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# 1 Opening remarks and approval of the agenda

The Chairman welcomed the participants to the second meeting of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482 emphasizing the need for the Group to work together in a spirit of consensus and stressing that further progress needs to be made based on data provided by the Radiocommunication Bureau (BR).

The draft agenda, Document [EG-DEC482-2/1](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG2DEC482-C-0001/en), was slightly modified to include the discussion on the working methods and establishment of priorities and approved as Revision 1 to Document EG-DEC482-2/1.

The ITU’s Deputy Secretary-General, Mr Tomas Lamanauskas, welcomed the participants, highlighting the growing importance of space services, as evidenced by the space-related items on the WRC-27 agenda. Technological advances and the rise of non-geostationary satellite systems have increased the complexity and workload of frequency assignment processing, which will require additional financial resources. The Deputy Secretary-General stressed that a stable cost recovery mechanism aligned with PP Resolution 91 is considered essential for long-term funding, and also reported that the recent meeting of the Council Working Group on Financial and Human Resources also discussed this issue in terms of the overall amount of costs associated with the entire satellite registration process, as indicated in the liaison statement [EG-DEC482-2/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG2DEC482-C-0002/en) sent to the Council Expert Group on Decision 482. The purpose of this meeting is to revise Decision 482 to improve cost recovery, avoid delays and prepare a report for the 2025 Council session. The Deputy Secretary-General concluded by calling for collaboration to ensure accurate and effective solutions.

# 2 Report of the first meeting of EG-DEC482

The Chair presented the report from the first meeting, Document [EG-DEC482-1/4](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG1DEC482-C-0004/en), where the group suggested holding an additional session before the next Council meeting. The Chair supported this proposal and recommended revisiting the idea once substantial progress has been achieved in the discussions.

# 3 Report by the Chair of the Standing Committee on Administration and Management of ITU Council 2024 (Section 26, 27, Annex L)

The Report by the Chair of the Standing Committee on Administration and Management, Document [C24/109](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-CL-C-0109/en), was presented and particular attention was paid to Annex L concerning an amendment to Decision 482 with the introduction of a cost recovery fee for requests submitted in accordance with Resolution **121 (WRC-23)** for using frequency assignments in the List of Appendix **30B** and in MIFR in support of the operations of an earth station in motion (Appendix **30B** ESIM) and received by the Radiocommunication Bureau on or after 1 January 2025.

# 4 Liaison statement from CWG-FHR to Council Expert Group on Decision 482

The group acknowledged the liaison statement from Document [EG-DEC482-2/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG2DEC482-C-0002/en) and Document [CWG-FHR-19/8](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-CWGFHR19-C-0008/en), which outlines the full costs related to the processing of space notices. It was noted that discussing the calculation of these full costs falls outside the group's mandate. The group noted that the Finance Department would provide further details on the structure and calculation of the 22 810 million CHF mentioned in the document as full costs at the next CWG-FHR meeting. Members interested in this topic could attend CWG-FHR meeting for further discussion. The group agreed to take note of this document and will try its best to provide an interim report on its efforts at the next meeting of CWG-FHR.

# 5 Data on processing of satellite network filings

BR presented the 10 items in Document [EG-DEC482-2/3](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG2DEC482-C-0003/en), prioritizing, as agreed by the meeting, those related to non-GSO satellite systems. The order of presentation was as follows: a), f), g), h), b), c), d), e), i) and j). The group noted that the data provided by BR is very detailed and comprehensive which is helpful for its discussion, but also expressed its serious concern for the late publication of the relevant document.

a) In the case of non-receivable filings, the appropriateness or otherwise of charging a fraction of the amount of an equivalent receivable filing for such cases, taking into account the needs of developing countries

 Most non-receivable cases occur when there is no response within 30 days. Without a response, invoices cannot be issued, as there is no date of receipt, as specified in Council Decision 482. The cost of processing a non-receivable API may range from 70% to 80% of the cost for a normal published API, while the cost for other filings is generally lower, around 40% of the overall cost.

*The Group requested that the Bureau explain where the above-mentioned percentage comes from and how much the fee could be increased by charging a fraction of the amount of an equivalent receivable filing for non-receivable filings. Additionally, in cases of non-receivability, the Group noted the need for further study to determine whether using the date of submission, rather than the date of receipt for the amendment to the Annex to Council Decision 482 is appropriate.*

f) The costs of processing non-GSO filings having more than 75 000 units or, alternatively, whether the formula to compute units for such non-GSO satellite systems should take into account the impact of the number of different orbital altitudes, number of satellites, number of earth stations, or other characteristics affecting workload associated with the processing of non-GSO systems

 Since 1 January 2020, the Bureau has received 10 non-GSO satellite systems exceeding 75 000 units (9 coordination requests and 1 notification), with processing times ranging from 5.8 to 13.6 months. Regarding the regulatory and technical examination, the statistics generally indicate that factors such as the number of different orbital altitudes or satellites do not solely determine the workload. A potential approach to calculating the number of units could involve considering the number of unique frequency ranges for each applicable form of coordination, both for uplink and downlink. Additionally, weighting factors could be introduced for specific coordination forms that require more extensive workload.

