

Expert Group on Decision 482

Virtual presentation with a Q&A session

14 January 2025, 1200-1500 hours CET

ITU Zoom platform



AGENDA

1. Opening remarks by Ms CHENG, Chair of Expert Group on Decision 482
2. Opening remarks by Mr LAMANAUSKAS, Deputy Secretary General
3. Introduction of Documents EG-DEC482-3/2 and EG-DEC482-3/3
4. Questions and answers
5. Any other business

Opening remarks

by Ms CHENG

Chair of Expert Group on Decision 482

Opening remarks
by Mr LAMANAUSKAS
Deputy Secretary-General

Introduction of Documents **EG-DEC482-3/2** and **EG-DEC482-3/3**

Documents **EG-DEC482-3/2** **and** **EG-DEC482-3/3**

Both documents have been posted on the Expert Group webpage on 10 January 2025:

- Additional data and information on processing of Satellite Network Filings (EG-DEC482-3/2)
- Comprehensive review and possible revisions to Decision 482 (EG-DEC482-3/3)

Both documents are structured on the basis of the 10 study items contained in the Terms of reference of the Expert Group.

In order to ease the presentation, the following slides present the information item by item.

IMPORTANT: the first meeting of the Expert Group during the period 2018-2022 noted and it was reiterated in Document EG-DEC482-2/3 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 information about percentages of work is **based on internal assessment by the Radiocommunication Bureau**. Alternatively, it indicates the **increase compared to the situation in 2005**.

Item 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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

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.

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

Non-receivable filings are determined so after the end of the completeness check, which could be estimated by the following percentage of the total work of processing a submission:

- Advance publication of information (API): 85%
- Coordination request (CR/C): 50%
- Notification in non-planned bands: 60%
- Space Plans (last case in 2017):
 - 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%

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

Special sections	API	CRC		Notification		Total
		GSO	Non-GSO	GSO	Non-GSO	
2020	5 814.00 CHF	-	6 685.00 CHF	18 546.00 CHF	-	31 045.00 CHF
2021	2 907.00 CHF	2 930.00 CHF	6 835.00 CHF	-	22 764.00 CHF	35 436.00 CHF
2022	969.00 CHF	-	32 870.00 CHF	-	8 436.00 CHF	42 275.00 CHF
2023	1 453.50 CHF	-	30 700.00 CHF	-	4 218.00 CHF	36 371.50 CHF
Total	11 143.50 CHF	2 930.00 CHF	77 090.00 CHF	18 546.00 CHF	35 418.00 CHF	145 127.50 CHF

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

Non-receivability:

- the receivability examination performed by the Radiocommunication Bureau concludes that the submission is not receivable,
 - this examination indicates that the submission is incomplete and the Bureau requests additional information or clarification within 30 days.
- Use the dates of the return of submission or the date of expiry of the 30-day period as starting points for the invoicing process of non-receivable or incomplete submissions.
- In cases of incomplete submissions for which the required clarifications would be provided after the expiry of the 30-day period, the remaining part of the fee would be due and the starting date of this second part of the invoicing process would be the date of reply to the Bureau's query.

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

decides (...)

2 that for each satellite network filing communicated to the Radiocommunication Bureau, the following charges shall apply: (...)

o) for filings received on or after 1 July 2025, Decision 482 (C-25) applies; the fee, calculated in accordance with the fee schedule in force at the date of receipt³, is payable after receipt of the notice;

³ For filings found not receivable by the Radiocommunication Bureau or for which the notifying administration did not provide clarifications on the submission within 30 days after the Bureau sent an inquiry, the date of receipt corresponds to the date on which the submission was returned by the Bureau or the date of expiry of the 30-day period set by the Bureau to provide clarifications on the submission. Moreover, in such cases, the fee should correspond to:

- 85% of the normal fee for category A1;
- 50% of the normal fee for categories C1 to C3;
- 60% of the normal fee for categories N1 to N5;
- 30% of the normal fee for Part A submissions in categories P1 and P4 and for categories P2, P3 and P5, 60% of the normal fee for Part B submissions in category P1 and 40% of the normal fee for Part B submissions in category P4.

