 kW)

This frequency must be considered a little too high as the field intensity in the eastern part of København would not exceed the field of Swedish broadcasting stations.

Denmark 1580 kc/s (2 kW)

This frequency could be accepted if a satisfactory solution were otherwise found for the problem of the Kalundborg frequency in the medium wave band. Since, however, a large number of receivers can not receive so high a frequency, Denmark would prefer a lower one.

Faroe Islands 940 kc/s (5 kW)

Under present circumstances this frequency must be held to be satisfactory.

Document No. 279.

Kalundborg 254 kc/s (60 kW)

This frequency must be considered satisfactory provided that the power is not limited to 60 kW but can be increased to the maximum level in current use in the long wave band. It is presumed that, in dealing with the 255-285 kc/s frequency band, the Broadcasting Conference will take the appropriate measures to protect the reception of Kalundborg in Denmark against disturbances from other services in the said band.

Kalundborg 1114 kc/s (150 kW)

This frequency is rather higher than is desirable, all the western part of Jutland as well as the Island of Bornholm being in the fading zone. Sharing with a 40 kW transmitter (without directional aerials) at Lisbon cannot be satisfactory after nightfall as the area for reception without interference is smaller than the free fading area.

København 1483 kc/s (150 kW)

This frequency must be considered too high. The field intensity in the eastern part of København will not exceed that of the Swedish broadcasting stations. A large number of the existing receivers would have difficulty in receiving on so high a frequency.

Denmark 1348 kc/s (2 kW)

This frequency is acceptable.

Faroe Islands 1492 kc/s (5 kW)

In view of the mountainous nature of these islands, this frequency is too high to be received in a satisfactory manner throughout the Faroe Islands.

Original: French

Observations of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg
relating to the two variant Plans submitted
by the Committee of Eight.

(2nd Session)

The Delegation of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg begs to submit the following observations on Documents 279 and 281:

- 1) Concerning separation between channels, we should prefer to adopt in medium waves a separation of 9 kc/s rather than 10 kc/s, taking into especial consideration the number of allocations actually necessary in the European Broadcasting area.
- 2) However, neither of the two variants takes into account our country's application for frequencies or the observations submitted by us at the Committee of Eight (Requirements, Document No. 9, Observations on the variants of the 2nd session, Document No. 211, Minutes of the Hearing, Document 245).

On several occasions detailed statements were submitted on the special nature of Luxembourg Broadcasting and on the necessity of operating on a long wave. Without wishing to develop once again the arguments contained in the aforementioned Documents, we would none the less like to restate the essential points:

- a) Since 1932 the Luxembourg Broadcasting Service has operated on a long wave, which in January 1934 was increased to 232 kc/s. We are still operating on this wave at the present time.

In addition to other considerations, such a wave is technically necessary in order to ensure an economic service (the sale, for example, of part of its transmission services), an indispensable condition to the Luxembourg Broadcasting Service, which could otherwise count only on the revenue corresponding to 46,000 receivers for 291,000 inhabitants.

- b) On the other hand, the damages which Luxembourg suffered from the war (loss of 3% of the national capital), as well as the present economic situation, make it difficult for the Luxembourg Broadcasting Service to think of sacrificing a powerful and modern transmitter (150 kW) with an expensive aerial system equipped for long wave.

We think that (a) the special circumstances and (b) the existing economic situation represent without possible contention the conditions to which paragraph 4 of the Document annexed to the Atlantic City Final Protocol relates. The paragraph runs:

(RD No. 90-E)

"It will be advisable to take into account, as equitably as possible, the special conditions of each country on the one hand, and, on the other, the existing economic situation which makes it advisable to introduce the minimum number of changes in the installations in service."

3) As for the variant at 9 kc/s, allocating to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg an exclusive frequency of 1438 kc/s and a shared frequency, for operation by day only, of 583 kc/s, the following observations are called for.

1438 kc/s:

Owing to the elongated shape of the country, its undulating and wooded terrain, ($\approx 3.10^{-14}$), and the extensive interference due to the important iron and steel industry, the operating radius of this wave would only allow of a satisfactory service for about one half of the country.

In addition, the use of this frequency would necessitate the construction of a practically entirely new transmitter, in view of the difference from the present frequency of 232 kc/s.

583 kc/s:

This frequency has been shared hitherto between countries of very different longitudes (Latvia and Egypt) with the result that the operation of the frequency by Luxemburg would be impossible, even during a part of the daytime.

The measurements made by the O.I.R. in the case of indirect transmission of waves of this band have afforded further proof of the difficulties inherent in the regulation of a service of this type.

4) As for the variant at 10 kc/s, allocating to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg a frequency of 1480 kc/s, shared with Cyprus, we are obliged to note that the service to be expected from such a wave would be at least as unfavorable as that from the wave of 1438 kc/s to which our observations in (3) above relate.

The eventual transformation of the transmitter would encounter the same difficulties.

Conclusion:

The Grand Duchy of Luxemburg cannot, even with the best will in the world to be accomodating, say that it is satisfied with the allocations provided in the two variants Docs. 279 and 281.

In view of the special conditions of the Luxemburg Broadcasting Service, and on the basis of the Atlantic City texts, the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg must continue to insist on the retention of its present wave or at least of a wave in the same band.

(d-34)

Original: French

C O M M I T T E E 4
(Technical Committee)

REPORT OF THE 1ST MEETING

6 July 1948

The meeting was opened at 2.30 p.m. by the Chairman, Professor Kessenikh.

The Chairman announced that, after consulting the various Delegations, he thought there was general agreement as to the appointment of the following as Rapporteurs:

- 1) Mr. Shamsha (Ukraine)
- 2) Mr. Angles d'Auriac (O.I.R.)

The Delegate of the United Kingdom remarked that in his opinion an Observer was not entitled to be a Rapporteur.

After an explanation by the Chairman, the Committee agreed to the appointment of the Rapporteurs above-mentioned, subject to the U.K. Delegate's reservation of the right to return to the question.

The Chairman said that the meeting would devote its attention to the study of RD Document No. 36 (Working Programme and Organisation of Committee 4). He pointed out an error which had slipped in to the English text of the Document in the 3rd line of the 2nd page. The "s" in the word "expert's" should be omitted, so that the phrase would read "a technical expert opinion."

He invited observations on the Document.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that as a whole the proposed text was extremely good, and he congratulated the Chairman. He had, however, certain constructive remarks to make:

1) In point b) of Section 1, it would be desirable to add two other subjects to the three which it was proposed to discuss, viz. (a) "limitation of the power of stations in the long-wave band" and (b) definition of the term "hours of work of services in the case of which operation is proposed for the day-time only."

2) As to point 1 e), the Technical Committee should not consider itself qualified as a matter of course to express an expert opinion on the Plan to be drawn up by Committee 5 for submission to the Plenary Assembly. It was the Plenary Assembly which should normally take cognizance of the Plan. If the Plenary Assembly saw fit, it could ask the Technical Committee to submit an expert opinion on the Plan. Such would appear to be the proper procedure from the point of view of the general organization of the Conference's work, as envisaged in RD Document No. 36.

He had some doubt concerning the appointment of a Drafting Sub-Committee as proposed in Section 2. There was already a Drafting Committee to which the text prepared by the proposed Sub-

(RD Doc.91-E)

Committee would anyway come, so that there was a risk of work being duplicated to no real purpose.

The Chairman thanked the United Kingdom Delegate for his interesting observations, and asked him to repeat the exact wording of the two items which he wished to see added to point 1 b).

The Delegate of the United Kingdom repeated the two items in question (see above).

In reply to the second observation of the United Kingdom Delegate, the Chairman said that in his opinion paragraph 1 e) merely meant that Committee 4 must be prepared to render any technical services which the Assembly might entrust to it, and that it must take that eventuality into account in drawing up its working programme.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom was satisfied with the Chairman's explanation.

In reply to the United Kingdom Delegate's third observation, the Chairman said that the drafting of technical texts was a very delicate question and as experience had shown, was likely to give rise to errors which in turn would bring on difficulties. Time would be gained, if the texts which had to be submitted to the Plenary Assembly were first examined and revised by technicians.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom proposed to substitute the expression "technical drafting" for the expression "final drafting", which would safeguard the rights of the Drafting Committee (Committee No. 6), without otherwise affecting the position.

The United Kingdom Delegate's suggestion was accepted by the Chairman.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., reverting to the second addition which the United Kingdom Delegate had suggested for point 1 b), proposed to modify the paragraph so as to read:

"Examination of stations authorized to use certain frequencies during the day and other frequencies during the night".

He added that his proposal would naturally imply the adoption by the Committee of the United Kingdom Delegate's proposal.

On the request of the Chairman, and in order to allow the Committee to express its opinion on the point immediately, without the necessity of submitting it to a special Working Group, he put his proposal in the following definitive form:

"Examination of the possibility of certain stations using during the day frequencies used by other stations during the night".

Replying to the Chairman, the Delegate of the United Kingdom indicated his acceptance of this wording on the express condition that an explicit definition was given to the terms "day" and "night".

(RD Doc.91-E)

The Chairman took note of this acceptance and, no objection being raised, it was decided to make the addition to the text of the wording proposed by the U.S.S.R. Delegate, with the qualifications suggested by the Delegate of the United Kingdom.

