ACRONYM : SABER

TITLE: Satellite Broadband for European Regions

PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR: CSI-PIEMONTE

WORK PACKAGE 2 LEADER: Skylogic Spa

Work Shop 2 MEETING MINUTES

Brussels, 23st April 2013, 9:00 – 16:30.

IN ATTENDANCE:

1 – CSI-Piemonte, IT: Vittorio Vallero; Mara Cocco

2 – CNR-IREA, IT: Mario Angelo Gomarasca;

3 – Fundecyt, ES: Francisco Diaz;

4 – Lepida, IT: Sandra Lotti;

5 – SIR, IT: (ABSENT)

6 – WNRI, NO: Ivar Petter Grøtte,

7 – BHV, NO: Kjell Pedersen-Rise;

8 – NEM, UK: Alex Roy;

9 – Niverlan, FR: Gaelle Rousseau;

10 – ACREO, SE: Crister Mattson; Marco Forzati

11 – SWRA, IE: Claire Davis,

12 – MWRA, IE: Fiona Mc Cormack; Stuart Calton;

13 – COI, PL: (ABSENT)

14 – RDHOR, SI: Davorin Rogina;

15 – MIT, RO: Aristica Iagar;

16 – ETA-2U, RO: Teodora Frunzà, Mariana Radu;

17 – eTRIKALA, GR: George Gorgogetas;

18 – TOSP, IT: Sabino Titomanlio;

19 – INFOTER, HU: Sàndor Mester;

20 – DEVONCC, UK: Karen Bridgford;

21 – RCITT, PL: Jacek Korona, Michat Piast

22 – SLINUA, IE: Rosemary O'Connor, Patrick Sullivan;

23 – EUTELSAT, FR: Stefano Agnelli, Lea Lanaud; Marie-Sophie Ecuer

24 – ASTRIUM, FR: Agnes Salvatori; Franziska Diesing

25 – SKYLOGIC, IT: Luisella Ciani, Giorgio Tarchi;

26 – SBBS, LU: Nima Azarmgin

Guests

27 – NEREUS Federica Bordelot

28 - DG CONNECT Pertti Jauhiainen, Philippe Lefebvre, Robert Henkel, Übelhör Martin;

29 – ESOA Aarti Holla

30 – SES Christine Leurquin

31 – Lysios Marie-Myrtille Marichal

Agenda:

MORNING SESSION

Workshop Introduction and overview

Coordinator WP2 – Luisella Ciani (Skylogic)

Presentation on WP2 Deliverable 3 (Regional and national satellite broadband implementation case studies)

Major conclusions from the Regional and National satellite broadband implementation case studies

Giorgio Tarchi (Skylogic)

Presentation on WP2 Deliverable 2 – Early Guidelines on Satellite Services Procurement

Luisella Ciani (Skylogic)

Panel 1: Guidelines on Satellite services procurement (WP2 Deliverable 2 - Early Guidelines on Satellite Services Procurement)

Presentation on WP2 Deliverable 4 - Early report on Satellite Broadband as an option for regions; including non-technological roadblocks and potential for demand aggregation.

Nima Azarmgin (SBBS)

Panel 2: DAE 2013 Broadband target: Satellite Broadband as an option for regions. (WP2 Deliverables 3 - Early report on Satellite Broadband as an option for regions; including non-technological roadblocks and potential for demand aggregation)

Panel 3 : Roadblocks on satellite broadband deployment + Satellite services procurement

Working session on WP2 deliverables

Introduction - Luisella Ciani - Coordinator WP2 (Skylogic**)**

Working Groups session on WP2 Deliverables:

- Early Guidelines on Satellite Services Procurement
- Early report on Satellite Broadband as an option for regions; including non-technological roadblocks and potential for demand aggregation
- FAQ

Working Groups Results and Debate

WP 2 Next steps - Coordinator WP2 (Skylogic) – Luisella Ciani

SABER Project next steps and Conclusions - Vittorio Vallero (CSI Piemonte) – SABER Coordinator

