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| **Purpose**  This document contains the final report of the Council Expert Group on Council Decision 482 to the 2025 session of the Council, based on the terms of reference of the Expert Group, as indicated in Annex to [Decision 632](https://www.itu.int/md/S23-CL-C-0126/en) (C23).  **Action required by the Council**  The Council is invited to **consider** the possible revisions to Decision 482 (C01, last amended C24) contained in this document and **agree** on draft revisions to this Decision.  **Relevant link(s) with the Strategic Plan**  Universal connectivity; Spectrum for Space and Terrestrial Services; Development and application of the ITU Administrative Regulations; Allocation and management of resources.  **Financial implications**  The cost recovery charges for satellite network filings that need to be recovered through revisions of Decision 482 are assessed in document [C25/64](https://www.itu.int/md/S25-CL-C-0064/en), and the financial impact of the modifications to Decision 482 (C01, last amended C24) that are proposed by the Expert Group are assessed by the secretariat in a separate document ([C25/74](https://www.itu.int/md/S25-CL-C-0074/en)), which also includes an example of the modifications to Decision 482 (C01, last amended C24) that would be needed to bridge the gap between the estimated financial implications of the Expert Group's proposals and cost recovery requirements.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **References**  *Annex to Council* [*Decision 632*](https://www.itu.int/md/S23-CL-C-0126/en) *(C23) and Council* [*Decision 482*](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-CL-C-0135/en) *(C01, last amended C24)* | |

# 1 Introduction

At its 2023 session, the Council established a Council Expert Group on Decision 482. The terms of reference of this Group are listed in the Annex to [Decision 632 (C23)](https://www.itu.int/md/S23-CL-C-0126/en).

This Group, chaired by Ms Fenhong CHENG (China), held four meetings on 22-23 January 2024, 4-5 November 2024, 10-11 February 2025, and 10-11 April 2025 in the ITU headquarters in Geneva.

Following a very detailed examination of each item outlined in Annex to Decision 632 (C23), this report contains a summary of discussions and recommendations about possible revisions of Decision 482.

# 2 General considerations for cost recovery

Taking into account Resolution 91 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), the Group agreed to the general considerations for cost recovery as follows:

– cost recovery charges applicable to various satellite network filings should be transparent, reviewed with care and reflect the actual costs by the Radiocommunication Bureau (BR) to process satellite network filings in accordance with Resolution 91 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010);

– the amount of the fees for cost recovery for non-GSO satellite system fillings should depend on the number of filings to BR and the threshold cost for large non-GSO satellite system filing should be increased since it requires a lot of ITU resources to process.

Moreover, the Group noted the provisions of Resolution 91 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), regarding the recovery of both direct and indirect costs for products and services, as detailed in *noting* c) of the Resolution. It was emphasized that BR is responsible for managing direct costs, while the Financial Resources and Management Department oversees the management of indirect costs. The Group also noted that the interpretation or revision of Resolution 91 should be within the purview of the Plenipotentiary Conference and falls outside the mandate of the Council Expert Group on Decision 482.

# 3 Review of items listed in the Annex of Decision 632 (C23)

It was noted during the first meeting of the Council Expert Group during the period 2018-2022 and reiterated in the introduction of Document [EG-DEC482-2/3](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EG2DEC482-C-0003/en), that “the use of an individual staff tracking mechanism for processing satellite network filings was implemented in the early 2000 but finally abandoned in 2005”. As such, the data and information provided by BR are based on its internal assessment.

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

Data and information provided by BR

The majority of non-receivable cases occur due to a lack of response within 30 days and not as a result of submissions from developing countries. Non-receivable filings are identified after the completion of the completeness check, which can be estimated as follows in terms of the total processing work for a submission:

– Advance publication of information (API): 85%

– Coordination request (CR/C): 50%

– Notification in non-planned bands: 60%

– Space Plans[[1]](#footnote-2):

• RR Appendices **30** and **30A**: Part A 30%, Part-B 60%, Notification 30%, Article 2A 30%

• RR Appendix **30B**: Part-A 30%, Part-B 40% and Notification 30%.

Non-receivability cases fall into two categories: either BR determines the submission is not receivable, or it is deemed incomplete, prompting BR to request additional information or clarification within 30 days. Non-receivability is only determined either after BR returns the submission with an indication of non-receivability or when the 30-day period for providing clarifications expires.

BR suggested that the invoicing process for non-receivable or incomplete submissions should begin on the date the submission is returned or on the date the 30-day clarification period expires. In cases of incomplete submissions, where the required clarifications are provided after the 30-day period, the remaining fee would become due, and the invoicing process for this second portion would start from the date of response to BR’s query.

BR proposed to revise Decision 482 by adding a new *decides* 2o) and a footnote giving the proposed percentage of fees to be invoiced for cases of non-receivable filings, according to the same categories listed in the Annex to Decision 482.

Summary of discussion

Some members supported the proposal by BR with the same or different percentage for coordination request and notification in non-planned bands, some members believed that this item would only apply when no reply is received by BR to a completeness communication within the regulatory period stipulated in BR communication. Some other members proposed that no amendment to Decision 482 should be made under this item due to minimal costs recovered by charging non-receivable filings.

The Group concluded that the revenues generated by charging non-receivable filings would be minimal, making its impact negligible. Therefore, the Group decided to focus on items that could generate more significant revenues and made no amendment to Decision 482 under this item.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482***

*No amendment to Council Decision 482.*

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

Data and information provided by BR

Most requests for free entitlement concern filings related to coordination requests or notifications within the categories C2, C3, N2 and P1 (the most expensive categories). There was consideration of imposing limitations on filings eligible for exemption from charges, such as restricting eligibility to filings with a national service area or excluding non-GSO filings with multiple configurations or those subject to epfd limits.

Recognizing that the intent of this item is to recover costs for submissions requiring significant ITU resources, non-GSO satellite systems meeting at least one of the following three criteria should be considered “large non-GSO satellite systems” and excluded from eligibility for exemption:

– non-GSO satellite systems with more than 25 000 units;

– non-GSO satellite systems containing two or more mutually exclusive configurations;

– non-GSO satellite systems subject to epfd limits of Article **22** of the Radio Regulations.

