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**1. Introduction**

During the first meeting of the Council Expert Group on Council Decision 482, the Radiocommunication Bureau was requested “to provide to the next meeting of the Expert Group on Decision 482, to the extent possible, estimation of time spent by various categories of staff (G, P, D) in processing those top 5% complex/large non-GSO satellite filings”.

This document provides the percentages of the overall treatment time spent by various categories of staff in processing non-GSO satellite filings and explains how these percentages may be affected by the complexity and size of these filings. It also provides information on the processing time of non-geostationary satellite networks. The combination of both information gives a realistic indication of the time spent by various categories of staff in processing non-GSO satellite filings.

On this basis, some figures for implementation of Procedure B are proposed in the conclusion to this document.

**2. Non-geostationary satellite filings subject to coordination**

As explained in Document EG-D482-1/4, the processing of a coordination request of a non-geostationary satellite network is mainly divided into three steps:

* Establishing the submission as receivable (“as received”, completeness, correctness)
* Performing the required regulatory and technical examination (compliance with RR Article 5 and with limits listed in the Rule of Procedure on RR No. 11.31, coordination requirements)
* Publishing the CR/C special section in a BR IFIC (capturing regulatory findings, publication)

As it was noted during the first meeting of the Council Expert Group, “the use of an individual staff tracking mechanism for processing satellite network filings was implemented in the early 2000 but finally abandoned in 2005” so the values provided in this section are estimates and not based on any actual time tracking.

This section presents estimated percentages of time spent on the three abovementioned steps, which should then be correlated to the estimated amounts of time spent in processing individual filings that are provided in the Annex to this document.

The involvement of staff at D level varies according to each “complex” non-GSO case. In general, D-level staff will be involved in the processing of a new type of complex non-GSO satellite filings. Once a course of action for a specific type of complex non-GSO satellite filings has been decided, the other instances of similar nature can be processed without (or with minimal) involvement of D-level staff. Since this involvement is not recurring, it is not included in the following analysis.

**2.1. Receivability**

For the receivability step, two main factors are driving the time allocation between categories of staff:

* A lack of harmonisation in the input RR Appendix 4 data elements implies manual capturing of the specificities of a complex non-GSO satellite filing,
* Complex non-GSO satellite filings often require clarifications from the notifying administration so that the Radiocommunication Bureau is sure to process the satellite filing as intended.

The second factor explains the need for more involvement of staff with grade P5, as shown in the table below. Both factors, together with the number of groups of frequency assignments, increase the amount of time spent during this process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | BR Staff grade |
|  | G4-G6 | P1-P4 | P5 |
| Standard case (filing with a usual number of units) | 47% | 52% | 1% |
| Difficult case (filing with a larger than usual number of units) | 42% | 51% | 7% |

**2.2. Regulatory and technical examination**

For this step, the time allocation between categories of staff essentially varies depending on the need to perform epfd examination or not. However, as for other steps, the overall time spent during this step is directly related to the number of groups of frequency assignments (which is reflected in the number of units).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | BR Staff grade |
|  | G4-G6 | P1-P4 | P5 |
| Case of a non-GSO network without epfd examination | - | 95.5% | 4.5% |
| Case of a non-GSO network subject to epfd examination | 0.5% | 91% | 8.5% |

**2.3. CR/C Publication**

For the last step, the time allocation between categories of staff does not vary significantly but the time spent on capturing and checking the regulatory findings is directly related to the number of groups of frequency assignments (which is reflected in the number of units).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | BR Staff grade |
|  | G4-G6 | P1-P4 | P5 |
| Standard case | 52.5% | 46.5% | 1% |
| Difficult case |

**3. Notifications of non-geostationary satellite filings not subject to coordination**

Detailed regulatory examinations for non-geostationary satellite filings not subject to coordination are performed only at the notification stage even if some preliminary checks are required at the stage of advance publication of information (API).

Procedure B was not proposed to be applied for these cases because notifications of large non-geostationary satellite filings not subject to coordination were not received by the Radiocommunications Bureau. It should be however noted that the Bureau recently received and processed such a notification having 10 640 units (see Annex).

The Bureau brings this information to the attention of the Council Expert Group but does not propose at this stage to consider the application of Procedure B for these cases.