1. Workshop Introduction and overview

Luisella Ciani (Skylogic Spa) welcomed everyone to the Second SABER Workshop and briefly introduced the main objective of the workshop that is working on the three WP2 Draft Deliverables that were previously sent to all SABER partners:

- Deliverable 2: Early Guidelines on Satellite Services Procurement
- Deliverable 3: Regional and national satellite broadband implementation case studies x 5
- Deliverable 4: Early report on Satellite Broadband as an option for regions; including non-technological roadblocks and potential for demand aggregation

In this contest Luisella reminded to the attendees that the documents on the deliverables, as an early draft, are intended to provide a starting point for feedback, comments, amendments of all SABER partners and external stakeholders during the workshop. Luisella stressed the importance to have a deep discuss in order to guarantee the overall reliability and quality of the deliverables.

After presenting the outline of the workshop, she provided a specific introduction of the morning session with the description of the specific objectives and participants of the 3 panels.

Luisella invited Giorgio Tarchi (Skylogic) to proceed with the presentation of the content of deliverable three document.

2. Presentation on WP2 Deliverable 3 (Regional and national satellite broadband implementation case studies)

Giorgio Tarchi (Skylogic) outlined that the main objective of deliverable three is to analyse National Broadband Plans and best practices of satellite broadband services deployments in partners' experiences and external cases in order to come to recommendations for early guidelines on satellite service procurement.

For what concern the Member States National Broadband Plans (NBPs), the proposed review focused on the following indicators:

- targeted basic broadband speed *(min 144kbps)*
- current percentage of the population covered by basic broadband *(95.7%)*
- targeted basic broadband coverage *(100%)*
- scheduled achievement of the basic broadband coverage target *(2013)*
- inclusion of satellite technology in the NBPs *(YES)*

Giorgio underlined that in 23 NBPs analysed (22 Member States + Norway):

- 55% include satellite technology in their NBP: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and the UK
- do not include satellite in their broadband strategy: Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania and Spain
- six countries reportedly achieved the 100% coverage objective*:
    - Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the UK include satellite in their NBP
    - Belgium does not mention satellite in its NBP
    - Malta and Cyprus: no information

Therefore, 50% of the countries that have achieved 100% before the 2013 deadline considered satellite in their mix of technology.

Then Giorgio went through the NBPs analysis outcomes observing that, in terms of General features, there is the necessity of:

i. setting a mix of technologies that implement the use of ALL the available technologies (France and the UK);
ii. inclusion of satellite among the technologies that provide basic broadband (Bulgaria, Germany, the Netherlands and Slovakia);
iii. recognition of the universal coverage of satellite broadband, that is independent from the density of population of the territory;

thus, acknowledgement that satellite is an important means to reach the 100% coverage target (Czech Republic, Germany, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden and the UK).

For what concern Specific Features, Giorgio highlighted the following NBSs analysis outcomes:

A. dedicated section on satellite technology or satellite broadband architecture with a balanced description (pros/cons) (Germany, UK);

B. eligibility of satellite terminals to public funds (Poland);

C. link between satellite broadband and rural and/or sparsely populated areas (Slovenia);

D. cost-efficiency and easy set-up of satellite broadband (Luxembourg).

Therefore, Giorgio proposed a set of recommendations for satellite broadband inclusion within any NBP updates:

- the mix of technologies **should not exclude implicitly any available technology**, in compliance with the principle of technological neutrality;
- recognizing at least **satellite among the technologies providing basic broadband access**; and as a consequence, implicitly **recognizing satellite as a complement** to the terrestrial technologies;
- mentioning the **ubiquity of satellite broadband coverage**, regardless geographic location nor density of population;
- inserting a **dedicated section** in the NBP on satellite technology to highlight its specificities, through a cost-benefit perspective;
- **expressing eligibility of satellite to public funds and state aid** mechanisms in full compliance with the EC rules and regulations;
- **recognizing the role of satellite in remote areas**, especially rural areas with low population density, that are unserved or non-covered because of the lack of investment of private terrestrial operators - as a consequence **implicitly recognizing that in these areas satellite is not a complement but the only solution** to provide broadband in a cost-efficient way;
- recognizing that satellite is a solution that provides **immediate connectivity (easy and fast deployment).**

For what concern the Case Studies analysed, Giorgio introduced the argument stating that a variety of public schemes were implemented directly or indirectly addressing the provisioning of satellite broadband access.