The above could be implemented into a revised Decision 482 by inserting exceptions for “large non-GSO satellite systems” to the free entitlement mechanism in *decides* 4.

Summary of discussion

All members supported that “large non-GSO satellite systems” should not be eligible for free entitlement. Considering the methodology for computing units for non-GSO satellite system is changed under item f), some members proposed to exclude non-GSO satellite systems with more than 50 000 units from eligibility for free entitlement filings but finally accepted BR’s proposal.

Some members also proposed the Expert Group on Decision 482 to include the specificities of submissions under Resolution **170** **(Rev.WRC-23)** in its report to the ITU Council and to suggest that all submissions made under Resolution **170** **(Rev.WRC-23)** be exempted from cost-recovery fees. After discussion, the Group agreed to emphasize that submissions under Resolution **170** are eligible for free entitlement per year. With respect to the proposal that all submissions made under Resolution **170** **(Rev.WRC-23)** be exempted from cost-recovery fees, in addition to any earlier exemptions made under that Resolution, interested Member States on this matter may wish, if they deemed appropriate, to send their request directly to the Council.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

*Decides 4 of Council Decision 482 was subsequently amended as follows:*

4that each Member State shall be entitled to the publication of Special Sections or parts of BR IFIC (Space Services) for one satellite network filing, including the application of Resolution **170** **(Rev.WRC-23)** (except non-GSO satellite system filings meeting at least one of the three following criteria:

a) non-GSO satellite systems with more than 25 000 units,

b) non-GSO satellite systems containing two or more mutually exclusive configurations,

c) non-GSO satellite systems subject to Nos. **22.5C**, **22.5D**, **22.5F** and **22.5L** of Article **22** of the Radio Regulations),

each year without the charges referred to above. Each Member State in its role as the notifying administration may determine which network shall benefit from the free entitlement[[2]](#footnote-3);

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

Data and information provided by BR

The workload involved in the processing of ESIM notices from submission until publication of the special section was described by BR. An ESIM notice is essentially a space station notice and the workload to process such a notice is equivalent to the workload for processing a notification of a space station.

At its 2024 session, the Council instructed the Expert Group on Decision 482 to review the cost recovery aspects of earth stations in motion subject to Resolution **121** **(WRC-23)** of the Radio Regulations in order to include a further update of Decision 482, if required, in its report to the 2025 session of the Council. 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.

In addition, Resolutions **121 (WRC-23)** and **123 (WRC-23)** alsocontain provisions in the event that unacceptable interference is reported, which would add to the overall implementation workload of BR, should it occur. Noting that these provisions are applied only in cases of the actual occurrence of unacceptable interference and the lack of experience since they have only entered into force on 1 January 2025, it is difficult to estimate the workload associated with such provisions and to compute a corresponding fee that would be added to the processing costs of every such submission. Alternatively, the Expert Group may consider a mechanism by which a fee is paid only in cases where unacceptable interference is actually reported.

In response to a request of Members, BR also provided the summary of specific actions for the processing of ESIM under under Resolutions **156** **(Rev.WRC-23)**, **169 (Rev.WRC-23)**, **121 (WRC-23)** and **123 (WRC-23)**.

Summary of discussion

During the discussion, it was established that the information available was insufficient to assess the real cost of processing ESIM submissions. The issue of interference management costs was raised but was subsequently not addressed.

Taking into account that currently there is no enough experience to address the case of cost recovery for ESIMs referred to in Resolutions contained below, it was agreed that this issue needs to be reviewed once sufficient number of ESIM under Resolutions **121 (WRC-23)** and **123 (WRC-23)** are submitted in order to have a clearer understating on the evolutions of the matter. Once that data is available, the BR should submit to the Council an approach on how to deal with cost recovery for ESIMs for its consideration and necessary actions, as appropriate.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

At the end of *decides* 1*quinquies*, add “See relevant part of final report of Council Expert Group on Decision 482 in this regard.”

d) The cost of processing resubmissions of notification requests.

Data and information provided by BR

Between the periods 2002-2005 and 2020‑2023, the percentage of resubmissions for GSO has increased from 29% to 122%, and for non-GSO subject to coordination, it has risen from 10% to 68%. When technical characteristics are modified in a resubmission, the resubmitted notice must be examined by comparing the revised characteristics, which may require additional regulatory and technical examination.

Notifications falling under categories N1 to N3 (i.e. those related to satellite systems subject to coordination) are those most likely to be resubmitted under No. **11.46** as examination under Nos. **11.32** and **11.32A** applies only to these cases. It is therefore proposed to add a note in the description of these three categories, indicating that an additional fee equal to 80% of the initial fee will be charged for these categories. This percentage reflects the possibility that certain notifications may be resubmitted twice (i.e. after unfavourable findings under No. **11.32** and after unfavourable findings under No. **11.32A**) and acknowledges that resubmissions may involve modified technical parameters. The value of 80% is an average between different cases of resubmissions (i.e. with or without modified technical parameters, updating information on coordination agreements or not, applying No. **11.32A** or not) in order to avoid the need for multiple invoices as requested by the Expert Group.

Summary of discussion

During the discussion, a lot of members expressed their serious concern on the imposition of an additional fee for resubmissions that do not involve modifications to technical characteristics. BR reiterated on several occasions that all resubmissions, regardless of whether they include modifications, require additional work from BR, including publication in Parts I, II, or III, as well as regulatory and technical examination. BR also highlighted the significant increase in the number of resubmissions since 2005, when the current cost structure, outlined in the annex to Council Decision 482, was established. Furthermore, BR noted that fewer than two resubmissions per year relate to changes in technical characteristics, and that charging only for these specific cases would result in a minimal financial impact.

The Group decided to add a note in the description of categories N1 to N3 indicating that an additional fee equal to 60% of the corresponding flat fee (compared to the current value in Decision 482) will be charged for resubmissions under No. **11.46** to notices when they require a new technical examination.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

Note: The first resubmission of notices in categories N1, N2, and N3 which includes new technical characteristics, under No. **11.46**, shall be charged an additional fee of CHF 18 540, CHF 34 750, and CHF 34 750 respectively, to cover the examination and processing of the resubmission.

e) The costs associated with 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, Sub-section IID of Article 9, Sections 1 and 2 of Article 13, Article 14

Data and information provided by BR

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 within the overall fee structure.