*The Group noted that the current methodology for calculation of units is based on GSO satellite networks and that several differences exist with the case of non-GSO satellite systems. The Group requested that the Bureau add a description of the more complex and larger non-GSO systems in the update to the document, and suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482 revising the ceilings, in particular that of 75 000 units and also reconsidering the methodology for calculating units for non-GSO satellite systems.*

g) Consider the introduction of units in categories A1 and N4, with a different fee being charged for more complex or larger systems, depending on the number of units

 The average examination time for non-GSO satellite networks or systems subject to coordination is 14% longer than for GSO satellite networks. On average, a non-GSO satellite system that is not subject to coordination requires only 29% of the time needed to examine a non-GSO satellite system that is subject to coordination. For submissions in the A1 category, it is proposed that units be defined as the product of the number of frequency ranges, the number of station classes, and the number of emissions, summed across all frequency groups. For submissions in the N4 category, units could be calculated in the same way as for categories C1 to C3 or N1 to N3. When it comes to RR No. **9.21**, the workload is almost identical to that for non-GSO satellite systems subject to coordination.

*The Group noted that significant changes to the fee structure of the small satellite networks should be avoided when considering the introduction of units in categories A1 and N4. The Group requested that the Bureau update data related to time spent in processing of these satellite filings in the relevant statistic, and suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482 to take account of the ideas set out above.*

h) An additional fee for recovering the costs of epfd examination of coordination requests and notifications.

 The average examination time for non-GSO satellite networks or systems subject to coordination is 14% longer than for GSO satellite networks. However, when epfd (equivalent power flux-density) calculations are required, the examination time increases by nearly 40%. It is proposed that the complexity of the epfd examination be assessed based on the number of "sets of validated epfd parameters" and the number of "examination scenarios." Furthermore, it is suggested that seven sets of epfd parameters be considered a threshold, beyond which the overall cost recovery fee would increase for each additional set of epfd parameters. A single examination scenario would be regarded as the baseline, already included in the flat fee, with additional examination scenarios subject to supplementary fees.

*The Group had a detailed discussion on the proposed methodology of the complexity of the epfd examination proposed by BR and noted the possible relationship with the update of current Recommendation ITU-R S.1503. The Group requested that the Bureau suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482 with the inclusion of additional processing charges to be applied to satellite networks or systems subject to epfd limits contained in Article* ***22*** *of the Radio Regulations considering the number of sets of validated epfd parameters and number of examination scenarios.*

b) Whether there are categories of filings for non-GSO satellite systems that, due to their complexity, should not be eligible for free entitlement

 Most requests pertain to filings related to coordination requests or notifications within the categories C2, C3, N2, and P1, which are the costliest categories. There is consideration as to whether certain limitations should be imposed on filings eligible for exemption from charges. For instance, eligibility could be restricted to filings with a national service area or exclude non-GSO filings that involve multiple configurations and/or are subject to epfd limits.

*The Group noted the importance of maintaining the current free entitlement mechanism but considering certain limitations imposed on filings eligible for exemption from charges. The Group requested that the Bureau suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Council Decision 482 to indicate that filings related to “large non-GSO satellite systems” will not be eligible for free entitlement. Additionally, the Bureau is asked to describe which types of non-GSO should be considered as “large non-GSO satellite systems”.*

c) Whether specific fees should be paid for processing submissions related to earth stations in motion, while avoiding double invoicing

 An ESIM notice is essentially treated as a space station notice, and the workload required to process it is equivalent to that of processing a space station notice. While most AP**30B** notices involve both an uplink and a downlink, AP**30B** ESIM notices involve only the uplink. However, AP**30B** ESIM notices require more stringent limit checks and additional examinations to ensure compatibility between the ESIMs themselves. Council Decision 482, as amended in 2024, establishes the same cost recovery fees for ESIM AP**30B** submissions as for standard AP**30B** submissions.

*The Group requested that the Bureau reassess the workload involved in processing ESIM notices submitted under Resolutions* ***121 (WRC-23)****,* ***123 (WRC-23)****, and* ***169 (Rev.WRC-23)****, with a view to fully implementing the Resolutions in their entirety. It was noted that the comprehensive implementation of these Resolutions and their annexes entails a workload that exceeds that of processing a single space notice.*

d) The cost of processing resubmissions of notification requests.