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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

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”.

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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

Noting that the intent of this item is to recover the costs of submissions requiring a lot of ITU resources, non-GSO satellite systems meeting at least one of the three following criteria should be considered as "large non-GSO satellite systems" and be excluded from eligibility for free entitlement because they each require substantially higher resources to be processed:

- 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.

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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

decides (...)

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 (except non-GSO satellite system filings meeting at least one of the three following criteria: non-GSO satellite systems with more than 25 000 units, non-GSO satellite systems containing two or more mutually exclusive configurations or non-GSO satellite systems subject to epfd limits 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 entitlement⁴;

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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

*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.*

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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

- Processing workload of ESIM notices: see section c) of Document EG-DEC482-2/3.
- Resolutions **121 (WRC-23)** and **123 (WRC-23)** contain provisions in the event that unacceptable interference is reported.
 - This would add to the overall implementation workload of the Bureau, should it occur.
 - These provisions are applied only in cases of the actual occurrence of unacceptable interference
 - Lack of experience since they have only entered into force on 1 January 2025
 - 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 wish to consider a mechanism by which a fee is paid only in cases where unacceptable interference is actually caused.

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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

The second meeting of the Expert Group did not request any suggestion of possible revisions to Decision 482 related to this item.

Item d - The cost of processing resubmissions of notification requests

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

*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.*

Item d - The cost of processing resubmissions of notification requests

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

- No specific additional information was requested under this item.

Item d - The cost of processing resubmissions of notification requests

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- Notifications under categories N1 to N3 (i.e. those related to satellite systems subject to coordination) are those susceptible to be resubmitted under RR No. **11.46** since examination under RR Nos. **11.32** and **11.32A** applies only to these cases.
- Add a note in the description of these categories indicating that an additional fee equal to 80% of the initial fee will be charged for these categories.
 - Some notifications may be resubmitted twice
 - Resubmissions may contain modified technical parameters
 - 80% is an average between the different cases of resubmissions in order to avoid the need for multiple invoices, as requested by the Expert Group.
- Note: Notices under categories N1 to N3 are subject to an additional fee equal to 80% of the flat fee of the initial submission, in order to cover the examination and processing of subsequent resubmissions under RR No. **11.46**.

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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

*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.*

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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

The workload associated with the BR's implementation of additional provisions like Resolutions **4 (Rev.WRC-03)** and **49 (Rev.WRC-23)**, and RR Nos. **11.32A, 11.41, 11.47, 11.49**, Subsection IID of Article **9**, Sections I and II of Article **13**, Article **14** is described in section e) of Document EG-DEC482-2/3. However, some of these provisions only apply to certain filings or when they are explicitly requested by administrations.

The table aims to provide:

- 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
- 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.

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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

Type of notification	Performed by the Radiocommunication Bureau if some conditions are met	Performed only if there is a specific request from the administration
Satellite networks or systems subject to coordination (except those subject to RR No. 9.21 only) (categories N1 to N3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bringing into use, bringing back into use, Resolution 40, suspension, extension of the period of validity Application of RR No. 13.6 Resolution 35 Implementation of RR No. 11.41A Suppression of frequency assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistance under Sub-Section IID of Article 9 Objection to coordination agreement after publication of Part I-S Implementation of RR No. 11.41B Application of RR No. 23.13 Assistance under RR Nos. 13.1 to 13.3 Application of RR No. 13.6
Satellite networks or systems subject to No. 9.21 only (current category N4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bringing into use, bringing back into use, suspension, extension of the period of validity Application of RR No. 13.6 Suppression of frequency assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to agreement after publication of Part I-S Application of RR No. 23.13 Assistance under RR Nos. 13.1 to 13.3 Application of RR No. 13.6
Satellite networks or systems not subject to coordination (current category N4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bringing into use, bringing back into use, suspension, extension of the period of validity Application of RR No. 13.6 Suppression of frequency assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of RR No. 23.13 Assistance under Assistance under RR Nos. 13.1 to 13.3 Application of RR No. 13.6

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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- Increase the start 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).
- Categories N1 to N3 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.

