



## GUIDELINE *IARU REGION 3*

### **Guidelines for a Conference Working Group (WG) Convenor and Secretary**

#### **Index**

This document has the following major sections:

1. **Introduction**
2. **Processes**
3. **Typical Agendas – Working Groups 1 and 2**
4. **“Recommendations” from the WG to the Plenary**
5. **Examples of “Recommendations”**

#### **1. Introduction**

At an IARU Region 3 Conference the detailed consideration of input documents is generally carried out by a number of “**Working Groups**” (WG). Each WG has a Convenor and Secretary appointed for the duration of the conference. Working Group members are drawn from the Delegates and Observers attending, assisted by the **Executive Committee members** ~~Directors~~ as required.

**This “Guideline”** is intended to assist the WG Convenors and Secretaries understand their tasks. It is also designed to improve the clarity of the “Recommendations produced. (The general procedures outlined in this Guideline may also assist the Finance Committee.)

Typically, the work is split between two major WG’s, with the subject matters allocated and aligned with the Conference Agenda. Traditionally the split is:

- Working Group 1 – Policy Matters
- Working Group 2 – Operational and Technical Matters

Sometimes a third (or more) Working Group may be formed if the conference wants to focus work and attention on some particular issue or subject. Such a WG may meet separately, at times that allow all Delegates and Observers to attend.

Since the two major working groups usually meet in parallel, the smaller delegations may find it difficult to attend both groups full time. WG Convenors need to recognise this problem and summarise the state of any discussion if newcomers attend a meeting.

(“**Committees**” are also nominated at the Delegates Meeting of each conference, as required in the “General Regulations”; for Credentials and Elections, Finance, and Editorial matters.)

**Note:** These guidelines were originally written for an in-person conference. They also provide guidance for on-line conferences (such as was held in 2021) when it is not possible to hold an in-person conference.



## 2. Processes

The documents submitted by each Member Society are introduced in the first Plenary stages of the conference by their Delegate. Only the key points are highlighted at this time. The Working Groups consider and discuss the details later in their groups.

The “General Regulations” of the International Amateur Radio Union Region 3 define the activities at the Plenary meeting as follows:

### “CONDUCT OF DISCUSSION

**5.7** In general, the work of the Conference will be based on the written Proposals submitted prior to the Conference though Proposals presented at the Conference may be considered. Copies of Proposals presented at a Conference should be handed to the **ChairmanChair**, the Secretary and to all Delegates.

**5.8** While giving all participants the opportunity to express their points of view, the **ChairmanChair** will endeavour to bring all Agenda items to a satisfactory conclusion, as expeditiously as possible, employing the voting procedure detailed in the Constitution.”

### “WORKING GROUPS

**5.9** After each Delegate who wishes has spoken on a topic, the **ChairmanChair** (of the Conference) may appoint working groups to report to the Conference on any Proposal, part of a Proposal or any other matter. The **ChairmanChair** shall define the terms of reference of any working group and the time that the working group shall present its report, and may appoint any person present at a Conference and willing to be so appointed to be a member of a working group. The **ChairmanChair** shall nominate one member of each working group as Convenor of that group. The **ChairmanChair** shall be an ex officio member of ~~all these~~ working groups ~~appointed by him~~ and in addition any other delegate may attend but not, without the permission of the Convenor of the working group, participate in any meeting of any working group. Any decision of the **ChairmanChair** in relation to the appointment of working groups of their terms of reference may be varied by a decision of the Conference.

Summary records of their work, in a form suitable for the Convenor to present to a Plenary Meeting, will be prepared by each working group.”

The Convenor and the Secretary of the WG therefore have the task to ensure that discussions cover all the documents submitted. They also have to prepare a summary record report of the outputs from the working group, including clear recommendations that the later Plenary meetings can discuss and adopt. More details of this are provided later in this Guideline.

The Secretary of IARU Region 3 will provide a standard template for the Summary Record Reports.

## 3. Typical Agendas – Working Groups 1 and 2

The two major “Working Groups” typically have the following agendas:

### **Working Group 1 – Policy Matters**

- 1.1 IARU Region 3 Policy
  - 1.1.1 Membership
  - 1.1.2 IARU Region 3 Strategic Plan (if any)



- 1.2 International/Regional Telecommunication Conferences, Meetings and Events:
  - 1.2.1 WRC – the next forthcoming WRC
  - 1.2.2 ITU Radiocommunication sector (ITU-R), APT/APG and Other Meetings
  - 1.2.3 ITU-TELECOM exhibitions scheduled
- 1.3 IARU Administrative Council Matters
  - 1.3.1 Any Administrative Council Resolutions tabled for action
  - 1.3.2 Future of IARU
- 1.4 Harmonization of License Qualifications
- 1.5 STARS\*\*\* (Support for the Amateur Radio Service in IARU Region 3)
- 1.6 Region 3 Newsletter and IARU Region 3 Web
- 1.7 Other Policy Matters