More information on the workload related to these provisions for any given filing, further elements to justify why notifications under categories N1 to N3 entail much more work than under category N4, and additional justification about the need to distinguish between notifications of satellite networks or systems not subject to coordination and those of satellite networks or systems subject to RR No. **9.21** only were also provided.

The possible amendments are to increase the starting fee and the flat fee of categories N1 to N3 by 20% compared to the value of 2005 (i.e. the one currently contained in the Annex to Decision 482). These categories relate to the notification of satellite networks and systems that are subject to coordination, which are also those linked with the application of most of the additional provisions decided by WRCs since 2005.

Summary of discussion

Some members expressed their support to BR proposal. Some other members expressed the view that resubmissions under these provisions are wholly or partially covered by this item e) and that the increase in item d) above should be removed or reduced accordingly.

The Group agreed to implement this item by increasing the starting fee, flat fee, and the per unit fee of categories N1, N2, and N3 by 20% (compared to the current value in Decision 482), noting the links with item d).

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

*The flat fee, the start fee and fee per unit have been increased by 20% for categories N1, N2 and N3.*

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

Data and information provided by BR

Since 1 January 2020, BR 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.

Ceilings in the fee structure inherently create difficulties to properly recover the costs associated with the processing of filings having more units than the threshold value corresponding to the ceiling, because adding units beyond the threshold level does not result in increased fees. In order to minimize this issue, while also keeping a cap on cost recovery invoices, it is suggested to raise the threshold number of units at which the fee ceiling starts from 75 000 to 500 000 (noting that the maximum number of units for a given satellite system received by BR had reached 485 640 in previous years). Concerning the methodology for calculating units for non-GSO satellite systems, it is suggested to insert in the computation of units the number of different sets of orbital planes and the number of forms of coordination per frequency range in the description of the cost recovery unit for categories of coordination (C) and notification (N).

Summary of discussion

The Group acknowledges that the substantial workload associated with processing non-GSO filings inevitably results in charging more for non-GSO satellite systems.

Regarding methodology for calculating units for non-GSO satellite systems

It is noted that in the current Decision 482, the total number of units for categories of coordination and notification is defined as below:

Various options[[3]](#footnote-4) for the methodology of calculating units were presented and carefully discussed taking into account the Bureau’s suggestion and proposals of members of the group.

Regarding ceilings of 75 000 units in the fee structure

The formula for the cost recovery fee used in Decision 482 is given below:

─until a max of 75 000 units

Various options[[4]](#footnote-5) for the ceilings were presented and carefully discussed taking into account the Bureau’s suggestion and proposals of members of the Group.

After extensive and lengthy discussions, the Group agreed in its capacity to introduce multiplier in the formula of calculating units and the multiplier is defined in footnote f) to reflect the increased complexity to process large filings, and to revise footnote e) to reflect the revised slope and no upper ceiling. It was indicated that the footnotes in the box below, may require further review and refinements to more precisely reflect the prevailing situation.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

 change the formula of calculating units as product of the number of frequency assignments, number of classes of station, and the number of emissions, and a multiplier in footnote f), summed up for all frequency assignment groups.

 add note f) The multiplier for each frequency group shall be the sum of factors A and B but not less than 1, factor A being 80% of the number of sets of orbital planes associated with the group under consideration, factor B being 20% of the mean number of satellites per set of orbital planes associated with the group under consideration divided by 1 000 and rounded up. For the purposes of Decision 482, two orbital planes are in the same set if they have the same value of apogee, perigee, angle of inclination and, in the case of non-circular orbits, the same value of the argument of the perigee.

 change note e) For non-geostationary satellite networks, the flat fee for categories A1, C1, C2, C3, N1, N2, N3, N4 and N5 is applicable from 100 units to 25 000 units. From 25 000 units to 75 000 units, there is an additional fee per additional unit, equal to the flat fee divided by 50 000. Above 75 000 units, there is an additional fee per additional unit, equal to the flat fee divided by 400 000.

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

Data and information provided by BR

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 categorized under A1 (i.e., API), it is proposed that units be defined as the product of the number of frequency ranges, the number of classes of stations, and the number of emissions, summed across all frequency groups. For submissions in the N4 category, units could be computed in the same manner as for categories C1 to C3 or N1 to N3. When No. **9.21** is involved, the workload is nearly identical to that of non-GSO satellite systems subject to coordination. Non-GSO satellite systems whose reference body is not Earth, and which are subject to pfd hard limits, require significant effort to establish findings under No. **21.16** (a 7% increase in workload).

It is proposed to include five suggested revisions in the Annex to this document as possible implementation of this item:

– API Units (Category A1): Units are proposed to be introduced with a description similar to the revised description of units for non-geostationary satellite systems in categories C and N (see item f), with the number of frequency assignments replaced by the number of frequency ranges, since API refers to frequency ranges rather than center frequencies. Additionally, the number of coordination forms per frequency range would be excluded, as API pertains to satellite filings not subject to coordination.

– API Fees (Category A1): In addition to introducing units in category A1, it is suggested to implement a starting fee and a flat fee for API submissions. Assuming the threshold value of units for the flat fee is set at 100, as in all other categories, the flat fee would account for the fact that approximately 5% of API submissions exceed 100 units, requiring significantly more resources for processing. The starting fee would be lower than the current flat fee, reflecting the fact that simpler API submissions are less costly to process.

– Notifications Units (Category N4): Units for notifications under category N4 would be introduced using the same description as for categories N1 to N3, as frequency assignments also exist for these notifications.

– Notification Fees (Category N4): Along with the introduction of units in category N4, it is proposed to introduce a starting fee and a flat fee, set at approximately 33% of the fees for category N1 as updated in item e) above. The starting fee would be lower than the current flat fee, acknowledging that “small” notifications are less expensive to process.

– New Category N5: It is suggested to split category N4 into two and create a new category, N5, for non-geostationary satellite networks or systems subject solely to No. **9.21**. The fees for this new category would be set at approximately 47% of those for category N1, as updated in item e) above.