The Chairman asked the Committee if they were prepared to adopt Document RD No. 36 as a basis for future work, in the form it would have after the various modifications and additions had been made.

The Delegate of Belgium thought it important to have the list of points on which no general agreement had been reached by the Committee of Eight. Certain points already figured in Document RD No. 37; but a complete list would be advisable.

The points were as follows:

1. Reservations made at the Final Meeting of the Committee of Eight concerning the norms of protection of 5 and 2 adopted respectively for frequency separations of 10 and 9 kc/s.
2. Separation in kc/s between adjacent frequencies (10 kc/s, 9 kc/s, or any other value.)
3. Frequency tolerations for exclusive waves and for shared waves.
4. Possible operation of different frequencies by stations working on the same shared wave.
5. Limitation of the power of stations on long waves.
6. Minimum field values necessary for town and country.
7. Characteristics of common international waves.
8. Power of stations using shared waves.
9. Position of stations working in derogation.
10. Recognition (or non-recognition) of a Zone of secondary service.
11. Possible increase of the number of allocations during the day.
12. Possible differentiation of the maximum powers of stations working in the range of medium waves.
13. Standard transmission curves.
14. Definition of the expression "actual position" and allowance for economic factors.
15. Relationship between the number of allocations and the number of official languages.

(RD Doc.91-E)

The Chairman thanked Mr. Corteil for the above interesting information. Document RD No. 36 indicated that the Committee should consider generally the results of the work of the Committee of Eight. Did the Belgian Delegate agree with Document RD No. 36, if the details he had just given were taken into account?

The Delegate of Belgium answered that the purpose of his intervention in the discussion was to inform the Committee of the facts, and not to make a proposal. Before pronouncing any opinion, he would like to hear the views of the different Delegations present.

The Chairman took note of the fact that Mr. Corteil did not formally propose the inclusion in section 1 b) of the questions he had listed. Had any Delegation any objections to make to Document RD No. 36?

The Delegate of Switzerland, referring to the points enumerated by Mr. Corteil - they were points which he had himself intended to bring to the Committee's notice - considered that they should add a point concerning the possible use of frequency modulation installations. The point was explicitly mentioned in the Directives annexed to the Additional Protocol of Atlantic City.

The Chairman noted the proposed addition, but did not see how it constituted an objection to Document RD No. 36.

The Delegate of the French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia had no objection of principle; but he wished to bring to the Committee's attention the last paragraph of the text under discussion, which he said seemed to him of the first importance.

He argued that Document RD No. 36 itself very rightly made a distinction between two parts of the Technical Committee's work. On the one hand was the "a priori" part, consisting of technical recommendations. On the other hand there was the analysis and examination of the results of the Committee of Eight's work, and especially of the Committee's Final Report (Document No. 284).

The last part of the Committee's work referred to seemed to him to be especially urgent, and in this connection he reminded them of the time-limits fixed by the Plenary Assembly.

He therefore proposed the following modification to the last paragraph of Document RD No. 36:

"The examination of Documents Nos. 284, 279, and 281 should be undertaken without delay by a Working Group of Committee 4. The said working Group's report to be submitted to a Plenary Meeting of Committee 4 before July 15, so that the Committee may draw up from it the provisional recommendations necessary for the beginning of the work of Committee 5".

The Chairman observed that the proposal was an addition, but not an objection, to Document RD No. 36. The said Document might immediately be adopted by the Committee, and they could then proceed, still as a plenary meeting, to the examination of the various additional proposals, and in particular those which, like the preceding one, were intended to give their final form to measures likely to speed up the work.

The Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia agreed with the Chairman's interpretation; but, as the amendment he had suggested entailed a time limit, it would be desirable to have it discussed on the earliest possible occasion and, if possible, at the present Meeting.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. having observed that the Russian interpreters were having some difficulty in following the rapid speeches of certain Delegates, the Chairman requested Delegates to speak more slowly, as prescribed in the Rules of Procedure of the Conference.

Replying to a question from the Delegate of Roumania (P.R.), the Chairman said that, regarding the task of Sub-Committee 4 A, the text that used the expression "paragraph b), section 1." should be understood as referring to the whole of paragraph b) of section 1 (Fundamental Tasks).

Replying to a question from the Delegate of Switzerland as to what action he proposed to take on Mr. Corteil's suggestion, the Chairman said that the question would be dealt with after the Committee had accepted Document RD No.36 as a whole.

The Delegate of France pointed out that the establishment of supplementary technical directives was specified as a task of Sub-Committee 4 A, but there was no mention of technical directives adopted by the Committee of Eight. Such directives should, however, be sanctioned by the Copenhagen Conference, and should therefore be examined also by Sub-Committee 4 A.

He thought on the other hand that the examination of Documents Nos. 279, 281 and 284, of which the Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia had spoken, was the first task of Sub-Committee 4 B.

As to the Sub-Committee's second task he had no observation to make.

On the Chairman proceeding to summarise the French Delegate's statement, it appeared that its meaning had not been clearly rendered by the interpretation. The Delegate of France accordingly repeated what he had said. He added that, if it was for Committee 4 itself to examine the technical directives on which agreement had been reached at Brussels, there was a risk of their work being slowed down.

The Chairman said that the discussion of technical directives would very soon come before Committee 4. The discussion would permit a clearer appreciation of the question; and, once finished, it would be easy to refer questions to the Sub-Committee, as proposed by the French Delegate.

The Delegate of France pronounced his satisfaction.

The Delegate of Egypt considered that the 15 points enumerated by Mr. Corteil should be included in Document RD No.36.

(D.19)

The Chairman, summing up the discussion, suggested that the Committee should adopt the following working method:

First, to finish the examination of Document RD No.36, and adopt it as a whole as a basic document.

Then to examine the various amendments proposed, e.g. that of the Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia, together with any proposals for additions, for the appointment of working groups, etc.

The Delegate of Egypt was of the opinion that the adoption of Document RD No.36 tel quel would tie the hands of the Committee in such a way as to preclude any extension of its scope.

The Chairman disagreed. An internal enlargement of the terms of reference would always remain possible. If necessary, a clause could be inserted in Document RD No.36 itself, emphasising its non-limitative character.

The Delegate of Belgium supported the French Delegate's statement. Sub-Committee 4 A should take cognisance, not only of the supplementary technical directives (i.e. points that were either not discussed at Brussels, or were discussed without any agreement being reached), but also of the technical directives on which agreement had been reached. Only eight countries were parties to the Brussels agreement. There were therefore 25 Nations present, whose opinions on the subject should be heard. Besides, all technical directives were closely related, and it was impossible to separate them artificially. As to Document RD No.36, after hearing the different Delegates, he would find it difficult to give his approval without first knowing exactly what would be the result.

(Tr.40/R.11/D.19)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., referring to the observations submitted by Mr. Corteil and certain other Delegations, was of the opinion that the Committee could initially accept Document RD No.36 as a working basis. Thereafter, the Chairman would prepare a complete list of the various proposals or amendments which had that day been submitted; and the list would be submitted for discussion at the next meeting of Committee 4.

As to the technical directives upon which there had been agreement at Brussels, he (the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.) thought it was preferable to discuss them in Committee 4 rather than in Sub-Committee 4 A.

The Chairman summarised the statements which Mr. Corteil and Mr. Makarov had just made. He particularly thanked Mr. Corteil, and expressed his respect for the spirit in which the latter had intervened; but he thought that there would be a loss of time if the technical directives upon which there had been agreement at Brussels were first discussed in Sub-Committee 4 and then in Committee 4.

He also thought the U.S.S.R. Delegate's proposal might accelerate the work of the Committee.

The Delegate of Yugoslavia agreed. Document RD No.36 could be adopted immediately as a basis. The various additions already proposed, and any others, should be discussed at a later date.

(D.19)

(RD-Doc.No.91-E)

The Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia felt a general repugnance to approving Document RD No.36 en bloc.

He had no objections to Section 1 (Fundamental Tasks). On Section 2 (Organisation), he wanted a precise definition of the words "task-documentation" in the wording of Task 1 of Sub-Committee 4 B. More generally, he wished to be enlightened as to the exact scope of the "task" in question.

In addition, it seemed to him that Section 2 should specify time-limits.

The Chairman replied that the "draft-documentation" formulated by the Committee of Eight comprised, not only two preliminary drafts of frequency allocation, but also a general report and various other documents, from which it appeared that certain technical principles had been retained either by the Committee of Eight as a whole or by the authors of the preliminary drafts.

It was the aggregate of these notions as a whole that Sub-Committee 4 B was called upon to analyse in such a manner as to form an opinion on the technical principles which had been adopted, and also to study the extent to which the Plans drawn up conformed to the technical principles.

The Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia thanked the Chairman for his explanations. They gave him all the information he had asked for. He had certain additional observations to submit concerning the role of Sub-Committees 4 A and B in relation to that of Committee 5.

He was of the opinion that the role of Sub-Committee 4A was essentially a technical one, but that Sub-Committee 4 B would have to play an intermediary role between Committee 4 and Committee 5. Sub-Committee 4 B was intended to take over - so to say - on a practical plane the achievements of the Committee of Eight. Its purpose was to examine the two preliminary drafts (Documents 279 and 281), and make recommendations of a provisional nature within a short limit of time, so as to facilitate the work of the Planning Committee.