### **Working Group 2 – Operational and Technical Matters**

- 1.1. IARU Monitoring System
- 1.2. International Beacons
- 1.3. Data Transmissions and Amateur Radio
- 1.4. Amateur Radio Direction Finding (ARDF)
- 1.5. Region 3 Award
- 1.6. Emergency Communications
  - 1.6.1. (Calling) Frequencies for Emergency Communication
- 1.7. Other Operational/Technical Matters
- 1.8. Review and Revision, if any, of the Existing Region 3 Band Plans for HF, VHF and UHF bands
- 1.9. Amateur Satellite
- 1.10. EMC and Standards
- 1.11. EMR and Standards

~~(NOTE: These two Agenda lists need to be checked for correctness and ordered in a logical sequence, or are they OK as is?— Peter)~~

### **Band Plans – Special Notes**

Not all member societies will submit a copy of their current band plans, even though requested to do so. Those that are submitted must be examined and compared with the existing IARU Region 3 band plans. Any changes need to be identified and recommended, band by band. If necessary, a specialist sub-working group needs to be convened to do the detailed work. It is not sufficient to just “Note” these Band Plan input documents. The Band Plans must be kept up to date, and this is a challenge.



#### 4. “Recommendations” from the WG to the Plenary

The wording of “Recommendations” is a continuing source of difficulty for WG Convenors and their Secretaries. If they are poorly worded and questioned in the Plenary – then the WG will often be requested to meet again and to re-submit the item. Otherwise, they will be amended in the Plenary. Both options waste valuable time. If they are approved but still poorly worded, they will generally be unable to be actioned – and nothing will result during the next 3 years until another regional Conference.

Some of the input documents from the Member Societies will already have clear Recommendations and cover only a single issue or WG agenda item. Discussion by the participants in the WG may modify such recommendations, however. Other inputs may not be very clear and will need to have a recommendation drafted that reflects the member society input, including any modification arising from views expressed in the WG.

The key questions for any Recommendation are:

- Has the requirement/recommendation been clearly expressed?
- Is the topic confined to a single issue or WG agenda item?
- Who is tasked with implementing it?
- What time frame is recommended?
- Are any resources required that can be identified?
- How are the outcomes to be reported back to the next Conference?
- Does it make sense and is it feasible to carry out?

Ultimately the Recommendations will be summarised in the “Summary Record Report” of the Conference, and most will need to be implemented in some way.

#### 5. Examples of “Recommendations”

Following are some examples of suitable formats and wording from “Plenary Summary Record Reports” to assist WG Convenors and Secretaries:

(A) **Recommendation WG1-1**

That IARU Region 3 Member Societies recognize the importance of the role of the regional telecommunications organizations, and in particular the APT, and that the Member Societies participate so far as possible in the activities of the APT; including national preparation and participation in delegations.

(B) **Recommendation WG1-2**

That the Conference endorses and recommends the principles set out in the booklet *Ethics and Operating Procedures for the Radio Amateur* by ON4UN and ON4WW and encourages Member Societies to distribute it as widely as possible, with supplementary material appropriate to their country.

(D) **Recommendation WG1-3**

That to improve mutual communications the IARU Region 3 Member Societies and Directors, including the Secretary, should use the Region 3 Newsletter and the website.



(E) **Recommendation WG1-4**

That e-mails and correspondence should be addressed to the IARU Liaison Officer, with copies to the President and the Secretary of each Member Society.

(F) **Recommendation WG1-5**

That the Conference recognises the diminishing number of amateurs in many societies and urges all member societies to explore every avenue to publicise the benefits of amateur radio to the public, by Internet, public media, publications, specialised media and public display opportunities.

(H) **Recommendation WG2-1**

That member societies again be urged to examine the IARU ‘Model Provision’ of the ITU Radio Regulations 25.3 and 25.9A, and advise the Secretary in writing within 12 months of this Conference the situation in their nation about the implementation of those regulations.

(I) **Recommendation WG2-2**

That member societies, noting the worthy contributions of several societies via their reports at the 14<sup>th</sup> conference; should provide details of emergency communications and preparations/training for emergencies as a standard reporting matter in all future triennial society reports.

(J) **Recommendation WG2-3**

Noting the positive public relations achieved in relation to a number of emergencies in which amateur radio provided support, it is recommended that member societies and their emergency groups include in their planning how best to publicise such activities and consider the appointment of a dedicated individual or individuals responsible for national and international publicity and promotion.

(K) **Recommendation WG2-4**

That the Region 3 ARDF Committee be tasked with expanding the number of Region 3 Societies who participate in ARDF, including the possibility of developing a new category of competition that places greater emphasis on technical skill rather than physical fitness.

(L) **Recommendation WG2-5**

That Region 3 Societies commend the project by AMSAT-ZL to construct a New Zealand satellite.

-----