**4. Conclusion**

Based on the data provided in section 2 and in Annex, Procedure B could be amended as follows:

* No change from 0 to 25000 units (corresponding to 96% of non-GSO submissions according to statistics contained in Annex), i.e.:
	+ From 0 to 100 units, a fee linearly increasing from the start fee to the flat fee as currently contained in Decision 482.
	+ From 100 to 25000 units, the flat fee as currently contained in Decision 482
* From 25000 to 75000 units, a fee linearly increasing from the flat fee as currently contained in Decision 482 to twice this value.
* Above 75000 units (corresponding to 98% of submissions according to statistics contained in Annex), a second flat fee, which would be twice the flat fee currently contained in Decision 482 (this value is chosen because the overall processing time of the remaining 2% of non-GSO submissions may extand up to 106% of the average time spent for 96% of the filings).

Out of the 254 coordination requests of non-geostationary satellite filings published between 2007 and 8 January 2019, only 10 satellite systems from 3 administrations would have been impacted by such a Procedure. These 10 satellite systems are listed below:

| **ADM** | **SATELLITE NAME** | **DATE OF RECEIPT** | **COST RECOVERY CATEGORY** | **UNITS** | **ORIGINAL INVOICE (CHF)** | **PROCEDURE B (CHF)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| F | MCSAT-2 HEO-1 | 25.11.2014 | C1 | 102564*3 \* 42588* | 20560 | 41120*83376.56 (3\*27792.19)* |
| F | MCSAT-2 LEO-1 | 25.11.2014 | C1 | 150444 | 20560 | 41120 |
| F | MCSAT-2 LEO-2 | 25.11.2014 | C1 | 44352*7 \* 13104* | 20560 | 28517.54*143920 (7\*20560)* |
| F | MCSAT-2 MEO-1 | 25.11.2014 | C1 | 211680 | 20560 | 41120 |
| F | MCSAT-2 MEO-2 | 25.11.2014 | C1 | 69552*4 \* 49140* | 20560 | 38879.78*121945.47 (4\*30486.37)* |
| F | MCSAT-2 MEO-1 | 12.12.2014 | C1 | 96390*8 \* 483842 \* 76356* | 20560 | 41120*320838**(8\*29824.7 + 2\*41120)* |
| G | O3B-C | 10.03.2015 | C1 | 198953 | 20560 | 41120 |
| F | ES-SAT-2 | 03.04.2015 | C2 | 35883 | 24620 | 29978.79 |
| HOL | HOL-MG-A006 | 29.12.2016 | C2 | 70603 | 24620 | 47074.92 |
| G | METHERA-A | 01.08.2018 | C1 | 26391 | 20560 | 21131.98 |

Note – numbers in italics also take into account the effect of Procedure A as decided by Council 2018.

Annex

Examples and statistics related to Procedure B

Examples and statistics about the possible application of modified Procedure B have been computed based on the coordination requests and notifications of non-geostationary satellite systems published between 2007 and 8 January 2019.

**Cases of coordination requests**: 254 submissions have been published during the abovementioned period.

59 (resp. 26, 7) submissions have exceeded 1000 (resp. 10000, 50000) units (for the 5 French networks that would have been impacted by Procedure A, the number of units for mutually exclusive configurations is shown in italics).

In order to provide an assessment of the time spent under each of the three steps identified in section 2, the following indicators was compiled:

* date of receipt as established by the Radiocommunication Bureau
* end date of receivability processing (also corresponding to the start date of the regulatory and technical examination)
* end date of regulatory and technical examination
* date of publication

From these four indicators, the following four parameters are computed:

* “duration of receivability”: end date of receivability processing – date of receipt
* “duration of examination”: end date of regulatory and technical examination – end date of receivability processing
* “duration of publication”: date of publication – end date of regulatory and technical examination
* overall processing time: date of publication – date of receipt

These parameters are based on raw data contained in the Radiocommunication Bureau databases but should be understood with the following caveats:

* The period labelled as “duration of receivability” includes not only the time spent on the receivability of the submission but also the waiting time due to previous satellite filings being examined before the actual start of the work on the submission. During periods when the number of submissions exceeds the Bureau processing capacities or the complexity of the submissions slows down the processing pace, this period automatically increases, even for simple satellite filings.
* The period labelled as “duration of examination” may overestimate actual examination time for a non-GSO filing without epfd examination due to some parallel processing. It may also a little underestimate the actual eximination time because some of the activities described in the examination step start before the end date of receivability processing.
* The period labelled as “duration of publication” slightly overestimate the actual time spent because BR IFIC are published only every two weeks (for example, a satellite filing may be ready for publication 5 days before the date of the BR IFIC; in such case, the actual time spent will be overestimated by 5 days).