Categories	2005		Possible revision	
	Flat fee	Start fee	Flat fee	Start fee
N1	30 910 CHF	15 910 CHF	37 092 CHF	19 092 CHF
N2	57 920 CHF	42 920 CHF	69 504 CHF	51 504 CHF
N3	57 920 CHF	42 920 CHF	69 504 CHF	51 504 CHF

Item 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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

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.

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

Three types of more complex and larger non-GSO systems:

- Those having different sets of orbital parameters and different applicable forms of coordination per frequency range
 - See section e) of Document [EG-DEC482-2/3](#)
 - Revising the description of cost recovery units to insert into Decision 482 these additional parameters.
- Those containing several mutually exclusive configurations
 - Only possible at the coordination stage
 - Previously addressed by the Council
- Those subject to epfd limits of Article **22** of the Radio Regulations
 - Case dealt under item h).

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- Ceilings in the fee structure:
 - inherently create difficulties to properly recover the costs in the case of filings having more units than the threshold value corresponding to the ceiling.
 - In order to minimize this issue, while also keeping a cap on cost recovery invoices, raise the threshold number of units at which the fee ceiling starts **from 75 000 to 500 000**
 - maximum number of units for a given satellite system received by the Bureau reached 485 640 in previous years
- Methodology for calculating units for non-GSO satellite systems:
 - Insert in the computation of units the number of different sets of orbital planes and the number of forms of coordination per frequency range for categories C and N.

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- Ceilings in the fee structure (at 75 000 units, 2 x flat fee, at 500 000 units, 10.5 x flat fee)
 - e) For non-geostationary satellite networks, the flat fee for categories C1, C2, C3, N1, N2 and N3 is applicable from 100 units to 25 000 units. From 25 000 units to ~~75 500~~ 000 units, there is an additional fee per additional unit, equal to the flat fee divided by 50 000. Above ~~75 500~~ 000 units, there is no additional fee per additional unit.
- Methodology for calculating units for non-GSO satellite systems (for GSO filings, NO CHANGE):
 - For non-GSO filings, product of the number of different sets of orbital planes, number of forms of coordination per frequency range, number of frequency assignments, number of classes of station and the number of emissions, summed up for all frequency assignment groups.

Item 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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

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.

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

The table below is extracted from section g) of Document EG-DEC482-2/3.

	Total examination time (days)	Number of satellite networks or systems	Average time (days)
GSO	24 210	242	100.0
Non-GSO subject to coordination	3 314	29	114.3
+ epfd	634	4	158.5
Non-GSO not subject to coordination	11 719	353	33.2
Not around Earth	887	25	35.5
9.21	476	10	47.6

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

	Minimum examination time (days)	Median examination time (days)	Maximum examination time (days)
GSO	6	79	898
Non-GSO subject to coordination	21	65	558
+ epfd	65	143	283
Non-GSO not subject to coordination	3	22	288
Not around Earth	13	28	98
9.21	8	44	97

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- API (category A1)
 - Units with a description similar to the revised description of units for non-geostationary satellite systems in categories C and N (see item f) BUT
 - with the number of frequency assignments replaced by the number of frequency ranges
 - API contains frequency ranges instead of centre frequencies
 - without the number of forms of coordination per frequency range
 - API relates to satellite filings not subject to coordination.
 - Introduce a start fee and a flat fee for API.
 - assuming that the threshold value of units to start the flat fee is 100 as in all other categories
 - about 5% of the API will have more than 100 units (see Doc. [EG-DEC482-2/3](#) for background information)
 - starting fee is lower than the current flat fee

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

				570		Not applicable	
1	Advance publication (A)	A1	<p>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).</p> <p>Note: Advance publication also includes the application of No. 9.5 (API/B special section) and will not be separately charged.</p>	5700	300	54	<p>Product of the number of different sets of orbital planes, number of frequency ranges, number of classes of station and the number of emissions, summed up for all frequency assignment groups</p>