Summary of discussion

**1) For category A1**

All members supported to introduce a description similar to the revised description of units for non-geostationary satellite systems in categories C and N, with the number of frequency assignments replaced by the number of frequency ranges.

With respect to fees of category A1, some members agreed with the proposal of BR, namely start fee, flat fee and fee per unit are CHF 300, CHF 5 700 and CHF 54; some other members offered a “bi-level” proposal, CHF 685 for the start fee and CHF 3 545 for the flat fee.

In addition, some members proposed adding the following two elements to the initial suggestion by BR:

i) insert a note similar to the one for the processing of coordination requests to indicate that each subset of a non-GSO filing consisting of multiple mutually exclusive configurations will be charged separately;

ii) insert a note to address the extra cost associated with filing with a total number of units above 25 000 units.

The Group agreed with the proposal of BR, i.e. the start fee, flat fee and fee per unit are set as CHF 300, CHF 5 700 and CHF 54. The Group also agreed with the two notes mentioned above.

**2) For category N4**

After discussion, the Group agreed to introduce a description similar to the revised description of units for non-geostationary satellite systems in categories C and N and introduce a start fee and a flat fee set at about 33% of those for category N1.

For non-geostationary satellite networks or systems subject to No. **9.21** only, some members support to split category N4 into two and create a new category N5, and the fees for new category N5 would be set at about 47% of those for category N1. This was agreed by the Group.

The Group also agreed to address the extra cost associated with filings with a total number of units above 25 000 for categories N4 and N5 in footnote e).

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482***

*For details, see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*.*

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

Data and information provided by BR

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.

It is suggested to add a footnote to the categories of coordination (C) and notification (N) with details of the additional processing charges related to epfd examination:

– a flat fee for filings with up to 7 examination scenarios

– flat fee set at about 40% of category N1 as updated under item e)

– an additional fee for each scenario beyond 7

– description of what constitutes a scenario.

Summary of discussion

During the discussion, it was agreed that a scenario, or single set of operational parameters, can be defined as the following characteristics: A.4.b.7.d.1 – Exclusion zone type, A.4.b.7.d.2 – Exclusion zone size, degrees, A.4.b.7.b – Earth station density (1/km2), A.4.b.7.c – Average distance (km), A.4.b.7.a – Number of satellites receiving simultaneously, A.4.b.6.a – Number of satellites transmitting to any latitude within corresponding range. A single scenario includes any number of frequency ranges in Article **22**. What constitutes a scenario needs to be clearly defined in Decision 482. The Group also determined that the number “7” used as a ceiling for the number of scenarios is not appropriate, as the average number of scenarios typically falls between 2 and 3. Consequently, the Group decided that an additional fee of CHF 3 200 would be charged for each scenario.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

*New footnotes g) and h) have been added to the Annex of Council Decision 482 as follows:*

g) For categories C1 to C3, each filing subject to Nos. **22.5C, 22.5D, 22.5F** and **22.5L** is subject to an additional fee of CHF 3 200 per examination scenario. The number of examination scenarios corresponds to those submitted by the notifying administration in accordance with Appendix **4** of the Radio Regulations and using the latest version of BR SpaceCap software.

h) For categories N1 to N3, each filing subject to Nos. **22.5C, 22.5D, 22.5F** and **22.5L** is subject to an additional fee of CHF 3 200 per examination scenario only if the examination scenario contains modified or new parameters compared to the corresponding CR/C filing.

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

Data and information provided by BR

To recover the costs associated with the second examination for processing Part B submissions, it is proposed to add a note to categories P1 (for Appendices **30** and **30A**) and P4 (for Appendix **30B**) indicating that, for Part B submissions requiring further examination, an additional fee equal to 50% of the fee of the associated category will apply.

Summary of discussion

During the discussion, some Members considered the proposed 50% additional cost too high, and suggested proposals ranged from 10% to 30%, while others suggested 40% to 50%. A compromise was reached, and the additional cost was set at 25%. The Group agreed to implement this item by adding a note to categories P1 (for Appendices **30** and **30A**) and P4 (for Appendix **30B**) that for Part B submissions for which a further examination is required, an additional fee of 25% applicable.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482*** *(see* [*attachment*](#Attachment)*)*

*Two notes have been added to lines P1 and P4 in the Annex of Council Decision 482 as follows:*

**Note for P1:** for Part B Special Sections for which a further examination under Note 7*bis* of § 4.1.12 of Appendix **30**, Note 16*bis* of § 4.2.16 of Appendix **30**, Note 9*bis* of § 4.1.12 of Appendix **30A**, Note 19*bis* of § 4.2.16 of Appendix **30A** is required, an additional fee of CHF 7 217.50 is applicable.

**Note for P4:** for Part B Special Sections for which a further examination under Note 7*bis* of § 6.21 c) of Appendix **30B** is required, an additional fee of CHF 6 337.50 is applicable.

j) The cost of dedicated resources needed to continually update and modernize BR 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.

BR provided information on the costs of updating or modernizing software applications used for satellite filings, as well as the financial impact of WRC-23 decisions on space software updates.

The Group acknowledged this information and reiterated that the costs associated with updating or modernizing software applications cannot be included in the costs of satellite filings. It is noted that country contribution also largely benefits to the upgrade of space software. Therefore, no revision to Decision 482 is proposed regarding this matter.

The Group emphasized that such costs should be assessed following each World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC) and highlighted the need for a clear and specific budget to be allocated for the implementation of WRC decisions, to prevent reliance on assistance from administrations or the existing budget.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482***

*No amendment to Council Decision 482.*

# 4 Other matters

## 4.1 Date of entry into force of the modified Decision 482 (Council 2025)

Given the significant impact of the proposed fees related to the modified Decision 482 (C25), some Members proposed that it applies to filings received on or after 1 January 2026, rather than 1 July 2025. Administrations and satellite operators have already established their budgets for the 2025 calendar year based on the current Decision 482 fees, and accommodating higher fees would create challenges in implementing planned activities.