| **ADM** | **SATELLITE NAME** | **COST RECOVERY CATEGORY / ORIGINAL INVOICE (CHF)** | **UNITS** | **DATE OF RECEIPT** | **END OF RECEIVABILITY PROCESSING** | **DURATION OF RECEIVABILITY (DAYS)** | **END OF REGULATORY AND TECHNICAL EXAMINATION** | **DURATION OF EXAMINATION (DAYS)** | **DATE OF PUBLICATION** | **DURATION OF PUBLICATION (DAYS)** | **OVERALL PROCESSING TIME (DAYS)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Average values for filings with less than 1000 units* | *-* | *-* | *75.8* | *-* | *51.1* | *-* | *33.6* | *160.5* |
| G | O3B-B | C1 / 20560 | 2244 | 03.02.2011 | 16.03.2011 | 41 | 07.04.2011 | 22 | 03.04.2011 | 26 | 89 |
| CAN | CANPOL | C2 / 24620 | 3213 | 07.04.2012 | 02.10.2012 | 178 | 18.10.2012 | 16 | 13.11.2012 | 26 | 220 |
| G | L5 | C1 / 20560 | 3235 | 14.09.2013 | 15.11.2013 | 62 | 12.12.2013 | 27 | 21.01.2014 | 40 | 129 |
| CAN | CANPOL-2 | C2 / 24620 | 3459 | 22.11.2013 | 06.02.2014 | 76 | 27.02.2014 | 21 | 18.03.2014 | 19 | 116 |
| G | L5 | C1 / 20560 | 2720 | 06.12.2013 | 11.02.2014 | 67 | 06.03.2014 | 23 | 15.04.2014 | 40 | 130 |
| G | L5 | C1 / 20560 | 3884 | 27.06.2014 | 15.09.2014 | 80 | 23.10.2014 | 38 | 11.11.2014 | 19 | 137 |
| NOR | ASK-1 | C2 / 24620 | 6687 | 18.11.2014 | 14.01.2015 | 57 | 12.03.2015 | 57 | 31.03.2015 | 19 | 133 |
| F | MCSAT-2 HEO-1 | C1 / 20560 | 102564*3 \* 42588* | 25.11.2014 | 10.04.2015 | 136 | 28.05.2015 | 48 | 23.06.2015 | 26 | 210 |
| F | MCSAT-2 LEO-1 | C1 / 20560 | 150444 | 25.11.2014 | 10.04.2015 | 136 | 21.05.2015 | 41 | 09.06.2015 | 19 | 196 |
| F | MCSAT-2 LEO-2 | C1 / 20560 | 44352*7 \* 13104* | 25.11.2014 | 13.10.2015 | 322 | 05.11.2015 | 23 | 24.11.2015 | 19 | 364 |
| F | MCSAT-2 MEO-1 | C1 / 20560 | 211680 | 25.11.2014 | 10.04.2015 | 136 | 28.05.2015 | 48 | 23.06.2015 | 26 | 210 |
| F | MCSAT-2 MEO-2 | C1 / 20560 | 69552*4 \* 49140* | 25.11.2014 | 20.10.2015 | 329 | 05.11.2015 | 16 | 24.11.2015 | 19 | 364 |
| F | MCSAT-2 HEO | C1 / 20560 | 17664*5 \* 17664* | 01.12.2014 | 14.10.2015 | 317 | 05.11.2015 | 22 | 24.11.2015 | 19 | 358 |
| CAN | COMMSTELLATION | C1 / 20560 | 3760 | 02.12.2014 | 14.05.2015 | 163 | 28.05.2015 | 14 | 23.06.2015 | 26 | 203 |
| F | MCSAT LEO | C1 / 20560 | 3760 | 03.12.2014 | 22.05.2015 | 170 | 04.06.2015 | 13 | 07.07.2015 | 33 | 216 |
| LIE | 3ECOM-1 | C1 / 20560 | 10624 | 10.12.2014 | 22.05.2015 | 163 | 25.06.2015 | 34 | 21.07.2015 | 26 | 223 |
| F | MCSAT-2 MEO-1 | C1 / 20560 | 96390*8 \* 483842 \* 76356* | 12.12.2014 | 22.09.2015 | 284 | 15.10.2015 | 23 | 24.11.2015 | 40 | 347 |
| NOR | STEAM-1 | C1 / 20560 | 10782 | 27.12.2014 | 22.05.2015 | 146 | 25.06.2015 | 34 | 21.07.2015 | 26 | 206 |
| NOR | STEAM-2 | C1 / 20560 | 24420 | 27.12.2014 | 22.05.2015 | 146 | 25.06.2015 | 34 | 21.07.2015 | 26 | 206 |
| CAN | CANPOL-2 | C1 / 20560 | 1608 | 06.01.2015 | 19.06.2015 | 164 | 02.07.2015 | 13 | 04.08.2015 | 33 | 210 |
| G | L5 | C1 / 20560 | 4300 | 18.01.2015 | 19.06.2015 | 152 | 02.07.2015 | 13 | 04.08.2015 | 33 | 198 |
| G | O3B-C | C1 / 20560 | 198953 | 10.03.2015 | 16.07.2015 | 128 | 12.11.2015 | 119 | 19.01.2016 | 68 | 315 |
| LIE | 3ECOM-3 | C1 / 20560 | 10752 | 18.03.2015 | 16.07.2015 | 120 | 19.11.2015 | 126 | 08.12.2015 | 19 | 265 |
| F | ES-SAT-2 | C2 / 24620 | 35883 | 03.04.2015 | 24.07.2015 | 112 | 19.11.2015 | 118 | 08.12.2015 | 19 | 249 |
| CYP | ANDROMEDA-A | C1 / 20560 | 3826 | 30.04.2015 | 24.07.2015 | 85 | 26.11.2015 | 125 | 08.12.2015 | 12 | 222 |
| NOR | NORSAT-H1 | C2 / 24620 | 8733 | 01.06.2015 | 07.08.2015 | 67 | 17.12.2015 | 132 | 19.01.2016 | 33 | 232 |
| CAN | 102 | C1 / 20560 | 3810 | 27.11.2015 | 05.02.2016 | 70 | 31.03.2016 | 55 | 26.04.2016 | 26 | 151 |
| F | MCSAT-2 LEO-2 | C1 / 20560 | 8064 | 14.12.2015 | 29.02.2016 | 77 | 16.06.2016 | 108 | 19.07.2016 | 33 | 218 |