That did not in any way mean that Committee 5 could not begin its work before Committee 4 had finished its own. The problem of frequency allocation was a practical one, which was based no doubt on technical notions, but had also non-technical bases, since in the last analysis its object was to satisfy the applications of the various countries. These applications were already known to them: so there was immediate working material for Committee 5.

He recalled the precedent set at Atlantic City. At that Conference certain Committees had been finally led by considerations of an imperative character to finish their work without waiting for other Committees to finish the technical studies, by which strictly speaking the work of the former was conditioned. The inevitable, or probably inevitable, disadvantages were better taken in hand it was felt and dealt with there and then than left to the future to face.

The meeting temporarily adjourned from 4.35 to 5.10 p.m.

On the resumption of the meeting, the Chairman thanked Mr.Schaeffer for his interesting observations. He feared that the practical application of all the ideas he (Mr.Schaeffer) had expressed would involve a number of difficulties and complications. However, he also considered that the rôle of Sub-Committee 4 B was to aid Committee 5 in its work by offering it technical recommendations.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom discussed the U.S.S.R. proposal to ask the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Committee to prepare a written list of the various additional proposals which had been submitted in the course of the day's meeting. He agreed to the proposal, and suggested that the terms of reference of the Chairman might well be extended. If necessary, he and the Vice-Chairman might coopt one or two Delegates to form a small working group. The text of Document RD 36 itself might be slightly modified to make it clearer. The Committee would then have before it a modified text RD No.36, together with a list of the points evoked at that day's meeting, which after discussion could be added to the text.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said his intention had been that the Committee should first adopt Document RD No.36 as a basic Document. The Chairman and the Vice-Chairman would in the meanwhile make a list of the various additions which had been proposed, including the points enumerated by Mr.Corteil; and the Committee would then be in a position to make a decision on the incorporation into the text of certain complementary provisions.

The Chairman proposed that Mr.Corteil should assist the Chairman of the Committee in the accomplishment of this task.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that, over and above the proposed additions to the text, there were one or two improvements in the wording of Document RD No.36, mainly of a drafting nature, which should be made. The small working group whose creation he had suggested might deal with them.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. preferred to refer them to the Committee itself.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom, returning to Point b) of section 1, remarked that the expression "questions which were not examined by the Committee of Eight" was not appropriate. Actually, they were questions which had been examined, but upon which it had been impossible to arrive at a decision. The draft should be modified accordingly.

Furthermore, point 1 (e) seemed to raise a ticklish question. Would it not be better to write that the expert opinion was to be submitted "upon application by the Plenary Assembly"?

He would like to hear Mr.Corteil's opinion on the point.

(RD Doc.91-E)

The Chairman took note of the general agreement on the modification of Point b).

The Delegate of Belgium stated that he would be willing to be a member of the Working Group, but he would also like the Delegates of the United Kingdom and France to be members.

As to the proposed modifications to Point B, he was of the opinion that the best revision would be to say: "the questions on which it has not been possible to reach an agreement of the Committee of Eight".

As to point 1 (e), he thought it would be contrary to all the traditions of previous Conferences if the Technical Committee intervened on its own initiative to give its opinion on the work of the Planning Committee. The Planning Committee should be able to transmit its work direct to the Plenary Assembly, the latter of course remaining free to ask for an expert technical opinion from the Committee at any time.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. observed that the form proposed by Mr. Corteil for Point b) did not embrace all possible cases. There were many questions that had not even been examined; and these should be mentioned.

He did not see that there was anything to be gained by the constitution of a Working Group. The Chairman and the Vice-Chairman could very well draw up the required list alone much more rapidly.

Concerning Point e) of section 1 there was nothing surprising to be said. There was no question of the Technical Committee intervening between the Planning Committee and the Plenary Assembly, but rather of assuming the role normally devolving upon it. It was logical that a Committee charged with the preparation of the technical foundations of a plan should be enabled to judge how well the plan had been based on those foundations, and whether it was in conformity with the technical principles.

The text of the Document tended in no way to diminish the rights of the Planning Committee. On the other hand its omission would be a blow at the rights of the Technical Committee.

The Delegate of Italy supported Mr. Corteil's proposals both as regards the setting up of a Working Group and as regards the modification of paragraph e) of section 1.

The Delegate of France thanked Mr. Corteil for his proposal; but he agreed with the U.S.S.R. Delegate that there was no necessity for anyone beyond the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, and Mr. Corteil. He thought however that the Technical Committee would be exceeding its terms of reference, if it took upon itself a technical analysis of the Plan to be drawn up by Committee 5. Such an expert opinion would have to be explicitly requested by the Plenary Assembly. The Text of paragraph e) of section 1 should be modified accordingly.

The Delegate of Yugoslavia (F.P.R.) thought, on the contrary, that it was for the Technical Committee as a matter of course to examine whether the Plan conformed to the technical recommendations it had given to Committee 5.

The Delegate of Roumania (P.R.) agreed with Mr. Daumard that there was no need to add anyone to the proposed group.

He did not consider that the present text of paragraph e) necessarily implied any "interposition" of the Technical Committee between Committee 5 and the Plenary Assembly. The proposed procedure could only help the latter.

Document RD No. 36 might immediately be adopted as a basis for the work.

The Delegate of the Vatican City supported the French Delegate's opinion that paragraph e) should be altered. Referring to the points brought up by the Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia, he was horrified by the volume of the task awaiting the Sub-Committee that was to study the results of the Committee of Eight's work. He was also alarmed at the mention of July 15 as the time-limit. The date proposed by the Plenary Assembly had been July 10.

He agreed with Mr. Schaeffer that it would be reasonable for the Planning Committee to start work at once. It would be perfectly possible to start, as the Committee already had a certain number of technical and other basis for its work.

He concluded that, if the time-limit of July 15 was really to be maintained, the Planning Committee might wait until that date before starting its work. If not, then it might set to work at once.

The Delegate of Switzerland could not accept the present form of paragraph e) either. The Technical Committee, if it adopted the clause, would certainly exceed its terms of reference. Moreover it was in the last instance for the Delegations themselves (and not for the Technical Committee) to decide whether or not they were satisfied with the Plan. Paragraph e) might therefore simply be omitted; but he could accept such a wording as that proposed by the Delegates of the United Kingdom or France.

As to paragraph b) of section 1, he observed that neither the word "examined" nor the word "decided" would cover all possible cases, and it would be better to change the form of the text, if necessary by the addition of an extra paragraph.

The Delegate of the Netherlands agreed with the French Delegate that it would not be necessary to add anyone to the Group consisting of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, and Mr. Corteil. He also thought that it would be contrary to custom, if the Technical Committee approved of the Plan drawn up by Committee 5, unless it was explicitly asked to do so by the Plenary Assembly.

(RD Document No. 91-E)

He agreed with the Vatican Delegate that Committee 5 might, in any case, start work as soon as possible.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia (P.R.) wished the Committee to adopt RD Document No. 36 immediately as a basis for work. It was not logical to call upon a Committee, which had laid the foundations of an Allocation Plan, to examine the way in which its recommendations had been applied. The procedure proposed had this advantage that it would speed up the work, as the Plenary Assembly only met rarely and, if the Technical Committee was obliged to wait until called upon, delay might result. Besides, the expert opinion proposed would be of interest, not only for the present Conference, but for subsequent Conferences as well.

The Committee of Eight had encountered difficulties which had prevented it from drawing up a single plan. He hoped that the present Conference would be able to overcome the same difficulties in the light of their experience.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom thought that the question under discussion was essentially one of organisation. Whatever advantage might be offered by an expert opinion, it remained clear that the Technical Committee had no right to trespass on the territory of the Planning Committee. Committees 4 and 5 had equal rights; and any decision reached by Committee 4 alone, which at the same time concerned the Planning Committee, would be valueless. He therefore repeated his former proposal.

The Delegate of Poland expressed surprise that such an important question should give rise only to formal objections or objections on grounds of "prestige". No fundamental objection had been made to the wording of paragraph e). There was no call to regard the question from the point of view of "competition" between the two Committees. It was rather a question of "cooperation"; and that cooperation was finding expression, before Committee 5 had so much as started its work, in the shape of the establishment of technical directives. It would find its logical completion in the expert opinion on the Plan which Committee 5 was going to draw up. He agreed with the time limit July 15.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. agreed entirely with the Polish Delegate. It would be incorrect, if the Technical Committee were not called upon as a matter of course to express its opinion on the Plan. But that did not imply any subordination of Committee 5 to Committee 4.

In view of the fact that it was getting late, he suggested that his earlier proposal concerning the working plan to be followed should be dealt with, and that they should adopt Document RD No. 36 that very day as a basis for their work. The question of the wording of paragraph e) might be left undecided provisionally.

The Delegate of Egypt supported Mr. Corteil concerning the form of paragraph b) of section 1.

(RD. Doc.No. 91-E)

The question under discussion ought not to be considered as a question of prestige but of organisation. He illustrated his point by asking what sort of effect the Technical Committee's opinion would have in the event of the Plan receiving the unanimous support of all the Delegations in the Plenary Assembly.

He considered that the Working Group should consist only of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Mr. Corteil.

The Delegate of Bielorussia (S.S.R.) supported the U.S.S.R. Delegate's proposal as regards working method. Concerning the Planning Committee, it was not impossible that it could do useful work at once; but it would certainly be preferable for it not to start work until Committee 4 had finished its preliminary report on the work of the Committee of Eight.