After discussion, the Group agreed to send a suggestion to 2025 Session of the ITU Council to consider favorably this proposal, however, the effective date of the modified Decision 482 should be under the authority of the Council.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482***

*The Group suggested to the Council to consider favorably its proposal to set the entry into force date of the modification to Council Decision 482 (C25) as of 1 January 2026.*

## 4.2 Modification of due date of invoices

Some Members in Document[EG-DEC482-3/9](https://www.itu.int/md/S25-EG3DEC482-C-0009/en) proposed to modify the due date by amending *decides* 9 to allow any administration to determine the free entitlement based on all satellite filings received by BR in the calendar year. Consequently, the due date for invoices would be six months after the invoice date or by the end of the current calendar year, whichever is later.

During the discussion, BR noted that such a change would significantly complicate the Finance Department’s tasks and annual reports. BR also clarified that, although not specified in Council Decision 482, it is currently possible to replace a filing designated as free entitlement with another, provided that the conditions are met: the initial request for free entitlement is canceled and replaced by the new one submitted by the administration. Some Members also do not agree with changes to the payment due date of six months after invoicing, understanding BR has an informal practice that, regardless of payment due date, allows each administration full freedom to select one free filing per year. Therefore, no amendment was made to Council Decision 482 under this matter, but difficulties were expressed about allowing any administration to determine the free entitlement based on all satellite filings received by BR in the calendar year. The ITU secretariat is invited to consider this issue raised by African Member States and suggest steps to address this issue at the upcoming ITU Council meeting.

***Possible amendments to Council Decision 482***

*No amendment was made to Council Decision 482 under this matter.*

# 5 Recommendations for the possible revision of Decision 482 for submission to the 2025 session of the ITU Council

The Group reviewed all ten items of the Terms of Reference ([Decision 632](https://www.itu.int/md/S23-CL-C-0126/en) of the Council) for potential modifications to Council Decision 482 (C24), and recommended that the cost recovery methodology currently contained in Decision 482 (C01, last amended C24) be modified, as included in the attachment of this document.

The Group expressed its appreciation to the Chair for her able leadership of the Group during its four meetings.

**Appendix:** List of options considered under item f)

**Attachment:** Recommendations about the possible revision of Decision 482

AppendiX

Regarding methodology for calculating units for non-GSO satellite systems

The following five options for the methodology of calculating units were raised and discussed based on proposals from BR and Members.

 **Option 1:** to consider forms of coordination and the number of shells

During the 3rd meeting of Expert Group, two additional variations in the above formulation were discussed:

 **Option 2**: to only consider forms of coordination

 **Option 3:** to only consider the number of shells

It was also proposed that orbital planes within the tolerance of *resolves* 11 of Resolution **8 (WRC-23)** be considered as a single orbital shell.

 **Option 4**: use a multiplication factor to the number of units (with no modification to the definition of units) that represents slices of thousands of satellites: i.e. 1 for 0 to 1 000 satellites, 2 for 1 000 to 2 000 satellites, 3 for 2 000 to 3 000 satellites: and to apply the following formula:

New number of units = current number of units x multiplication factor

 **Option 5:** modify the formula for the calculation of the total number of units as initially suggested by BR as follows:

Units = the product of the # frequency assignments, # of class of stations, # of emissions and # of different sets of orbital planes summed up for all groups in the filing

Regarding ceilings of 75 000 units in the fee structure

The following five options for the ceilings of 75 000 units in the fee structure were raised and discussed based on proposals from BR and members.

 **Option 1** (BR proposal):

─**until a max of 500 000 units**

 **Option 2** (based on the methodology of Option 3):

─**with a max of 300 000 units**

 **Option 3** (based on the methodology of Option 3):

CR fee=**new** flat fee+(total units-25 000)\*(flat fee)/(75 000) ─**with a max of 300 000 units**

 **Option 4:** introducing the second ceilings for non-GSO filings having more than 75 000 units, such as four times of flat fee for more than 475 000 units for example, to address this matter.

 **Option 5:** For new number of units > 25 000: Flat fee + (Flat fee / 50 000) \* (additional units – 25 000). Above 500 000 units, there is no additional fee per additional unit.

ATTACHMENT

DECISION 482 (C01, last amended C25)

(adopted at the XXth Plenary meeting)

Implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings

The ITU Council,

considering

*a)* Resolution 88 (Rev. Marrakesh, 2002) of the Plenipotentiary Conference on the implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings;

*b)* Resolution 91 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010) of the Plenipotentiary Conference on cost recovery for some products and services of ITU;

*c)* Council Resolution 1113, on cost recovery for the processing by the Radiocommunication Bureau of space notifications;

*d)* Document [C99/68](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/gs/council/c99/docs/docs1/068.html) reporting on the Council Working Group on implementation of cost recovery for satellite network filings;

*e)* Document [C99/47](http://www.itu.int/itudoc/gs/council/c99/docs/docs1/047.html) on cost recovery for some ITU products and services;

*e bis)* Document [C05/29](http://www.itu.int/md/S05-CL-C-0029/en) on cost recovery for the processing of satellite network filings;

*f)* that WRC-03 and WRC-07 adopted provisions referring to Council Decision 482, as amended, under which a satellite network filing is cancelled if payment is not received in accordance with the provisions of this decision;

*g)* that WRC-07 significantly revised the regulatory procedures associated to the fixed‑satellite service Plan contained in Appendix **30B** that entered into force as of 17 November 2007;

*h)* that the date of entry into force of Decision 482 (modified 2005) was 1 January 2006,

recognizing

the practical experience of the Radiocommunication Bureau in implementing cost-recovery filing charges and the methodology as reported to the Council at its 2001 to 2007 sessions in accordance with Decision 482 as revised by the Council,

decides

1 that all satellite network filings concerning advance publication, their associated requests for coordination or agreement (Article **9** of the Radio Regulations (RR), Article 7of Appendices **30**/**30A** to the RR, Resolution **539 (Rev.WRC-19)**), the use of the guardbands (Article 2A to Appendices **30**/**30A** to the RR), requests for modification of the space service plans and lists (Article 4 of Appendices **30** and **30A** to the RR), requests for the implementation of the fixed-satellite service plan (former Sections IB and II of Article 6 of Appendix **30B** to the RR up to 16 November 2007), and requests for the conversion of an allotment into an assignment with modification which is beyond the envelop characteristics of the initial allotment, the introduction of an additional system, modification of the characteristics of an assignment in the List of Appendix **30B** to the RR (Article 6 of Appendix **30B** to the RR as from 17 November 2007) shall be subject to cost-recovery charges if, and only if, they have been received by the Radiocommunication Bureau on or after 8 November 1998;