Said that, taking into account the specificities of each measure, 4 main models are identified from the analysis of partners' experiences and external cases:

- cost-efficiency and easy set-up of satellite broadband (Luxembourg);

- direct subsidy to end-users beyond the reach of existing terrestrial networks; open scheme;
- qualification of multiple providers of (satellite) broadband; call-off procedure;
- selection of a single provider of (satellite) broadband; call for tender;
- selection of a single provider for the provisioning of 100% broadband coverage (multi-technologies); call for tender.

Giorgio went through with pro and cons of each model to conclude that, with reference to satellite broadband implementation schemes, in recent times the most frequent and effective experiences analyzed were those applying the **Qualification of Multiple ISPs Model**, followed by the Selection of a Single Satellite ISP Model. This seems justified by favorable pros/cons balances, and represents the main input for the early guidelines.

Moreover Giorgio provided the following additional advices:

- the set up of a **registration portal** (possibly geo-referentiated) for willing users is becoming progressively a common practice; it helps to build a valuable database to dimension the actual needs of the community and enables targeted communication regarding any plans or measures for the reduction of digital divide
- where appropriate, consider planning for **multiple calls** for grant application, **of limited duration**, to overcome the potential indecision of willing users in adopting a non-traditional solution (waiting for the «soon-coming» wireline broadband

3. Presentation on WP2 Deliverable 2 – Early Guidelines on Satellite Services Procurement

Luisella Ciani (Skylogic) started her presentation remembering that the preliminary guidelines on satellite broadband deployment planning aim to support early stream regions that want to reach the European Digital Agenda 2013 targets (basic broadband for all by 2013).

Luisella said that the draft document was prepared on the basis of the results from the analysis of the current best practices and the indications from SABER partners from the last workshop held in Cork:

i. Clear rules on how to procure and deploy satellite broadband access in compliance with EU funds and state aid legislation;

ii. minimising the lengthy administrative procedures typical of the preparation and management of calls for tender;

iii. find a solution for the random physical audit to the end users that is too costly and long.

Then Luisella went through the content of the guidelines saying that the object of the grant is the financing of users' access (e.g. supply of a modem and an antenna including installation) to End User (Household, SMEs, Farmers, PAs) using Public funds – mostly ERDF and EAFRD – in compliance with the EU legislation.

The proposed draft analyses the most appropriate models to be adopted:

1. "Multi Provider Approach (MPA)" and "Single Provider Approach (SPA)")
2. The financial management and The Audit System.

Luisella started illustrating the MPA model characteristics: i) Reduces the amount of time required for administrative procedures and ii) Allows the final recipients to choose the best suitable satellite broadband solution on the market. Then she proceeded describing the **MPA – Competitive Selection Process** which is defined by the identification of the Area by the Public Authority then the selection of satellite broadband service providers with characteristics in line with the scheme through a call off procedure that follows with an Agreement between the Public Authority and Resellers selected.

For what concern the **MPA – From End-User point of view** Luisella explained the voucher process supplied by the Public Authority to the eligible

end users and collected by the selected satellite internet service providers. In MPA process the Public Authority pays the reseller after the submission of a detailed report (that includes the vouchers) of each user terminal installed.

Luisella then proceeded explaining the **Single Provider Approach (SPA)** that consists in a call for tender for the selection of **one satellite internet provider.** Luisella underlined that, on the basis of satellite broadband access characteristics and the analysed case studies, the SPA is characterised by a lengthy approval process – which may account for delays on satellite broadband deployment. Luisella also described the SPA **Bids elements** saying that, in general, the performance and quality criteria described for the "MAP" are also applicable in the case of the "SPA" and that in order to minimise the amount of aid required, the notice must also specify the estimated number of users.