The Chairman summed up the discussion. There were two possible solutions. They might follow the proposal of the U.S.S.R. Delegate by adopting at once Document RD No. 36, with the provisional exception of paragraph e), and examining at a later date the amendments drawn up by the Chairmen. The alternative was to revise Document RD No. 36 in the light of the observations made during the discussion.

The Delegate of Belgium laid stress on the importance of the Document in question, in view of the many observations to which it had given rise they could not well adopt it as a whole, even taking into consideration the possibility of further amendments. He insisted on a Working Group being asked to revise the Document in the light of the observations made at the Meeting.

If the Committee thought a Working Group unnecessary, they could simply entrust the task to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. It was not necessary that he (Mr. Corteil) should take part.

The Chairman regretted that they could not come to a conclusion at once. The Committee of Eight - to whose arduous labours he paid tribute - had unfortunately left so many questions unanswered that they should all try to avoid any but constructive criticisms.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom proposed that the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteurs should prepare a new version of Document RD No. 36, and endeavour to incorporate in it all the suggestions that had been offered at the Meeting. The next Meeting would then be devoted to a discussion of the new Document.

The Chairman thought that, in spite of the practical difficulties of translation and printing, Mr. Faulkner's proposal was perhaps calculated to put an end to the difficulties. The Committee concurring, he announced that the proposal was adopted.

The next Meeting was fixed for Wednesday, July 7 at 10 a.m.

The Meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

H. Anglès d'Auriac,

Shamsha,

Rapporteurs.

Kessenikh,

Chairman.

(Tr.40/R.11/D.23)

July 13, 1948

Submitted in: English

REPORT OF COMMITTEE 5
(FREQUENCY ALLOCATION COMMITTEE)

FIRST MEETING

5 July 1948

The meeting was opened at 14.40 by the Chairman, Mr. H. FAULKNER (United Kingdom).

The Chairman expressed his thanks for the honour done to his country by his nomination to the Chairmanship. He introduced the Vice-Chairman, Mr. POPOVITCH (Yugoslavia). He proposed the appointment of two rapporteurs, Mr. W.J. CHALK, (United Kingdom) and Mr. GROSS (Roumania), and this proposal was adopted.

The Chairman called the roll and it was found that of the thirty countries represented at the Conference only two, Albania and Iceland, were not present at the meeting.

The Chairman read out the terms of reference of the Committee as stated in RD Document No.2, and proceeded to the other item on the agenda - the date of the next meeting. He said that as the Technical Committee had been allotted the task of reporting on the technical aspects of the report of the Committee of Eight Countries, he proposed to leave open the date of the next meeting pending the receipt of the results of the Technical Committee's deliberations.

Answering a question from the Delegate of the Vatican City, the Chairman stated that the technical directives from the Technical Committee would reach the Frequency Allocation Committee via the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of Morocco and Tunisia expressed fear of a very long delay before the Committee would start its work, and thought that a working group should be chosen to start a separate study of the two Brussels plans.

The Delegate of France reminded the meeting that the Plenary Assembly had directed the Technical Committee to make the study of the Brussels reports its first task and that a target date, 10 July, had been fixed. In addition the Chairman gave an assurance that should no directive be received by about 10 July an early opportunity would be taken of raising the question, so that the Committee could start its work.

This was accepted, and as there were no other comments, the meeting adjourned at 15.10.

H. Faulkner
Chairman

V. Popovitch
Vice-Chairman

W.J. Chalk
N.Y. Gross
Reporters.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 93

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 131 - Amendment to Document No. 93

July 13, 1948

Original: Russe

Recommendations of Sub-Committee 4 B
of Committee 4 (Technical)

Sub-Committee 4 B was set up in conformity with the decision of Committee 4 taken on 8 July 1948 on the occasion of the discussion of Document No. 48 (revised).

The Delegate of Bielorussia (S.S.R.), Mr. I.P. Likhushin was appointed Chairman of the Sub-Committee, and Mr. P. Junod, Member of the Delegation of Switzerland, Vice-Chairman. In conformity with the decision of Committee 4, Sub-Committee 4 B was to submit a technical analysis of the preliminary documents drawn up by the Committee of Eight. In conformity with paragraph (d) of Document No. 48, the recommendations of the Sub-Committee to Committee 5 were to be submitted by July 15 at the latest.

In view of the urgency and the importance of the work entrusted to it, Sub-Committee 4 B started by a general examination of Documents Nos. 279 and 281 (variants of the Plan elaborated by the Committee of Eight) together with Document No. 284. The comparative table of frequency allocation as it appears in these two Plans is given in Document No. 64 of 9 July 1948, submitted by the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

At its Meeting on 12 July 1948 Sub-Committee 4 B examined Document No. 64, and studied the results of the comparative application of the two variants. It devoted special attention to the importance of exclusive channels as a guarantee of the high quality of Broadcasting.

During the discussion several Delegates drew attention to the desirability of allocating to countries as many exclusive channels as possible, and the necessity for a fair distribution of these channels. The wish was also expressed that Document No. 64 should be completed by the addition of data relating to the protection of exclusive channels from the influence of channels adjacent to the mutual protection of sharing stations.

With this discussion as a basis, the Sub-Committee submits the following recommendations to Committee 4:

1. The variant of the Plan contained in Document No. 281 allocates a greater number of exclusive channels. This variant is therefore preferable to the variant contained in Document 279, in so far as the quantitative satisfaction of exclusive channel requirements is concerned.

2. It seems indicated that the Copenhagen Conference should take as a basis for the Plan it proposes to draw up the principle of allocating the maximum possible number of exclusive channels.

I.P. Likhushin,
Chairman.

P. Junod,
Vice-Chairman.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 94

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 116 - Amendment to Document No. 94

Submitted in: English

UNITED KINGDOM

Analysis of the Medium Wave Allocations
provided in the 9 kc/s and 10 kc/s Plans
(Documents Nos.279 and 281)

1. GENERAL

An analysis has been made of the medium wave allocations⁺ provided in the two plans submitted by the Committee of Eight Countries. In each case where it is proposed to share a frequency between several countries an estimate has been made of the level of interference which each is likely to experience. In making this estimate, the median value of the indirect wave has been taken for the unwanted station and where a directional aerial is specified in either plan, the additional protecting thus afforded has been taken as 10 db.

The results of the analysis are presented in the two Tables attached to this document. In both cases, the allocations have been divided under the following three headings, "Exclusive", "Shared" and "International Common", and the "Shared" allocations have been sub-divided into seven categories (making nine categories in all) according to the level of interference which it is estimated will be experienced. The precise definitions of the seven categories used for the "Shared" allocations are given on the page immediately preceding Table I.

Table I shows how many allocations in each category the two plans provide in each of the bands 515-699 kc/s, 699-899 kc/s, 899-1099 kc/s, 1099-1299 kc/s, 1299-1499 kc/s, 1499-1605 kc/s, which appear to represent convenient sub-divisions of the medium wave broadcasting band.

Table II shows how many allocations in each category are provided for each of the countries named in the plans.

2. SPECIAL COMMENTS

2.1. Analysis of Exclusive Allocations

An analysis of the exclusive allocations from the point of view of the level of interference that is likely experienced from stations adjacent channels is in course of preparation and will shortly be presented in a separate document.

+ The term "allocation" is used throughout the present document to denote the use of a frequency, either on a shared or an exclusive basis by one country, either for a station or for a group of stations.

2.2. Correlation with the Analysis Presented in Document No. 38.

In comparing the results of the present analysis, which are based on the field strength of the interfering signal, with those presented in the Annex to Document No 38, which are based on protection ratios at the 3 mV/m contour of the wanted station, it should be borne in mind that the field strength of the interfering signal is related to the protection ratio by the equation:

interfering field strength in db relative to one mV/m + protection ratio in db at 3 mV/m contour of wanted station. 70db.

2.3. DEROGATIONS

In comparing the total numbers of allocations provided in the two plans the following point should be borne in mind.

Paragraphs Nos 131 and 138 of the Atlantic City Regulations refer to the continued operation of certain broadcasting stations by derogation. In the 10 kc/s plan certain of these stations have already been accommodated in the broadcasting band whilst the 9 kc/s plan makes no specific provision for them, leaving it to the present Conference to decide how they are to be accommodated. A direct comparison of the numbers of allocations specifically provided in the two plans as set out in the present analysis is, therefore, slightly misleading. This comment applies also to the analysis given in the RD Document Nos. 38 and 64.