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- Notifications of satellite systems not subject to coordination (category N4)
 - Units using the same description as for categories N1 to N3
 - frequency assignments also exist for notifications
 - introduce a start fee and a flat fee
 - set at about 33% of those for category N1 (see Doc. [EG-DEC482-2/3](#) for background information) as updated under item e
 - value of start fee is lower than the current flat fee
- Split category N4 into two and create a new category N5 for non-geostationary satellite networks or systems subject to No. 9.21 only
 - fees set at about 47% of those for category N1 (see Doc. [EG-DEC482-2/3](#) for background information) as updated under item e.

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

N4	Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to a satellite network not subject to coordination under Section II of Article 9, or to a non-geostationary satellite network subject to No. 9.21 only.	7-030		Not applicable	
		<u>12 300</u>	<u>6 300</u>	<u>60</u>	[same description as for categories N1 to N3, this cell should be merged once revisions marks are removed.]
<u>N5</u>	<u>Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to a non-geostationary satellite network or system subject to No. 9.21 only.</u>	<u>17 600</u>	<u>9 000</u>	<u>86</u>	

Item h - An additional fee for recovering the costs of epfd examination of coordination requests and notifications

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

*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.*

Item h - An additional fee for recovering the costs of epfd examination of coordination requests and notifications

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

No specific additional information was requested under this item.

Item h - An additional fee for recovering the costs of epfd examination of coordination requests and notifications

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- 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
 - see Doc. EG-DEC482-2/3 for background information.

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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

f) For categories C1 to C3 and N1 to N5, each filing subject to RR Nos. **22.5C**, **22.5D**, **22.5F** and **22.5L** is subject to an additional fee computed as per the table below.

Type	Category	Start fee per filing (in CHF) (≤ 7 examination scenarios)	Additional fee per examination scenario (in CHF)	Description of an examination scenario
Coordination (categories C1 to C3)	<u>Coordination request for a non-geostationary satellite system subject to Nos. 22.5C, 22.5D, 22.5F and 22.5L of the Radio Regulations.</u> <u>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.</u>	22 400	3 200	<u>For each set of validated epfd parameters, an examination scenario consists in a single set of operational parameters (exclusion zone width, Nco, earth station density etc.) applicable to specific frequency ranges.</u>
Notification (categories N1 to N5)	<u>Notification for recording in the MIFR of frequency assignments to a non-geostationary satellite system subject to Nos. 22.5C, 22.5D, 22.5F and 22.5L of the Radio Regulations.</u>			

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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

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.

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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

No specific additional information was requested under this item.

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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- add a note to categories P1 (for RR Appendices **30** and **30A**) and P4 (for RR Appendix **30B**)
 - for Part B submissions for which a further examination is required, an additional fee equal to half the fee of the associated category is applicable.

Note: for Part B Special Sections for which a further examination under Note 7bis of § 4.1.12 of RR Appendix 30, Note 16bis of § 4.2.16 of RR Appendix 30, Note 9bis of § 4.1.12 of RR Appendix 30A, Note 19bis of § 4.2.16 of RR Appendix 30A is required, an additional fee of 14 435 CHF is applicable.

Note: for Part B Special Sections for which a further examination under Note 7bis of § 6.21 c) of RR Appendix 30B is required, an additional fee of 12 675 CHF is applicable.

Item 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

Request from the second meeting of the Expert Group

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.

Item 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

Information provided in response to the Expert Group's request

No specific additional information was requested under this item.

Item 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

Possible amendments to Council Decision 482

- Noting the conclusion of the Expert Group at its second meeting that “(...) the costs of updating or modernizing the software applications used for satellite filings cannot be included in the costs of satellite filings”, no suggested revision of Decision 482 is included with respect to this item.
- As indicated by the Expert Group, it should however be noted that there is a “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”.

Questions and answers

Any other business

ITUCOUNCIL
GENEVA**2025**

Thank you!