For what concern the financial management Luisella explained that for both MPA and the SPA the guidelines foreseen that payments go through the service provider avoiding the anticipation of the antenna, modem and installation payment by the end user. This also to facilitate the audit procedures foreseen within the EU funds regulations and to avoid issues in collecting data from each end user.

Luisella dedicated the last part of her presentation on the random on the spot check procedure mandatory in the ERDF and EAFRD. In fact, the high number of end-users beneficiaries of the satellite broadband access creates an issue for the Public administration managing the EU funds in terms of high number of end-users (located in unserved and sometimes unreachable areas) excessive travelling time during the audit and consequent high cost.

4. Panel 1:Guidelines on Satellite services procurement

The first panel was moderated by Karen Bridgford (DEVONCC).

The main objective of the panel was to go through the propose first drat of the guidelines.

Panelists:

Vittorio Vallero (CSI Piemonte), Sandra Lotti (Emilia Romagna Region), Gaëlle Rousseau (Niverlan), DG Comp, DG Regio/Agri, Alex Roy (NEM), Fiona Mc Cormack (MWRA), Luisella Ciani (Skylogic)

The main points of the discussion examined:

1 Views/ comments on the Guidelines and their applicability to your Region/Country

2 Barriers and key issues you have faced in trying to spend/commit Rural Development Programme/other EU/public funding to implement satellite broadband solutions, successes and failures

3 Ideas for speeding up commitment of the remaining funding available (by end 2013) and maybe ideas for better use of funding for the new Programme (2014-2020).

The main points of the panel discussion on barriers focussed on particular problems with funding rules for some measures such as EARDF/use of Agricultural funds that require very rigorous tracking of actual defrayal on equipment/individual installations especially the on the spot procedure foreseen by the EAFRD regulations. This is normally not a problem for large earth stations but presents a significant cost when required for individual satellite dish installations in rural and remote areas.

There was also recognition that trying to implement a completely new scheme within the remaining months of 2013 was very difficult and unlikely to happen, given the requirements for public authorities to run open tender procedures/OJEU compliant tenders and State Aid approval. More realistically, existing schemes and interventions could perhaps be improved or added to in order to commit more of the available funding. The final discussion point was around the need to make schemes ‘technology neutral’ to conform to State Aid guidelines but to ensure that satellite is included/not precluded as a valid technology option.

5. Presentation on WP2 Deliverable 4 - Early report on Satellite Broadband as an option for regions; including non-technological roadblocks and potential for demand aggregation.

Nima Azarmgin (SBBS) started his presentation explaining the main objectives of deliverable four, signally:

- Initial review of techno-economic analysis highlighting risks of relying on terrestrial technologies only to meet the DAE targets of achieving 100% broadband coverage
- Initial review of satellite-based broadband service offers, capabilities (e.g. peak speed and performance), service models and tariffing relative to terrestrial broadband options with satellite industry players and other broadband providers
- Initial review of non-technological roadblocks and obstacles towards satellite communication deployment at both a European and wider International level.
- Initial review of demand aggregation schemes in Europe and Internationally.
- Initial review of market and policy documents such as the Guide on Broadband Investment Models, Guidelines for State Aid Rules in Deployment of Broadband Networks and ESOA's contribution to this, ESA's Broadband Mediterranean Study (BB-MED) (forthcoming) and other industry partner reports.

Then Nima went through each single objective starting with the ***Initial review of the techno-economic analysis.*** The main outcomes of the analysis are:

- Broadband penetration is far below the EU targets, mainly due the economic sustainability of existing technologies by population density at target ARPU

  (Ex. UK : according to Gigaclear, it will take at least a decade to build broadband networks serving 500,000 properties. France: to cover the 5 last percents (140,000 households out of a 28 Mio total in France) would cost €7 billion, i.e. an average 5,000€ per household)
- Satellites will become an ever-increasing integral part of such an infrastructure mix delivering higher speed broadband services.