SHARED ALLOCATIONS

The seven categories into which the shared allocations have been subdivided in the Table are defined as follows:

- Category I. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 30 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
- Category II. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 35 db nor less than + 31 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
- Category III. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 40 db nor less than + 36 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
- Category IV. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 45 db nor less than + 41 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
- Category V. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 50 db nor less than + 46 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
- Category VI. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 55 db nor less than 51 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
- Category VII. Allocations where the strongest interference from any one of the stations sharing the same frequency has a median field strength not exceeding + 60 db nor less than + 55 db relative to one microvolt per metre.
-

T A B L E IANALYSIS OF ALLOCATIONS ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY BANDS

| Frequency Band (Kc/s) | Number of Allocations provided in the 9 kc/s Plan (Doc.279) | | | | | | | | | Number of Allocations provided in the 10 kc/s Plan (Doc.281) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|----|----|--------|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|---|----|----|--------|----|----|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Exclusive | | | Shared | | | | | | Exclusive | | | Shared | | | | | |
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | International Common | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | International Common |
| 515-699 | 6 | 20 | 3 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 1 | - | - | - |
| 699-899 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 15 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | - | - | - |
| 899-1099 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 10 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 3 | - | - | - |
| 1099-1299 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 12 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 1 | - | - | - |
| 1299-1499 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 7 | 1 | - | - | - | 28 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 1499-1605 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 7 |
| Totals | 46 | 67 | 39 | 47 | 8 | - | - | - | 28 | 58 | 27 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 15 |

Grand total
(Excluding = 207
International allocations
Common Waves)

Grand Total
(Excluding = 217
International allocations
Common Waves)

TABLE II

(RD No. 94 E)

ANALYSIS OF THE ALLOCATIONS PROVIDED FOR EACH COUNTRY IN THE 9 KC/S AND 10 KC/S PLANS

| Country | Number of Allocations provided in the 9 kc/s Plan (Doc.279) | | | | | | | | | Number of Allocations provided in the 10 kc/s Plan (Doc. 281) | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|--|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | |
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | International Common | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | International Common |
| Albania | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | I | I | | | | | I | | |
| Algeria | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Andorra | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Austria | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Belgium | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| Bulgaria | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Cyprus | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Cyrenaica & Tripolitania | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Czechoslovakia | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Denmark | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Egypt | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Faroes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finland | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | 2 | 4 | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| France | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | 1 | 7 | | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Germany - U.S.S.R. Zone | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |

| Country | Number of Allocations provided in the 9 kc/s Plan (Doc.279) | | | | | | | | | Number of Allocations provided in the 10 kc/s Plan (Doc.281) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|---|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | International Common | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | International Common |
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | |
| Germany - U.S.Zone | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| " - British Zone | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| " - French Zone | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Gibraltar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | 2 |
| Hungary | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Iceland | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Italy | 5 | 3 | | 2 | | | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Lebanon | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Luxemburg | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Madeira | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monaco | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Morocco | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Netherlands | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Norway | | 2 | 3 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| Palestine | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | |

| Country | Number of Allocations provided in the 9 kc/s Plan (Doc.279) | | | | | | | | | Number of Allocations provided in the 10 kc/s Plan (Doc.281) | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|---|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | International Common | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | International Common |
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | |
| Poland | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 |
| Portugal | | 3 | 2 | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | |
| Roumania | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Spain | | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | | | |
| Sweden | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | 1 | | 2 |
| Switzerland | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| Syria | | | | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Tangiers | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trieste | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Tunisia | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Turkey | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| United Kingdom | 3 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| U.S.S.R. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Russia | | 5 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| - Ukraine | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | 5 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| - Byelorussia | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| - Finno Carelia | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| - Estonia | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| - Latvia | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |

| Country | Number of Allocations provided in the 9 kc/s Plan (Doc.279) | | | | | | | | | Number of Allocations provided in the 10 kc/s Plan (Doc.281) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--------|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|-------------------------|---|--------|----|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | International Common | Exclusive | Shared | | | | | | | International Common |
| U.S.S.R. | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | |
| - Lithuania | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| - Moldavia | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Vatican City | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Yugoslavia | 5 | 2 | | | | | | | 2 | 5 | | | 3 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Total | 46 | 67 | 39 | 47 | 8 | - | - | - | 28 | 58 | 27 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 15 |



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 95

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 139 - Amendment to Document No. 95

July 9, 1948

July 9, 1948

Submitted in: French

J O I N T R E P O R T

of the Combined Executive Committees
(Committees 1)

of the

European Regional Broadcasting Conference

and of the

Maritime Regional Radio Conference

2nd Meeting

Friday 9 July 1948

The Meeting was opened at 5 p.m. under the Chairmanship of Mr. N. E. Holmblad.

The Chairman announced that the 2nd RD Plenary Assembly, interrupted a few moments earlier, would resume on Monday 12 July.

European Broadcasting Conference.

The Chairman of Committee 4 recalled that he had asked for Sub-Committee 4 B to meet on Monday afternoon, at the same time as the Plenary Assembly in another room, in order to expedite the work of his Committee, whose terms of reference were to submit the Report on the work of the Committee of Eight Countries.

The Delegate of Portugal said that the Delegation of his country was small, and could not be represented at all the meetings held simultaneously. However he agreed to the proposal of the Chairman of Committee 4.

The Chairman of Committee 3 announced that his Committee did not intend to hold a Plenary Meeting during the coming week. Committee 3 had submitted a proposal concerning the nature of the present Broadcasting Conference.

It had, however, set up a Working Group, under the Chairmanship of Italy, to deal with questions referred to it.

(RD Doc. 95-E)
(MAR Doc. 41-E)

The Chairman of Committee 2 said that it was necessary for his Committee to meet, for example, on Thursday morning. The Committee had examined a certain number of credentials; but there were still others, which had not yet been examined.

The Chairman of Committee 5 said that the work in connection with the Report to be presented by Committee 4 on the work of the Committee of Eight Countries was very arduous, as they had to consider so many different points.

He proposed that Committee 5 should meet on Friday 16, or Monday 19 July, by which time he thought he would be in possession of the Report.

The time-table of the RD Conference, drawn up on the basis of the wishes expressed, was fixed as follows:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Monday | 10 a.m. Plenary Assembly 2.30 p.m. Plenary Assembly -- Sub-Committee 4 B |
| Tuesday | 9.30 a.m. Working Group Committee 3 2.30 p.m. Committee 4 |
| Wednesday | 9.30 a.m. Sub-Committee 4 A 2.30 p.m. Sub-Committee 4 B |
| Thursday | 9.30 a.m. Committee 2 2.30 p.m. Committee 4 |
| Friday | 9.30 a.m. Committee 5 2.30 p.m. Committee 3. |

Maritime Radio Conference.

The Chairman of Committee 4 announced that his Committee had set up two Working Groups: Working Group 4 A (technical), Working Group 4 B (allocations). He wanted three meetings arranged for these Groups during the following week, with the possibility of calling others, should the need arise, by agreement with the Chairman of the Conference.

The Chairman of Committee 2 announced that, his Committee having examined all the credentials submitted to it, there would be no need for a meeting the following week.

In reply to the Chairman's question regarding the need for convening a MAR Plenary Assembly, the Chairman of Committee 4 replied that several Maritime Delegations were attending the C.C.I.R. in Stockholm, and it would be better to await their return.

The Programme for the MAR Conference was fixed as follows:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Tuesday | 9.30 a.m. to 11 a.m. Working Group 4 A (Technical) |
| | 11. a.m. Working Group 4 B (Allocations) |
| Wednesday | 9.30 a.m. to 11 a.m. Working Group 4 A (Technical) |
| | 11. a.m. Working Group 4 B (Allocations) |
| Thursday | 9.30 a.m. to 11 a.m. Working Group 4 A (Technical) |
| | 11. a.m. Working Group 4 B (Allocations) |

(RD Doc. 95-E)
(MAR Doc. 41-E)

Referring to page 2 of Document 39 RD/24 MAR (1st meeting of Committees 1), the Delegate of Poland wished to replace the name of the Vice-Chairman of Committee 2 (Mr. Waskiewicz) by that of Mr. Wolowski.

The Chairman announced that the Brussels documents, for which the Delegations concerned, had asked in the Plenary Assembly were being distributed as and when they were mimeographed. Distribution had begun with the Minutes of the two Sessions in Brussels.

He asked the Chairman of RD Committees 4, 5 and 6 and MAR Committees 3 and 5 to give the names of the Rapporteurs of these Committees.

RD Committee 4: Mr. Shamsha (Ukraine), Mr. D'Auriac (O.I.R.)
RD Committee 5: Mr. Chalk (United Kingdom) and one person to be designated.
RD Committee 6: To be designated.
MAR Committee 3: Mr. Goloventchenko (U.S.S.R.) and Mr. Biansan (France).
MAR Committee 5: To be designated.

The Chairman said that certain questions being held in abeyance had not been included in the Plenary Assembly's Agenda because they had not yet arisen at the time of publication of the Agenda. He proposed the publication of a supplementary Agenda for Monday's meeting which would include the following items:

to be added to Item 4: Admission of the U.I.R.
the I.C.A.O.
the U.N.E.S.C.O.

to be added to Item 5: Invitation of the Republic of San Marino.

Adopted.

The Chairman of RD Committee 2 asked that the Plenary Assembly Agenda also include an Item concerning the nature of the Conference, so that the Credentials Committee might proceed with its work.

The Chairman of RD Committee 3 said that he was prepared to submit the information already collected to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman noted that Saturday, July 10, was reserved for an excursion and that Delegates would only have until the Monday following to study the documents submitted by Committee 3 on this subject. He therefore suggested that this question should not be included in the supplementary Agenda.