 The percentage of resubmissions for GSO satellites increased from 29% to 122%, while for non-GSO satellites subject to coordination, the increase was from 10% to 68%, comparing the periods 2002-2005 and 2020-2023. When technical characteristics are modified in a resubmission, the revised notice must be examined by comparing the updated characteristics, which may require additional regulatory and technical examination.

*During the meeting, concerns were expressed about the idea of charging each resubmission separately. The possibility of charging resubmissions, particularly those with modified technical characteristics, which lead to a lot of workload, was discussed. The Group requested that the Bureau suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482 to address this issue. The possible amendments would introduce an additional fee for notices that are likely to be resubmitted under RR No.* ***11.46****, to be included in the first notification fee, thereby reducing the need for multiple invoices.*

e) The costs associated with the BR’s implementation of additional provisions: Resolutions 4 (Rev.WRC-03) and 49 (Rev.WRC-23), Nos. 11.32A, 11.41, 11.47, 11.49, Subsection IID of Article 9, Sections 1 and 2 of Article 13, Article 14

 The workload associated with various provisions related to notified or recorded frequency assignment including but not limited to RR Nos. **11.32A**, **11.41A**, **11.41B**, **11.47**, **11.49**, Subsection IID of Article **9**, and Sections 1 and 2 of Article **13**, as well as the application of No. **23.13** and Resolution **35 (Rev.WRC-23)** should be considered when determining the fee for the corresponding notifications. However, rather than charging a separate fee for each individual provision, the increased workload should be accounted for within the overall fee structure.

*The Group noted that charging a separate fee for each provision should be avoided and that assistance to developing countries should not be charged. The Group also discussed whether it is necessary to increase the fee for notification considering that the current fee for notification is already high. The Group requested that the Bureau provide, if possible, more information about the workload and suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482 to address this issue. The possible amendments could introduce an additional fee, ranging from 10% to 30% of the first notification fee, taking into account that certain provisions, such as Resolution* ***49*** *or Resolution* ***35****, are not applied to all notifications.*

i) Consequences of modifications introduced by any WRC after WRC-2000, if any, to regulatory provisions governing the Space Plans

 It is proposed two options to cover the costs associated with the second examination of Part B submissions: either charge a separate additional fee equal to half the Part B fee or increase the Part B fee by 50%.

*The Group requested that the Bureau suggest, for the next meeting, possible amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482 to introduce an additional fee for filings requiring further examination, set at half the fee for Part B.*

j) The cost of dedicated resources needed to continually update and modernize the Bureau software applications used for satellite filings. However, satellite cost recovery should not be used to fund the development of software tools for processing terrestrial filings.

 Costs of updating or modernizing software applications used for satellite filings and financial impact of WRC-23 decisions in terms of space software updates are provided.

*The Group took note of the provided information and reiterated that the costs of updating or modernizing the software applications used for satellite filings cannot be included in the costs of satellite filings. These costs should be assessed following each World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC). The Group also emphasized the need for a clear and specific budget to be allocated for the implementation of WRC decisions, to avoid the need to request assistance from administrations or to dip into the existing budget.*

Finally, the Group requested that the Bureau update the document of the data on processing of satellite network filings based on the comments and requests during the meeting.

# 6 Review of Document [EG-DEC482-2/DT/1](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG2DEC482-241104-TD-0001/en)

The Bureau presented the document titled “Elements for cost recovery for satellite network filings”, which proposes amendments to the Annex to Council Decision 482. These amendments include the creation of a new annex for specific types of submissions related to large non-GSO systems, the introduction of new categories, and the establishment of revised fee ceilings, different from the current ones.

The meeting also noted the provisions of *resolves* 4i) of Resolution 91 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), which requires the recovery of both direct and indirect costs for products and services, as detailed in *noting c)* of the Resolution. It was emphasized that the Bureau is responsible for managing direct costs, while the Financial Resources and Management Department oversees the management of indirect costs. The total fee, which will include both direct and indirect cost structures, must be approved by the Council.

The Group expressed concerns regarding Resolution 91, noting that its implementation or revision falls outside the mandate of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482. The Group also requested that the Bureau prepare, for the next meeting, a comprehensive review of the Annex to Council Decision 482. This review should take into account the proposals outlined in items a) to j). Additionally, the Bureau was asked to consider whether it would be more appropriate to have two separate annexes to Council Decision 482, or to consolidate them into a single annex with a complementary or sub-annex.

# 7 Date(s) of next meeting(s)

The meeting confirmed that the third session of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482 will be held from 10 to 11 February 2025. Additionally, a virtual meeting will be organized on 14 January 2025, during which the Bureau will present the documents requested at the second meeting. This presentation will be followed by a Q&A session.

# 8 Any other business

In closing, the Chair thanked the ITU’s Deputy Secretary-General, all the ITU Member States and Sector Members who participated in the meeting of the Expert Group (including those who participated remotely), BR staff and the Secretariat for their efficient assistance during the meeting.
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