- Bandwidth aggregation strategies to merge different access technologies in order to deliver and exploit opportunities for consumption.

Nima explained that, to guarantee the overall reliability and quality of the deliverable, a dynamic database with approximately 250 broadband retail offers (rows) and up to 10 parameters (columns) such as e.g peak speeds, included monthly data volume, retail service and CPE pricing or minimum contract period commitment was created covering UK/Ireland, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France, Italy, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Hungary, Cyprus, Greece, Sweden, Norway and Spain and including Service providers of the satellite-based broadband solutions from main satellite Operators: Avanti, Eutelsat, Hispasat, Hellas-Sat and SES + resellers.

For what concern the **Initial review of non-technological roadblocks and obstacles towards satellite broadband deployment**, Nima explained that the main obstacles to satellite broadband deployment identified in public broadband strategies are mostly originated by:

- Lack of awareness at Public Administration level;
- Inadequate / not technologically neutral treatment of satellites within rules and regulations, calls for tender (no level playing field with other technologies).

This means, concluded Nima, that Satellite broadband solutions, need to be better known in order to be fully exploited (as observed in the DAE Scoreboard 2012).

Going in detail of the ***Recurrent non-technological roadblocks*** Nima explained that the most frequent are:

- Satellite **network architecture** not taken into account in "technology-neutral" Calls for Tender / State Aid Programmes
- Claims that **Open Access** is not guaranteed
- Bundling service objectives with **unnecessary infrastructure requirements** (i.e., restriction of technical solutions to "*construction*")
- No respect of the **Technology Neutrality** principle (i.e., award criterion based on different number of points for different technologies)

In this contest the proposed recommended solutions are:

- The consistent implementation of the principle of technology neutrality

(level playing field between the various technologies).

- The inclusion of a mandatory ex-ante cost-benefit analysis of the various solutions for broadband connectivity.
- proper consideration of the specificities of the satellite network architecture (i.e., no separation between backhaul and access).
- The recognition of satellite as existing infrastructure.
- The clear eligibility of the satellite access to public funding.

For what concern the ***Preliminary requirements for early-stream regions***

Nima underlined that Some Regions expressed urgent need of clear rules on how to tackle the remaining digital divide via satellite broadband (i.e. in white areas).

In this contest, the different reasons highlighted by the regions explaining the remaining broadband gap are:

- Geomorphological situation (e.g., mountainous areas)
- Low density of population
- Sparse demand and consequently
- Lack of investments by the private sector in terrestrial technologies because of the absence of return on investment both in the short and long term.

Specifically, said Nima, the ***Issues faced by early-stream regions when planning to deploy Satellite BB are:***

- Reach the largest possible number of users and handle broadband subscriptions by using public support;
- Have clear evidence of the households that will benefit from the scheme;
- Support satellite broadband with public funds in the framework of national broadband policies and state aids;
- Deal with complex administrative procedures, somehow maladjusted to the provision of satellite broadband;
- Identify and encourage domestic consumers in remote areas to apply for grants and to deal with the administration of state aid

As regards the last objective of the deliverable, ***Initial review of demand***

aggregation schemes in Europe and Internationally, Nima briefly explained what is the Demand Aggregation in terms of Public strategy which consists of pooling the demand for telecommunications services in a region and/or a specific sector. Nima also announced the main stakes that is to achieve alignment of central and local policymakers and business demand for high-speed broadband services and the ***advantages*** when applicable***.*** Signally:

- DA creates a consistent market from a sparse demand
- DA allows public funding reductions
- DA makes a more attractive market for investors and improve broadband deployment into rural areas

Nima concluded introducing the opportunity to converge ***Demand Aggregation and Satellite Broadband in the EU.*** SABER early analysis arrived at the conclusion that solutions needs to be aggregated at a EU level and then implemented at a national or regional level.

6. Panel 2: Requirements of the early stream regions

The second panel was moderated by Agnes Salvatori, (Astrium).