He added that there was another important question which should come before the Conference, namely that of the representation of Germany, which had been raised, but which had not been included in the Plenary Assembly's Agenda. He asked the opinion of Committee 1 as to whether this question - which called for consideration at the earliest possible moment - could be submitted to Committee 3 or whether it should be dealt with by

(RD Doc. 95-E)
(MAR Doc. 41-E)

the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman of Committee 3 believed that it was for the Plenary Assembly to decide who should be entrusted with the question. He thought that the Report of the first meeting of Committee 3 (RD Doc. No. 42) supported this opinion.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked what was the problem as regards Germany, which would come up before the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman said that the problem concerning Germany appeared to him to be the following: the Conference required information concerning the requests for frequencies for this country. From whom would requests come? Who were the competent authorities? Committee 3 had decided that the Plenary Assembly should answer these questions.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. believed that Germany's case had already been studied at Atlantic City, where certain directives had been furnished concerning allocations for minimum technical needs. It was not necessary to place it on the Plenary Assembly's shoulders before Committee 4 and 5 had made concrete proposals which would be discussed in a general plan.

The Chairman of Committee 3 understood that the U.S.S.R. had suggested that no one should represent Germany or present her needs. This was an argument analogous to that which had been presented in the case of Spain. It was coherent and logical, but Spain's position and that of Germany were not to be compared. While Germany could not represent herself, she could de facto and de jure, be represented by those who were at present representing her. At Brussels, Great Britain and France had represented requests for their respective zones of occupation. He himself had raised the question of procedure in Committee 3, and he urged that it be submitted to the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that Mr. Meyer was arguing a point which had not been raised. He wished only to know how the question would be put to the Plenary Assembly. The U.S.S.R. had proposed that the minimum technical needs should be dealt with first by the Planning Committee, and then by the Conference. He added that the Soviet Delegation thought it desirable to have representatives of Germany present at the Conference. Until such time as a German Government was set up, German requirements could only be defended at the Conference by a representative from the Allied Control Commission.

The Chairman of Committee 3 agreed. He pointed out, that it was therefore for the Plenary Assembly to decide who would represent Germany, and to authorize the Chairman of the Conference to send the invitation.

The Delegate of Yugoslavia proposed that discussion on this question be adjourned, and that the subject should not be entered on the Agenda before the Plenary Assembly had completed examination of the Report on the Work of the Committee of Eight Countries.

(RD Doc. 95-E)
(MAR Doc. 41-E)

The Chairman said that he had not intended to open discussion on this question, but that he had only wanted an exchange of views so that he might learn the opinions of the Delegations on the subject. It seemed to him that the Delegates present were in agreement that an invitation should be sent, so that Germany's needs might be known. It was for the Plenary Assembly, to entrust this task to him.

The Yugoslave Delegation's suggestion had given rise to no objections; the question of Germany did not therefore appear to be urgent, but it would have to be raised as soon as possible after the necessity arose; he asked the Chairmen of Committees to advise him immediately the need for dealing with this question arose in the work of their respective Committees.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

H. Voutaz

N.E. Holmblad

Rapporteur

Chairman

(Tr.15/R.4/D.30)

V A T I C A N C I T Y

Preliminary remarks relating to Documents
Nos. 284, 279 and 281 submitted by the Committee
of Eight to the European Regional Broadcasting
Conference.

1. General Observations

The above mentioned documents present two proposals which, in the light of the voluminous documentation of the Committee of Eight, seem diametrically opposed to one another because of the basic division between the two separations of 9 kc/s and 10 kc/s respectively. However, the Delegation of the Vatican City considers that this opposition is not irreconcilable.

No draft Plan merits support or preference simply by virtue of the abstract principle of a separation of 9 or 10 kc/s, or even on the strength of the allocations proposed. It is necessary above all to examine how the Plan conforms to the fundamental mandate directing the Conference (Directives for the European Regional Broadcasting Conference, §4, sub-para 1, page 325.). One has to examine therefore to what degree the Plan satisfies reasonably and equitably the requirements of all the Countries, taking into account the areas served (which implies a consideration of the frequencies and the permissible powers) and the protection of the different services.

In the light of this principle, as also in the light of the observations already put forward (see Doc. 158 of the Committee of Eight, pages 6, 7, 8, 18, 19, 20., Doc. 160 pages 1, 2, 3, RD Doc. 38), the Delegation of the Vatican City does not consider that the plan proposed in Document No. 281 (10 kc/s separation) offers a happy or fertile basis for the work of the Conference. On the other hand the Plan proposed in Document No. 279 (9 kc/s separation) appears in many respects acceptable in the light of the arguments and observations referred to.

Consequently, the Delegation of the Vatican City, taking into account the practical considerations which must govern the drawing up of any Plan of frequency allocation, considers that it would be a grave mistake, entailing serious risk, to begin again from the beginning, and not to take advantage of this truly remarkable draft - based, as it is, on great competence and long and vast experience.

Moreover, accepting the discussions and work as a starting point, and correcting them progressively (in the light of the general basic principles as well as of the reasonable requirements and reservations of the Countries), it is not impossible to transform the original Plan into a compromise between the 9 and the 10 kc/s separations.

In view of the fact that $9 \times 10 = 10 \times 9$, each time that one allocation in ten is added to another group of shared waves (or again each time that one in ten is suppressed) one arrives at nine allocations in a 10 kc/s separation Plan. In the extreme case, if such an operation could be continued, one would arrive at a complete plan with 10 kc/s separation. As in reality such an adaptation (total or partial) is not possible, because of the many reasonable requirements to be satisfied and of the protection that it is indispensable to assure to the different services, we are bound to conclude that our fundamental obligation to take into account the requirements of all the countries and the necessity to produce a technically satisfactory plan compel us to keep to a 9 kc/s separation.

II. Observations on the special case of Radio-Vatican.

- a) In principle a 10 kc/s separation would be very suitable for the protection of long-distance services by indirect transmission; but consideration of common interests makes it a duty not to press for such a solution, unless some system of mixed 9 and 10 kc/s separations can be found admitting of easy adaptation, especially to the case of exclusive waves.
- b) The draft Plan submitted in Document No. 279 (10 kc/s separation) does not take the special character of Radio-Vatican into account. (For the special character of Radio-Vatican see Directives for the European Conference §4 sub-para 2, and Minutes of the Meetings of the 33 Countries at Atlantic City, Doc. No. 160, page 1, of the Committee of Eight). The solution proposed in Document No. 279 is not therefore acceptable.
- c) On the other hand the solution proposed in Document No. 281 (9 kc/s separation) takes the essential elements of the Vatican case into account, and is therefore acceptable as a basis for discussion. At the same time the following points call for consideration:
 1. The power corresponding to the highest frequency (1375 kc/s) should also be of the order of 100 kW, in conformity with the statement submitted (see Document No. 244 of the Committee of Eight), and in conformity also with the solutions proposed for Radio-Monte Carlo, and Radio-Luxemburg.
 2. The frequency of 1375 kc/s may be considered for all practical purposes as exclusive, for it is shared with Madeira only (1 kW). It is however extremely desirable, especially in the event contemplated in paragraph a) above, that the frequency of Madeira should be changed. The change will be very simple, and will be welcomed by Madeira, which would prefer more advantageous sharings.

3. The frequency of 1375 kc/s, to be employed for a long-distance service by indirect transmission, should be sufficiently protected, taking into account adjacent channels, especially in regions that could not usually be served by short waves. As a result the observation already submitted on this point (see Document 248 of the Committee of Eight) an important correction has already been made to the Plan. But, in view of the average quality of the receivers, further corrections are greatly to be desired in connection with the neighbouring frequencies of 1357, 1384, and 1393 kc/s proposed for stations in Italy, Germany and France.
4. According to the initial demand, two simultaneous programmes were to be possible at night, and the first draft Plan (Document 143 of the Committee of Eight) had already allocated two frequencies for simultaneous operation. As a result however of the distinction which has been made between day and night waves (Document 281 of the Committee of Eight) this demand is no longer satisfied. It would nevertheless be easy to satisfy in view of the fact that it is a question of providing for a local service of low power (5 kW.).

(Signed) F. Soccorsi,

Head of the Delegation of the
Vatican City.



**European Broadcasting Conference (CER)
(Copenhagen, 1948)**

Document No. 97

Note: The following documents were issued in relation to this document:

- Document No. 326 - Corrections to Document No. 97

European Regional
Broadcasting Conference
København, 1948

RD Document No 97 -- E

July 14, 1948

Submitted in: French

G R E E C E

Copenhagen, 14 July 1948

The Chairman of the
European Regional
Broadcasting Conference,
Copenhagen.

Sir,

I have the honour to send you herewith the observations
of Greece on the two variants of the frequency allocation plan
contained in Documents 279 and 281.

I have etc.,

St. Eleftheriou,
Head of the Delegation of Greece.

Observations

of the Delegation of Greece on the frequency allocations appearing in Documents 279 and 281.

The Delegation of Greece notes with surprise that its minimum desiderata as given in Document 225, have not received serious consideration.

Indeed, from perusal of the attached comparative table, it appears that the two new preliminary drafts in Documents 279 and 281 in no way change the situation in Greece but, on the other hand, favour countries of lesser area and population.

Without wishing to dispute the frequency requirements of other countries, the mere desire to make apparent the injustice to Greece of the preliminary frequency allocation Plans, which provide no exclusive wave for Greece, has led us to make a comparison with the frequencies allocated to Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. These preliminary frequency allocation Plans do, however, allocate new exclusive frequencies to countries already richly endowed with them.

Document 281 withholds an exclusive frequency from our country while providing one for Albania and another for Bulgaria. It is noteworthy that the surface area of Albania is 1/5th of that of our country, and its population numbers only 14% of that of Greece. The corresponding figures for Bulgaria are 80% of the area and population of Greece. Similarly, Yugoslavia receives two new supplementary exclusive frequencies according to the said Plans. For these reasons, we find it impossible to comprehend the motives for such disparate treatment.