| F | AST-NG-C-3 | C2 / 24620 | 1504 | 20.06.2016 | 19.10.2016 | 121 | 05.01.2017 | 78 | 24.01.2017 | 19 | 218 |
| NOR | SE-6-HEO-1 | C1 / 20560 | 9480 | 09.08.2016 | 29.11.2016 | 112 | 16.02.2017 | 79 | 21.03.2017 | 33 | 224 |
| NOR | SE-6-HEO-1A | C1 / 20560 | 10216 | 09.08.2016 | 29.11.2016 | 112 | 16.02.2017 | 79 | 21.03.2017 | 33 | 224 |
| NZL | APOG | C1 / 20560 | 1728 | 10.12.2016 | 24.03.2017 | 104 | 04.05.2017 | 41 | 30.05.2017 | 26 | 171 |
| G | THEO | C1 / 20560 | 4404 | 22.12.2016 | 24.03.2017 | 92 | 11.05.2017 | 48 | 30.05.2017 | 19 | 159 |
| HOL | HOL-MG-A006 | C2 / 24620 | 70603 | 29.12.2016 | 04.04.2017 | 96 | 15.06.2017 | 72 | 25.07.2017 | 40 | 208 |
| SLM | SI-SAT-KURUKURU | C2 / 24620 | 5589 | 30.12.2016 | 19.05.2017 | 140 | 22.06.2017 | 34 | 25.07.2017 | 33 | 207 |
| G | O3B-C | C1 / 20560 | 7561 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 10.08.2017 | 72 | 19.09.2017 | 40 | 261 |
| NOR | STEAM-2B | C1 / 20560 | 10722 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 10.08.2017 | 72 | 05.09.2017 | 26 | 247 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-3A-R | C1 / 20560 | 10842 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 27.07.2017 | 58 | 05.09.2017 | 40 | 247 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-3B-R | C1 / 20560 | 14724 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 10.08.2017 | 72 | 05.09.2017 | 26 | 247 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-3C | C1 / 20560 | 10830 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 27.07.2017 | 58 | 05.09.2017 | 40 | 247 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-3D | C1 / 20560 | 13842 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 10.08.2017 | 72 | 05.09.2017 | 26 | 247 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-3E | C1 / 20560 | 10830 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 20.07.2017 | 51 | 05.09.2017 | 47 | 247 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-3F | C1 / 20560 | 13842 | 01.01.2017 | 30.05.2017 | 149 | 10.08.2017 | 72 | 05.09.2017 | 26 | 247 |
| CAN | CANPOL-3 | C2 / 24620 | 1515 | 09.02.2017 | 07.07.2017 | 148 | 24.08.2017 | 48 | 19.09.2017 | 26 | 222 |
| F | ZIP | C1 / 20560 | 2142 | 22.03.2017 | 01.08.2017 | 132 | 14.09.2017 | 44 | 03.10.2017 | 19 | 195 |
| G | THEME | C1 / 20560 | 2007 | 29.03.2017 | 01.08.2017 | 125 | 21.09.2017 | 51 | 03.10.2017 | 12 | 188 |
| G | L5 | C1 / 20560 | 3074 | 13.06.2017 | 24.10.2017 | 133 | 16.11.2017 | 23 | 23.01.2018 | 68 | 224 |
| USA | USASAT-NGSO-4 | C1 / 20560 | 2017 | 24.08.2017 | 23.11.2017 | 91 | 15.02.2018 | 84 | 03.04.2018 | 47 | 222 |
| F | AST-NG-C-4 | C2 / 24620 | 2608 | 05.10.2017 | 05.12.2017 | 61 | 22.03.2018 | 107 | 17.04.2018 | 26 | 194 |
| F | MCSAT-2 HEO | C1 / 20560 | 14900 | 17.10.2017 | 28.05.2018 | 223 | 12.07.2018 | 45 | 07.08.2018 | 26 | 294 |
| F | EB-SAT-LEO-1 | C2 / 24620 | 3386 | 21.12.2017 | 28.03.2018 | 97 | 14.06.2018 | 78 | 26.06.2018 | 12 | 187 |
| F | EB-SAT-LEO-1B | C2 / 24620 | 3386 | 21.12.2017 | 28.03.2018 | 97 | 14.06.2018 | 78 | 26.06.2018 | 12 | 187 |
| CHN | SPACEWAY | C1 / 20560 | 9293 | 28.12.2017 | 04.04.2018 | 97 | 07.06.2018 | 64 | 26.06.2018 | 19 | 180 |
| CAN | KELYPSIS | C2 / 24620 | 18278 | 19.01.2018 | 09.05.2018 | 110 | 14.06.2018 | 36 | 10.07.2018 | 26 | 172 |
| LUX | LUX-N1-2 | C1 / 20560 | 11440 | 06.02.2018 | 24.04.2018 | 77 | 28.06.2018 | 65 | 10.07.2018 | 12 | 154 |
| AUS | MNSAT | C1 / 20560 | 1117 | 04.04.2018 | 18.06.2018 | 75 | 09.08.2018 | 52 | 04.09.2018 | 26 | 153 |
| CHN | SIGNSAT-NGSO | C1 / 20560 | 1297 | 18.07.2018 | 10.08.2018 | 23 | 11.10.2018 | 62 | 30.10.2018 | 19 | 104 |
| G | METHERA-A | C1 / 20560 | 26391 | 01.08.2018 | 26.09.2018 | 56 | 01.11.2018 | 36 | 27.11.2018 | 26 | 118 |
| SLM | SI-SAT-KURUKURU | C2 / 24620 | 4507 | 23.08.2018 | 31.10.2018 | 69 | 29.11.2018 | 29 | 08.01.2019 | 40 | 138 |