Panelists: Nima Azarmgin (SBBS), Arti Holla (ESOA), Robert Henkel (DG Cnect), Davorin Rogina(RDHOR), Kjell Pedersen-Rise (BHV), Stefano Agnelli (Eutelsat)

Agnès Salvatori from Astrium Satellites moderated Panel 2 aiming to discuss how satellite broadband could become a true option for the EU regions. In particular, it gave the floor to regional actors to express their views on the roadblocks preventing a wider deployment of satellite connectivity, their needs and their recommendations. The panel also tackled the potential support of the European authorities and the concept of Demand Aggregation. The lively debate highlighted a divergence of views between the satellites services market actors and the European authorities which will need further work: indeed, while the Commission expects industry to better market its solutions and convince the national authorities, the sector experiences on the terrain the need for a kind of EU support (like a labelling) in order to get local authorities attention and trust. SABER, recognised during this second workshop as tool with true potential, will have to work on the short term on

ways to converge on the most efficient approach.

Davorin Rogina, from the private company RD Horizon which supports Regional Development Programmes, presented the case of the Koroska region in Slovenia, still suffering from a high level of Digital Divide. This situation remains despite the fact that the municipalities joined forces into a partnership for implementing the 5 steps scheme defined by the government: 1) connectivity mapping 2) public tenders followed by 3) a competitive dialogue and 4) provision of evidences about white areas leading to 5) allocation of EU funds. Seventeen municipalities benefited from 84 M€ to establish 30000 connections, leading to an individual connection cost of 2800 €. Despite the obvious economic advantage of satellite solutions in such case, satellite services are not envisaged by the state in the 2014-17 plan and Davorin expects that the SABER deliverables will to help him raise awareness and influence its regional and national authorities to consider satellite from 2014 onwards.

Kjell, the project manager of Det Digital Agder within the Norwegian public company BHV (Bykle&HovdenVekst), identified a set of roadblocks preventing a wider deployment of satellite solutions in the Agder region. One major issue if the limited choice of ISPs; there is often a single internet provider to manage the complete portfolio of offers without sufficient competence on the satellite services. On the procurement side, an equivalent lack of knowledge does not facilitate the situation. From a technical stand-point, users often reported issues with delay in packets delivery, low data rate (perception dating from before 2011), IP address from Italy rendering hot line service complicated. Despite these imperfections, Norway remain a very good example of successful Demand Aggregation realised purely at national level, thanks to a centralised willingness.

Dealing with Policies within the Broadband Unit of DG Connect, Robert Henkel expressed his satisfaction with the SABER Thematic Network findings. Robert insisted that with the regional Funds, the new State Aids rules for broadband of the Commission and the Procurement Rules guidelines produced by SABER, we have enabling tools in our hands to trigger a wider deployment of satellite services. Robert believes that the potential role of the Commission is still misunderstood; if the Commission can help raising awareness and distributing basic knowledge about wireless solutions in especially in rural areas, it is in the hand of the industry to better market its solutions, solve its price and quality issues and convince the national authorities.. A debate took place around the credibility of private actors when addressing public authorities, and the mandatory need for a kind of EC “label” to support the private marketing.

Operators recalled that the investment in satellite infrastructure demonstrate their commitment already. ACREO added that in case of market failure, the Commission should not hesitate to promote the satellite solution. Robert stressed again that the Commission has to be technological and economical neutral and cannot promote one specific technology or industry. However, this debate was not conclusive and remains at core of the issue tackled by SABER.

Nima Azarmgin from SES addressed the possibility of a unique Web Portal as a major enabling tool: it would guide potential satellite services users and provide all information regarding offers and subsidies possibilities. SABER is assembling such information regarding the SABER partners regions, and will publish them through the SABER website. However, Nima recommended to revive the EU Broadband Portal in order to extend the exercise and the tool to the whole Europe. Robert confirmed that guidance is absolutely necessary and mentioned a dedicated guide produced by the German authorities to address all broadband technologies.