As regards the preliminary draft frequency allocation Plan set forth in Document No. 279, we note that the 1321 kc/s frequency allocated to Albania is regarded as shared with Spain. However, after considering on the one hand, the power assigned - 60 kW and 2 kW respectively - and the distance between the two countries on the other hand, we can conclude that, for practical purposes, an almost exclusive frequency is allocated to Albania.

The same is true, and to an even greater extent, of the 574 kc/s frequency allocated to Yugoslavia, which is regarded as shared with Iceland. A comparison of the respective powers - 100 kW and 1 kW - and of the intervening distance (far in excess of 3000 km) puts the quasi-exclusive nature of this frequency, as far as Yugoslavia is concerned, beyond doubt.

Furthermore, the frequencies of 1312 kc/s and 1474 kc/s allocated to Greece on a power of 2 kW, which are considered in the Plan as shared, are, in view of their low power, rather frequencies of the common international wave No. 1 type, and it would be more accurate to regard them as such.

(RD Doc. 97 - E)

The two preliminary drafts in Documents 279 and 281 also put our country in a markedly inferior position, even on shared frequencies, because both allocate higher powers to the countries sharing these frequencies with Greece. If we take the protection ratio of 100 as a basis, the field of action of our transmitters will be much reduced, owing to the extremely mountainous configuration of Greece and the poor soil conductivity.

However, as our country is surrounded by a large number of thickly populated islands at distances of more than 400 km, not the official figure of the area of Greece, but a service area of at least double the official published figure, must be taken into account.

We protest particularly against the fact that the frequency of our national station of Athens still remains shared with two very powerful transmitters, and this in both the variants of the new Plan proposed by the Delegations of the Netherlands and of the U.S.S.R.

In spite of all its good intentions to collaborate in the preparation of a new plan for frequency allocations to countries in the European area, and its desire to facilitate the task of the Copenhagen Conference, Greece will be obliged to make reservations regarding the acceptance of a plan which does not satisfy its minimum claims, and more particularly its claim for an exclusive wave between 600 and 650 kc/s for its national station, which is of primary importance for Greek broadcasting.

As regards the 9 or 10 kc/s separation, it is clear that the latter is preferable in theory, but we think that frequency requirements of the European countries are so numerous that we shall be obliged to have recourse to the 9 kc/s separation.

COUNTRY U.S.S.R. PLAN - DOCUMENT 281

THE NETHERLANDS PLAN - DOCUMENT 279

Frequency Nature Excl. Number of Frequencies Shared Inter Total Frequency Nature Excl. Number of Frequencies Shared Inter Total

ALBANIA

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|--------|---|---|---|---|------|--------|---|---|---|---|
| Area : 27,538 km ² | 1110 | Excl. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 790 | Shared | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Population: 1,030,000 | 1320 | Shared | | | | | 1321 | Shared | | | | |
| | 1390 | Shared | | | | | | | | | | |

BULGARIA

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|---|---|---|---|------|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | 640 | Shared | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 754 | Shared | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| | 870 | Excl. | | | | | 817 | Excl. | | | | |
| Area : 103,146 km ² | 1070 | Shared | | | | | 1348 | Int. | | | | |
| Population: 6,067,000 | 1440 | Shared | | | | | 1564 | Shared | | | | |
| | 1540 | Shared | | | | | | | | | | |

GREECE

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|---|---|---|---|------|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | 670 | Shared | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 601 | Shared | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| | 990 | Shared | | | | | 772 | Shared | | | | |
| Area : 126,982 km ² | 1050 | Shared | | | | | 1222 | Shared | | | | |
| Population: 7,500,000 | 1330 | Int. | | | | | 1312 | Shared | | | | |
| | 1550 | Shared | | | | | 1348 | Int. | | | | |
| | 1580 | Int. | | | | | 1429 | Int. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 1474 | Shared | | | | |

YUGOSLAVIA

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|---|---|---|----|------|--------|---|---|---|---|
| | 570 | Shared | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 574 | Shared | 5 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| | 690 | Excl. | | | | | 700 | Excl. | | | | |
| | 850 | Excl. | | | | | 1195 | Excl. | | | | |
| Area : 847,857 km ² | 1020 | Excl. | | | | | 1303 | Excl. | | | | |
| Population: 13,930,000 | 1080 | Excl. | | | | | 1348 | Int. | | | | |
| | 1170 | Excl. | | | | | 1429 | Int. | | | | |
| | 1370 | Shared | | | | | 1447 | Excl. | | | | |
| | 1400 | Shared | | | | | 1519 | Shared | | | | |
| | 1490 | Shared | | | | | 1582 | Excl. | | | | |
| | 1510 | Shared | | | | | | | | | | |

(D.35)

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

Observations of the Bulgarian Broadcasting Service relating to the preliminary drafts of the Plans submitted by the Committee of Eight Countries.

Mr. Chairman,

The Bulgarian Delegation, having examined the two preliminary drafts, has the honour to submit to you the following observations:

1. The present situation of Bulgarian broadcasting.

The broadcasting network in medium waves comprises the following four transmitters:

Sofia I - 850 kc/s - 100 KW
Sofia II - 767 kc/s - 60 KW
Varna - 1276 kc/s - 2 KW
Stara Zagora - 1402 kc/s - 2 KW

The power of each of the last two stations will very soon be increased to 20 KW.

In spite of the great power of the national transmitter, and as a result of the mountainous character of the country and of the poor soil conductivity which reaches the level of 10-14 U.E.M.C.G.S., there are in Bulgaria many localities where reception of the national transmitters is impossible.

In addition, we wish to mention the harmful interference caused by the stations (Stavanger, Zaragoza) which share the waves allocated to the Bulgarian transmitters. Owing to the high power of these stations, there is considerable interference in the reception of all of our transmitters, not only abroad, but also within national territory.

On the grounds of the very unfavourable conditions in the country for propagation of waves, the Bulgarian Broadcasting Service submitted to the Committee of Eight Countries at Brussels the following requests:

- a) A longer and exclusive wave (between 450 and 550 m) for the national transmitter - Sofia I;
- b) A wave of about 400 m for the Sofia II transmitter;
- c) For the Varna and Stara Zagora transmitters, longer waves (about 300 m) to be shared with distant stations of limited power;
- d) A shared wave for a small regional station (the power of this station should not be limited to less than 5 KW).

(D.19)

2. The Bulgarian Broadcasting Service had noted that its requests were taken into consideration in the preliminary draft of the 10 kc/s Plan (Doc. No.281). However, concerning the sharing of the 640 kc/s frequency between the Sofia II station and the Helsinki station, the Bulgarian Delegation considers that the great power (100 KW) and relative proximity (1900 km) of Helsinki do not allow of the degree of protection necessary for a satisfactory service in the receiving zone of the Sofia II station. This could be avoided if the Helsinki station used an effective directional aerial.

As to the Sofia I station, the Bulgarian Delegation wishes its frequency to be altered to about 600 kc/s, which would be more favourable from the point of view of propagation.

3. Concerning the 9 kc/s preliminary draft (Doc.No.279), the Bulgarian Delegation submits the following observations:

The frequencies provided for in this Plan do not correspond to the requirements of the Bulgarian broadcasting. Indeed, in this Plan, the frequency of the Sofia I station is changed from 850 to 817 kc/s, but the powerful neighbouring station of Munich (Stuttgart) - 100 KW at 1000 km and with a separation of 9 kc/s - would cause intolerable interference in the receiving zone of the Sofia I station.

In this draft, contrary to our wishes, the number of frequencies has been decreased to 4.

When it is considered that the frequency 1564 kc/s (Varna) is practically unusable, the number of frequencies becomes 3.

In addition, the frequency 1348 kc/s (common international wave) is unacceptable for Bulgarian broadcasting.

It must again be noted that the powers provided for in this draft do not correspond either to the requirements of Bulgarian broadcasting.

4. The Bulgarian Delegation much prefers a separation of 10 kc/s which is consistent with a service of good quality. It considers that the 10 kc/s preliminary draft should serve as a basis for discussion when the new frequency allocation plan is being drawn up.

I have etc.....

For the Head of the Delegation
of Bulgaria (P.R.)

(Signed) Ing. As. Marinov.

(Tr.42/R.4/D.19)

July 14, 1948

Submitted in: Russian

A G E N D A

of

the 4th Plenary Meeting of Committee No 4.

15th July, 1948

2.30 p.m.

1. Reports of the Chairmen of Sub-Committees 4A, 4B, 4C.
2. Study of Document No 49.
3. Study of Document No 284 of the Committee of Eight Countries.

Professor B. Kessenich

Chairman of Committee No 4

St : 30

July 14, 1948

Submitted in: French

BELGIUM - MOROCCO & TUNISIA - SWITZERLAND

DRAFT RESOLUTION

to be adopted by Committee 4

In the terms of reference to Committee 4 (Document No. 48), and taking into account corrections not yet published, it is specified that Committee 4 must submit "recommendations to the Planning Committee by 15 July at the latest".

Draft recommendations, submitted by Sub-Committee 4. B to Committee 4 (Document No. 93) were published on July 13. The above named Delegations make a formal protest against both the form and the substance of Document No. 93. In particular, they cannot accept Document No. 93 as representing a fully enlightened and duly expressed opinion of Sub-Committee 4 B.