The following table shows the percentages of complex non-GSO coordination requests:

|  | **Statistics as processed** | **Impact of Procedure A** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of units** | **Number of filings having less than the number of units** | **Percentage** | **Number of filings having less than the number of units** | **Percentage** |
| 1000 | 196 | 77.17% | 196 | 70.50% |
| 2000 | 202 | 79.53% | 202 | 72.66% |
| 3000 | 208 | 81.89% | 208 | 74.82% |
| 4000 | 219 | 86.22% | 219 | 78.78% |
| 5000 | 222 | 87.40% | 222 | 79.86% |
| 6000 | 223 | 87.80% | 223 | 80.22% |
| 7000 | 224 | 88.19% | 224 | 80.58% |
| 8000 | 225 | 88.58% | 225 | 80.94% |
| 9000 | 227 | 89.37% | 227 | 81.65% |
| 10000 | 229 | 90.16% | 229 | 82.37% |
| 11000 | 237 | 93.31% | 237 | 85.25% |
| 12000 | 238 | 93.70% | 238 | 85.61% |
| 14000 | 239 | 94.09% | 246 | 88.49% |
| 15000 | 241 | 94.88% | 248 | 89.21% |
| 18000 | 242 | 95.28% | 253 | 91.01% |
| 19000 | 243 | 95.67% | 254 | 91.37% |
| 25000 | 244 | 96.06% | 255 | 91.73% |
| 27000 | 245 | 96.46% | 256 | 92.09% |
| 36000 | 246 | 96.85% | 257 | 92.45% |
| 45000 | 247 | 97.24% | 260 | 93.53% |
| 50000 | 247 | 97.24% | 272 | 97.84% |
| 70000 | 248 | 97.64% | 272 | 97.84% |
| 71000 | 249 | 98.03% | 273 | 98.20% |
| 77000 | 249 | 98.03% | 275 | 98.92% |
| 97000 | 250 | 98.43% | 275 | 98.92% |
| 103000 | 251 | 98.82% | 275 | 98.92% |
| 151000 | 252 | 99.21% | 276 | 99.28% |
| 199000 | 253 | 99.61% | 277 | 99.64% |
| 212000 | 254 | 100.00% | 278 | 100.00% |