1*bis* that all satellite network filings concerning notification for recording of frequency assignments in the Master International Frequency Register (Article **11** of the RR, Article 5 of Appendices **30**/**30A** to the RR and Article 8 of Appendix **30B** to the RR) received by the Radiocommunication Bureau on or after 1 January 2006 shall be subject to cost-recovery charges if, and only if, they refer to advance publication or modification of the space service plans or lists (Part A), requests for the implementation of the fixed-satellite service plan or requests for the conversion of an allotment into an assignment with modification which is beyond the envelop characteristics of the initial allotment, the introduction of an additional system, the modification of the characteristics of an assignment in the List of Appendix **30B** to the RR, as appropriate, received on or after 19 October 2002;

1*ter* that all requests for the implementation of the fixed-satellite service plan (former Sections IA and III of Article 6 of Appendix **30B** to the RR) shall be subject to cost-recovery charges if, and only if, they have been received by the Radiocommunication Bureau on or after 1 January 2006;

1*quater* that all requests for consolidation of frequency assignments in the MIFR of different GSO networks submitted by an administration (or an administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations)at the same orbital position into frequency assignments of a single satellite network received by the Radiocommunication Bureau on or after 1 July 2013, shall be subject to cost recovery charges;

1*quinquies* that all 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, shall be subject to cost recovery charges. See relevant part of final report of Council Expert Group on Decision 482 in this regard;

2 that for each satellite network[[5]](#footnote-6)1 filing communicated to the Radiocommunication Bureau, the following charges[[6]](#footnote-7)2 shall apply:

a) for filings received on or after 1 September 2020, Decision 482 (C-20) applies; the fee, calculated in accordance with the fee schedule in force at the date of receipt, is payable after receipt of the notice;

b) for filings received on or after 1 July 2024, Decision 482 (C-24) applies; the fee, calculated in accordance with the fee schedule in force at the date of receipt, is payable after receipt of the notice;

c) for filings received on or after [DD/MM/YYYY], Decision 482 (C25) applies; the fee, calculated in accordance with the fee schedule in force at the date of receipt, is payable after receipt of the notice;

3 that the fee shall be regarded as a charge for a satellite network filing. There will be no charge for modifications which do not result in further technical or regulatory examination by the Radiocommunication Bureau, except modifications under 1*quater* above, including but not limited to the name of the satellite/earth station and its associated satellite name, name of the beam, responsible administration, operating agency, date of bringing into use, period of validity, associated satellite (and beam) or earth station name;

4 that each Member State shall be entitled to the publication of Special Sections or parts of the BR IFIC (Space Services) for one satellite network filing, including the application of Resolution **170 (Rev.WRC-23)**, (except non-GSO satellite system filings meeting at least one of the three following criteria:

a) non-GSO satellite systems with more than 25 000 units,

b) non-GSO satellite systems containing two or more mutually exclusive configurations,

c) non-GSO satellite systems subject to Nos. **22.5C**, **22.5D**, **22.5F** and **22.5L** of Article **22** of the Radio Regulations),

each year without the charges referred to above. Each Member State in its role as the notifying administration may determine which network shall benefit from the free entitlement[[7]](#footnote-8)3;

5 that the nomination of the free entitlement for the calendar year of receipt by the Bureau of the satellite network filing based on the formal date of receipt of the filing shall be made by the Member State no later than the end of the period for payment of the invoice in *decides* 9 below. The free entitlement cannot be applied to a filing previously cancelled for non-payment;

6 that for any satellite network for which the advance publication information (API) was received prior to 8 November 1998, there will be no cost-recovery charges for the first coordination request referring to that API, regardless of when the Radiocommunication Bureau receives it. Any modifications received on or after 1 January 2006 shall be subject to a charge in accordance with *decides* 2 above;

7 that there will be no cost-recovery charges for any Part A submission involving the application of Article 4 of Appendices **30**/**30A** received by the Bureau prior to 8 November 1998 or Part B submission involving the application of Article 4 of Appendices **30**/**30A** where the associated Part A was received prior to 8 November 1998. Any request for publication in Part A received after 7 November 1998 under § 4.3.5 up to 2 June 2000 and then § 4.1.3 or § 4.2.6 of Appendices **30**/**30A** and corresponding Part B submitted under § 4.3.14 up to 2 June 2000 and the § 4.1.12 or § 4.2.16 of Appendices **30**/**30A** shall be subject to a charge in accordance with *decides* 2 above;

7*bis* that there will be no cost-recovery charges for any submission under § 6.17 of Article 6 of Appendix **30B** where the associated submission under § 6.1 of that Article was received prior to 17 November 2007;

8 that the Annex (Schedule of processing charges) to this decision should be reviewed periodically by the Council;

9 that the payment of charges shall be made on the basis of an invoice issued upon receipt of the filing by the Radiocommunication Bureau and sent to the notifying administration or, at the request of that administration, to the satellite network operator in question within a period of a maximum of six months after issue of the invoice;

10 that any subsequent cancellation received by the Radiocommunication Bureau within 15 days of the date of receipt of the filing shall remove the obligation to pay the fee;

11 that publication of Special Sections or parts of the BR IFIC (Space Services) for the amateur-satellite service, the notification for recording of frequency assignments for earth stations, for the conversion of an allotment into an assignment in accordance with the procedure of former Section I of Article 6 of Appendix **30B**, the addition of a new allotment to the plan for a new Member State of the Union in accordance with the procedure of Article 7 of Appendix **30B** shall be exempt from any charges;

12 that the date of entry into force of Decision 482 (modified 2025) shall be [DD/MM/YYYY];

13 that the provisions of this decision need to be revised when further data from time recording are available,

recommends

that should Council revise the schedule in the Annex, any credits that may arise should be applied by the Bureau to subsequent invoices as requested by administrations,

encourages Member States

to develop domestic policies that will minimize the occurrence of non-payment and consequential revenue loss to ITU,

instructs the Director of the Radiocommunication Bureau

1 to enhance the Radiocommunication Bureau’s electronic notice form software (SpaceCap) in order to enable the calculation of the best estimated charges associated with a satellite network filing of any type prior to its submission to ITU;

2 to submit an annual report to the Council on the implementation of this decision, including analyses of:

a) the cost of the different steps of the procedures;

b) the impact of the electronic submission of information;

c) enhancement in quality of service, including, among others, reduction of the backlog;

d) the costs of validating filings and requesting corrective action thereto; and

e) difficulties encountered in applying the provisions of this decision,

3 to inform the Member States of any practice used by the Radiocommunication Bureau to implement the provisions of this decision and the rationale for that practice.