In order to expedite the discussions and to allow of the date, July 15 being respected in principle the above mentioned Delegations propose the following resolution for Committee 4:

RESOLUTION

I - For want of time, Committee 4 has not been able to formulate any precise recommendation for the Planning Committee by the prescribed date,

II - However, the Committee suggests that the Conference recommend the Planning Committee to proceed without delay to a detailed analysis of the observations of the various countries, submitted by July 13.

III - For its part, Committee 4 will proceed with the task allotted to it. It states the first aims of Sub-Committee 4 B thus:

"With a view to proceeding later to a constructive analysis of the two Plans contained in Documents 279 and 281, the Sub-Committee shall formulate a method of analysis evincing the various factors which will enable the Committee to evaluate the results of a plan", for example:

- the classification of allocations according to their nature - exclusive or shared - and their position in the spectrum,

- summation of the quantitative results, taking into account the weighting in question in accordance with the above classification.

(RD Doc.100-E)

- general economy of means by statistical methods i.e. summation of surfaces covered with such and such a degree of protection, average sharing distance.....
etc.

Examples are given only to elucidate the meaning of the sentence in inverted commas, which alone is to be submitted for the approval of the Committee, and then of the Assembly.

Statement of Reasons

Such a method only can give results, The Conference is, in fact, faced with the following alternative:

1. either to take no account of the preparatory work of the Committee of Eight Countries - and it is doubtful whether a larger meeting can arrive at better results in a shorter time;
2. or to take prior documentation into account and try to use it to the best advantage, even in its diverse forms. In this case no blunt or incomplete comparison between the two Plans can bear fruit.

The consideration of the two Plans must be carried out at the same time, in a detailed and thorough manner, from two different points of view:

a) from the practical standpoint, by the Planning Committee (No 5) in the light of the observations of the various countries;

b) from the technical standpoint, by Committee 4. This presupposes the previous elaboration of a method of analysis on sound technical and statistical bases.

The above named Delegations have drawn up the present proposal with the sole object of other Delegations to refer to their specialists for all detailed technical suggestions which might promote the propounding of such a method.

(Tr. 5/R.4/D)

St : 30

July 20, 1948

Submitted in: French

LIST

of Documents Nos. 1 to 100 of the European Regional Broadcasting
Conference

Document RD No.

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1 | | Heads of Delegations Meeting (24/5/48) |
| 2 | Denmark | Draft of Formation of Committees |
| 3 | " | Program, Opening Meeting (June 25) |
| 4 | " | Draft Rules of Procedure |
| 5 | - | Joint Meeting of Committees I |
| 6 | - | Draft of Working Methods |
| 7 | Denmark | Report of the Danish Administration |
| 8 | - | Heads of Delegations Mtg. (replaces RD 1) |
| 9 | - | Program, Opening Meeting (June 25) |
| 10 | - | Minutes, 1st Mtg., Heads of Delegations |
| 11 | - | Supplement to Minutes, RD Doc. No. 10 |
| 12 | - | Corrections to Draft Rules of Procedure |
| 13 | - | Agenda, 1st Plenary Meeting. |
| 14 | - | Formal Inauguration of the Conferences. |
| 15 | - | Minutes, 2nd Mtg., Heads of Delegations. |
| 16 | Egypt | Protest Against the State of Israel |
| 17 | Syria | " " " " " " |
| 18 | - | Minutes, 3rd Mtg., Heads of Delegations |
| 19 | Working Group on Voting Rights | Report on the Admission of New Members |
| 20 | Chairman of Conf. | Telegram, Government of Latvia (S.S.R.) |
| 21 | " " " | Telegram, Government of Moldavia (S.S.R.) |
| 22 | " " " | " " " Estonia " |
| 23 | " " " | " " " Lithuania " |
| 24 | " " " | " " " Karelo-Finnish " |
| 25 | - | Correction to heading of RD Doc. No. 18. |
| 26 | - | Minutes, Plenary Ass'y., 1st Mtg. (28-6-48) |
| 27 | France | Amendment to Rule 17, Rules of Procedure |
| 28 | United Kingdom | " " " " " " |
| 29 | - | Minutes, Plenary Ass'y., 1st Mtg. (29-6-48) |
| 30 | - | Minutes, Plenary Ass'y., 1st Mtg. (30-6-48) |
| 31 | - | " " " " " (1-7-48) |
| 32 | Turkey | Requirements of Turkey |
| 33 | Chairman, Conf. | Communication re. submission of Comments on 2nd variants of Brussels Plan. |
| 34 | Egypt | Corrections to RD Doc.16-F(not concerning English text) |

(List of C.E.R. Documents, 1-100)

Document RD No.

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--|
| 35 | Syria | Corrections to RD Doc. 17-E (not concerning English text) |
| 36 | Committee 4 | Program of Work and Organisation, Committee 4 |
| 37 | Committee 2 | Report of 1st Meeting (5-7-48) |
| 38 | United Kingdom | Commentary (ref. RD 33) |
| 39 | Committee 1 | Report of 1st Meeting (3-7-48) |
| 40 | Int'l Chamber | Re. Admission |
| 41 | C.I.R.M. | Re. Admission |
| 42 | Committee 3 | Report of the 1st Meeting (5-7-48) |
| 43 | Committee 3 | Text as documentation for the Committee |
| 44 | O.I.R. | Request for admission |
| 45 | O.I.R. | Request re. distribution of its Documents |
| 46 | Chairman, Conf. | Admission of the State of Israel |
| 47 | - | Agenda for the 2nd Plenary Assembly |
| 48 | Committee 4 | Document replacing RD 36. |
| 49 | Committee 4 | Proposal on technical expert opinion |
| 50 | Committee 3 | Report of the 2nd Meeting (6-7-48) |
| 51 | France | Observations on the two variants |
| 52 | San Marino | Request for Admission to the Conference |
| 53 | - | Analytical Table of Contents, Brussels Docs. |
| 54 | France | Admission of I.C.A.O. |
| 55 | United Kingdom | Draft Convention. |
| 56 | UIR Secretariat | Admission of U.I.R. |
| 57 | Committee 2 | Report of the 2nd Meeting |
| 58 | Committee 3 | Report of the 3rd Meeting (7-7-48) |
| 59 | Iceland | Preliminary Observations on the two variants Docs. 279, 281, 294, Brussels |
| 60 | Committee 3 | Report of the 4th Meeting (8-7-48) |
| 61 | - | Correction to signatures, RD Doc 54 |
| 62 | UNESCO | Admission to the Conference |
| 63 | - | Supplement to Agenda, Document RD 47-E |
| 64 | Committee 4, Sub-Committee 4 B | Data for analysis of draft documentation of Committee of Eight |
| 65 | United Kingdom | Amendment to Document RD 38 (not concerning English text) |
| 66 | Iceland | Amendment to Document RD 59 (not concerning English text) |
| 67 | Lebanon | Observations in reply to RD 33 |
| 68 | Committee 4, Sub-Committee 4 B | Comparative Table No. 2 (follows RD 64) |
| 69 | Morocco & Tunisia | Observations on the 2nd variant |

(List of C.E.R. Documents 1-100)

Document RD No.

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 70 | - | Correction to Document RD 55-E |
| 71 | Netherlands | Comments on preliminary Brussels drafts |
| 72 | Switzerland | Idem. |
| 73 | United Kingdom | Synchronisation of Transmitters |
| 74 | Monaco | Observations on Brussels variants |
| 75 | San Marino | Admission (sequel to RD No.52) |
| 76 | - | Rules of Procedure (replaces RD 4) |
| 77 | - | Correction to Document RD 68 |
| 78 | Egypt & Syria | Observations on Brussels variants |
| 79 | United Kingdom | Wave Propagation Data |
| 80 | Ireland | Observations in reply to RD 33 |
| 81 | Norway | Idem. |
| 82 | Italy | Idem. |
| 83 | Turkey | Idem. |
| 84 | Committee 4 Sub Comm. 4 B | Table 3- Analysis quality of exclusive channels in medium waves. |
| 85 | United Kingdom | Separation in kc/s between adj.channels |
| 86 | <u>Cancelled</u> (Concerned Maritime Conference) | |
| 87 | Chairman, Conf. Communication from Head of U.S. Delegation re. | RD 33 |
| 88 | Finland | Observations in reply to RD 33 |
| 89 | Denmark | Preliminary observations in reply to RD 33. |
| 90 | Luxembourg | Observations in reply to RD 33. |
| 91 | Committee 4 | Report of the 1st Meeting (6-7-48) |
| 92 | Committee 5 | Report of the 1st Meeting (5-7-48) |
| 93 | Committee 4 Sub-Comm. 4 B | Recommendations |
| 94 | United Kingdom | Analysis of the Medium Wave Allocations |
| 95 | Committees 1 | Report of the 2nd Meeting (9-7-48) |
| 96 | Vatican City | Preliminary remarks in reply to RD 33 |
| 97 | Greece | Observations in reply to RD 33 |
| 98 | Bulgaria (P.R.) | Observations in reply to RD 33 |
| 99 | Committee 4 | Agenda of the 4th Plenary Meeting (15-7-48) |
| 100 | Belgium, Morocco, Tunisia, and Switzerland | Draft Resolution to be adopted by Committee 4. |