The following table shows the average values of the various durations of examination steps:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of units** | **Number of filings**  | **Percentage** | **Duration of receivability (days)** | **Duration of examination (days)** | **Duration of publication (days)** | **Overall duration of processing (days)** |
| 1-1000 | 196 | 77.17% | 75.8 | 51.1 | 33.6 | 160.5 |
| 1001-2000 | 6 | 2.36% | 105.8 | 49 | 24.8 | 179.7 |
| 2001-3000 | 6 | 2.36% | 86.2 | 55.2 | 28.3 | 169.7 |
| 3001-4000 | 11 | 4.33% | 110.1 | 44.4 | 26.6 | 181.1 |
| 4001-5000 | 3 | 1.18% | 104.3 | 30 | 30.7 | 165 |
| 5001-6000 | 1 | 0.39% | 140 | 34 | 33 | 207 |
| 6001-7000 | 1 | 0.39% | 57 | 57 | 19 | 133 |
| 7001-8000 | 1 | 0.39% | 149 | 72 | 40 | 261 |
| 8001-9000 | 2 | 0.79% | 72 | 120 | 33 | 225 |
| 9001-10000 | 2 | 0.79% | 104.5 | 71.5 | 26 | 202 |
| 10001-11000 | 8 | 3.15% | 142.1 | 64 | 32.1 | 238.3 |
| 11001-12000 | 1 | 0.39% | 77 | 65 | 12 | 154 |
| 12001-14000 | 1 | 0.39% | 149 | 72 | 26 | 247 |
| 14001-15000 | 2 | 0.79% | 186 | 58.5 | 26 | 270.5 |
| 15001-18000 | 1 | 0.39% | 317 | 22 | 19 | 358 |
| 18001-19000 | 1 | 0.39% | 110 | 36 | 26 | 172 |
| 19001-25000 | 1 | 0.39% | 146 | 34 | 26 | 206 |
| 25001-27000 | 1 | 0.39% | 56 | 36 | 26 | 118 |
| 27001-36000 | 1 | 0.39% | 112 | 118 | 19 | 249 |
| 36001-45000 | 1 | 0.39% | 322 | 23 | 19 | 364 |
| 45001-70000 | 1 | 0.39% | 329 | 16 | 19 | 364 |
| 70001-71000 | 1 | 0.39% | 96 | 72 | 40 | 208 |
| 71001-97000 | 1 | 0.39% | 284 | 23 | 40 | 347 |
| 97001-103000 | 1 | 0.39% | 136 | 48 | 26 | 210 |
| 103001-151000 | 1 | 0.39% | 136 | 41 | 19 | 196 |
| 151001-199000 | 1 | 0.39% | 128 | 119 | 68 | 315 |
| 199001-212000 | 1 | 0.39% | 136 | 48 | 26 | 210 |

**Cases of notifications**: 447 submissions have been published from 2007 until 8 January 2019

Three submissions have exceeded 1000 units:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ADM** | **STATION** | **Date of receipt** | **Cost recovery category** | **Units** | **Original invoice (CHF)** | **Procedure B (CHF)** |
| G | O3B-A | 07.10.2014 | N1 | 1684 | 30910 | 52052.44 |
| G | O3B-B | 05.02.2016 | N1 | 1684 | 30910 | 52052.44 |
| CYP | KYPROS-NGSO-1 | 14.05.2018 | N4 | 10640 | 7030 | Note |

Note: Procedure B was not proposed to be considered for notifications under categorie N4 (i.e. notification of satellite systems not subject to coordination).