**Annex**: 1

ANNEX

Schedule of processing charges to be applied to satellite network filings   
received by the Radiocommunication Bureau on or after [DD/MM/YYYY]

| Type | | Category | | Flat fee per filing (in CHF) ( 100 units,  if applicable)e) | | Start fee per filing (in CHF) (< 100 units) | Fee per unit (in CHF) (< 100 units) | Cost-recovery unit | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Advance publication (A) | A1 | Advance publication of a non-geostationary-satellite network not subject to coordination under Section II of Article **9**; Advance publication of inter-satellite links of a geostationary-satellite space station communicating with a non-geostationary space station provisionally not subject to coordination under Section II of Article **9** in accordance with the Rule of Procedure on No. **11.32**, § 6 (MOD RRB04/35).  Note: Advance publication also includes the application of No. **9.5** (API/B special section) and will not be separately charged.  Note: For advance publication information of a non-geostationary satellite network where the notifying administration has indicated that the different sub-sets of orbital characteristics would be mutually exclusive, the processing charges are separately computed for each of the sub-sets and thereafter added to produce the processing charge of the satellite network. |  | | |  | | |
| 5 700 | | 300 | 54 | Product of the number of frequency ranges, number of classes of station, number of emissions and a multiplier in footnote f), summed up for all frequency assignment groups | |
| 2 | Coordination (C)g) | C1\* | Coordination request for a satellite network in accordance with No. **9.6** along with one or more of Nos.  **9.7**, **9.7A**, **9.7B**, **9.11**, **9.11A**, **9.12**, **9.12A**, **9.13**, **9.14** and **9.21** of Section II of Article **9**, § 7.1 of Article 7 of Appendix **30**, § 7.1 of Article 7 of Appendix **30A** and Resolution **539 (Rev.WRC-19)**.  Note: Coordination also includes the application of Nos. **9.1A**, **9.53A** (CR/D special section) and **9.41**/**9.42** and will not be separately charged.  Note: For coordination requests of a non-geostationary satellite network where the notifying administration has indicated that the different sub-sets of orbital characteristics would be mutually exclusive, the processing charges are separately computed for each of the sub-sets and thereafter added to produce the processing charge of the satellite network. | 20 560 | | 5 560 | 150 | Product of the number of frequency assignments, number of classes of station, number of emissions and a multiplier in footnote f), summed up for all frequency assignment groups | |
| C2\* | 24 620 | | 9 620 |
| C3\* | 33 467 | | 18 467 |
| 3 | Notification (N)a), h) | N1\*d) | Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to a satellite network subject to coordination under Section II of Article **9** (with the exception of non-geostationary-satellite network subject to No. **9.21** only).  Note: Notification also includes the application of Resolutions **4** and **49**, Nos. **11.32A** (see footnote *a)*), **11.41**, **11.47**, **11.49**, Sub‑section IID of Article **9**, Sections 1 and 2 of Article **13**, Article **14** and will not be separately charged.  Note: The first resubmission of notices in categories N1, N2, and N3 which includes new technical characteristics, under No. **11.46**, shall be charged an additional fee of CHF 18 540, CHF 34 750, and CHF 34 750 respectively, to cover the examination and processing of the resubmission. | 37 092 | | 19 092 | 180 |
| N2\* | 69 504 | | 51 504 |
| N3\* | 69 504 | | 51 504 |
| N4 | Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to a satellite network not subject to coordination under Section II of Article **9**. |  | | |  | | |
| 12 300 | 6 300 | | 60 | | [*Editor’s note: same description as for categories N1 to N3. To be merged once revisions marks are approved.*] |
| N5 | Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to a non-geostationary satellite network or system subject to No. **9.21** only. | 17 600 | 9 000 | | 86 | |
| 4 | Plans (P) | P1 | Part A Special Section for a proposed new or modified assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 List or feeder-link Lists of additional uses under § 4.1.5 or proposed modification to the Region 2 Plans under § 4.2.8 of Appendices **30** or **30A**; or Part B Special Section for a proposed new or modified assignment in the Regions 1 and 3 List or feeder-link Lists of additional uses under § 4.1.15 (except Part B special section related to the application of Resolution **548 (Rev.WRC-12)**) or proposed modification to the Region 2 Plans under § 4.2.19 of Appendices **30** or **30A**b).  Note: for Part B Special Sections for which a further examination under Note 7*bis* of § 4.1.12 of Appendix **30**, Note 16*bis* of § 4.2.16 of Appendix **30**, Note 9*bis* of § 4.1.12 of Appendix **30A**, Note 19*bis* of § 4.2.16 of Appendix **30A** is required, an additional fee of CHF 7 217.50 is applicable. | 28 870 | | | Not applicable | | |
| P2d) | Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to space stations in the broadcasting-satellite service and its associated feeder-link in Regions 1 and 3 or Region 2 under Article 5 of Appendices **30** or **30A**b). | 11 550 | | |
| P3 | Coordination request in accordance with Article 2A of Appendices **30** and **30A**. | 12 000 | | |
| P4 | Request for the conversion of an allotment into an assignment with modification which is beyond the envelop characteristics of the initial allotment, or for the introduction of an additional system, or for the modification of an assignment in the List in accordance with § 6.1 of Article 6 of Appendix **30B**; or request for inclusion of assignments into the List for converted allotment with modification which is beyond the envelop characteristics of the initial allotment, or for an additional system or for modified assignments in the List in accordance with § 6.17 of Article 6 of Appendix **30B**c); or request for assignments to Appendix **30B** ESIM in accordance with § 1 of Section A of Part 1 in Annex 1 of Resolution **121 (WRC-23)**; or request for inclusion of assignments to Appendix **30B** ESIM into the Appendix **30B** ESIM List in accordance with § 11 of Section A of Part 1 in Annex 1 of Resolution **121 (WRC-23)**.  Note: for Part B Special Sections for which a further examination under Note 7*bis* of § 6.21 *c)* of Appendix **30B** is required, an additional fee of CHF 6 337.50 is applicable. | 25 350 | | |
| P5d) | Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to space stations in the fixed satellite service under Article 8 of Appendix **30B** or of frequency assignments to Appendix **30B** ESIM under Section B of Part 1 in Annex 1 of Resolution **121 (WRC‑23)**. | 20 280 | | |

a) Fees for Categories N1, N2 and N3 are applicable to the first notification of assignments that also contains a request to apply No. **11.32A**. If the application of No. **11.32A** is not requested, 70% of the indicated fees will apply, with the remaining 30% to be charged to a subsequent request, if any, for application of No. **11.32A**.

b) Under this category, taking account that a filing for the broadcasting-satellite service and its associated feeder link in Region 2 includes both the downlink (Appendix **30**) and the feeder link (Appendix **30A**), which are examined and published together, the total fee application to such filing shall be twice the fee indicated in the column “Flat fee per filing”.

c) Fees for a request in accordance with § 6.17 of Article 6 of Appendix **30B**also contains a possible subsequent request (resubmission) in accordance with § 6.25. A request in accordance with § 6.17 of Article 6 of Appendix **30B**for a submission treated as that under § 6.1 in accordance with § 7.7 of Article 7 shall not be charged.

d) For cases of consolidation of frequency assignments in the MIFR of different GSO networks submitted by an administration (or an administration acting on behalf of a group of named administrations) under Article **11** of the Radio Regulations, category N1 shall apply, for cases submitted under Appendices **30** or **30A**, category P2 shall apply, and for cases submitted under Appendix **30B**, category P5 shall apply.

e) For non-geostationary satellite networks, the flat fee for categories A1, C1, C2, C3, N1, N2, N3, N4 and N5 is applicable from 100 units to 25 000 units. From 25 000 units to 75 000 units, there is an additional fee per additional unit, equal to the flat fee divided by 50 000. Above 75 000 units, there is an additional fee per additional unit, equal to the flat fee divided by 400 000.

f) The multiplier for each frequency group shall be the sum of factors A and B but not less than 1, factor A being 80% of the number of sets of orbital planes associated with the group under consideration, factor B being 20% of the mean number of satellites per set of orbital planes associated with the group under consideration divided by 1 000 and rounded up. For the purposes of Decision 482, two orbital planes are in the same set if they have the same value of apogee, perigee, angle of inclination and, in the case of non-circular orbits, the same value of the argument of the perigee.

g) For categories C1 to C3, each filing subject to Nos. **22.5C**, **22.5D**, **22.5F** and **22.5L** is subject to an additional fee of CHF 3 200 per examination scenario. The number of examination scenarios corresponds to those submitted by the notifying administration in accordance with Appendix **4** of the Radio Regulations and using the latest version of the BR SpaceCap software.

h) For categories N1 to N3, each filing subject to Nos. **22.5C**, **22.5D**, **22.5F** and **22.5L** is subject to an additional fee of CHF 3 200 per examination scenario only if the examination scenario contains modified or new parameters compared to the corresponding CR/C filing.

**\* Definition of category for coordination (C) and notification (N)**

The category for coordination (C1, C2, C3) and for notification (N1, N2, N3) is related to the number of forms of coordination applicable to a particular satellite network coordination request or notification submission, as follows:

• C1 and N1 correspond to a satellite network filing referring to only one cost-recovery form of coordination (A, B, C, D, E or F). Both categories also include cases for which no form of coordination applies as a result of unfavourable finding under No. **11.31** of the Radio Regulations for all frequency assignments of the submitted filing, or cases including frequency assignments published for information only.

• C2 and N2 correspond to a satellite network filing referring to any two or three cost‑recovery forms of coordination amongst A, B, C, D, E or F.

• C3 and N3 correspond to a satellite network filing referring to any four or more cost‑recovery forms of coordination amongst A, B, C, D, E or F.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cost-recovery form of coordination | Individual Radio Regulations forms of coordination |
| A | No. **9.7** |
| B | Appendix **30** 7.1, Appendix **30A** 7.1 |
| C | No. **9.11**, Resolution **539** |
| D | Nos. **9.7B, 9.11A**, **9.12, 9.12A**, **9.13**, **9.14** |
| E | No. **9.7A[[8]](#footnote-9)4** |
| F | No. **9.21** |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Concerning notices in RR Appendices **30**, **30A** and **30B**, the last case where a notifying administration did not reply to the completeness letter was in 2017. The estimated percentage of the workload of processing completeness in the three Appendices is computed as the percentage of work related to registration, pre-examination and completeness compared the overall processing tasks of registration, pre-examination and completeness, examination, publication, database update, multi-fax and reminders. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A submission of filings under Article 4 of Appendix **30** and Appendix **30A** in the Regions 1 and 3 Plans, referring to a single orbital position with the same satellite name and received on the same date shall be considered as one “satellite network” filing for the purpose of free entitlement. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See Appendix. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See Appendix. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. 1 In this decision, the term “satellite network” refers to any space system in accordance with No. **1.110** of the Radio Regulations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 2 The fee per “unit” (see Annex) shall not be understood as a tax imposed on spectrum users. It is used here as a driver for the calculation of cost recovery relating to publication of satellite systems. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. 3 A submission of filings under Article 4 of Appendix **30** and Appendix **30A** in the Regions 1 and 3 Plans, referring to a single orbital position with the same satellite name and received on the same date shall be considered as one “satellite network” filing for the purpose of free entitlement. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. 4 Cost recovery for category C1 only. See also *decides* 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)