The feasibility of Demand Aggregation was addressed by Stefano Agnelli from Eutelsat: myth or reality? Stefano believes it is rather a myth, as already demonstrated by the difficulty to aggregate demand at national level. He recommends to rather spending effort on setting up common process and stimulation tools. Robert mentioned at this occasion the need for TV publicity which he has yet not seen at this stage.

Aarti Holla, General Secretary of ESOA concluded the panel by looking at the wider European perspective. She believes that satellite solutions are not looked at by the people who are in charge of citizens' wellness. They are discussed in ICT technologies forums which do not give others, in particular MEPs, the possibility to have a say and act.

7. Working session on WP2 deliverables

Introduction

Luisella explained that the main objective of the working session is to have a rich discussions, comments, suggestions and recommended amendments/improvements of the Preliminary draft of Deliverables 2,3,4 and FAQ in order to guarantee the overall reliability and quality of the documents.

The work was organised in 3 Working Groups (WG). Each WG had to analyse a different deliverable plus the FAQ. Each WG had to select a WG coordinator.

The partners were divided as follows:

WG 1 – Deliverable 2	WG 2 – Deliverable 3	WG 3 – deliverable 4
Lepida	Fundecyt	CNR
Devon	Infoter	SBBS
MIRA	RDHOR	ETA-2U
eTrikala	Toscana spazio	Abruzzo
CSI Piemonte	RCITT	SWRA
SLINUA	NEM	BHV
Niverlan	WNRI	Eutelsat
NEREUS	Astrium	CoI
Sylogic	Eutelsat (Lea)	MWRA
	ESOA	

8. Working Groups Results and Debate

The topics object of the discussion for each deliverable to be analysed were:

1 Comments on the draft

2 List of suggested amendments

3 Conclusions

4 List of proposed FAQs

Working Groups coordinators:

- WG1 – Deliverable 2: Karen Bridgford/ Patrick Sullivan
- WG2 – Deliverable 3: Agnes Salvatori
- WG3 – Deliverable4: Nima Azarmgin

The timing for each WG discussion to develop the analysis was 1:20 hour. During the WGs discussion Luisella provided assistance in case of specific requests.

Each WG Coordinator presented the analysis undertaken.

The main highlights for each WG are:

WG1 – Deliverable 2

1 **Comments on the draft**

- Add a foreword to document explaining the advantages of using satellite connectivity (?this might be covered in one of the further WP documents?)
- 'Beneficiary' is stated as the 'operator' of the service – but in our view, the beneficiary is the 'end user'
- Need to get terminology correct
- Could give examples of the types of solutions that might deliver the outcomes/objectives you are seeking
- Guidelines could suggest that you should evaluate whether an existing Programme or project can be enhanced/amended rather than scoping a

new project – this reflects the very tight timescales to 2013 – give examples of what could be examined

- Any enhanced scheme or new project may need State Aid approval – this will add to your timescales to deliver

2 **List of suggested amendments**

- Contextualize the purpose of the Guidelines – to help regions looking to support the 2013 targets for satellite broadband
- Amend the 'reseller' to 'provider' (search and replace in document)
- Prepare a schedule of the terms and conditions that will apply to the Contract and circulate at time of tender process to all bidders
- Introduction section – amend scope to cover access to satellite services – delete reference to deployment and management of services
- Need to specify the extent/terms of the subsidy envisaged & and timescales that apply – this may vary depending on what aims you have for the project/how much subsidy is on offer – delete comment about providing the 'total cost' of the service and specific timescale on availability of the grant scheme/subsidy
- Amend 'beneficiary' to mean 'end user' and 'recipient' to mean service provider
- Amend/update Annex list of case studies
- See FAQs for additional suggestions

3 **Conclusions**

- Need Commission to give feedback on documentation before it is finally issued and then endorse the final draft

4 **List of proposed FAQ**

- What is the starting point in planning a new scheme or new intervention?
    - Check whether you have a national broadband scheme?
    - Does the national scheme have State Aid approval?
    - If so, does it allow inclusion of satellite?
    - If not, does it preclude the use of satellite?
- What is the proposed funding source?

- Are there onerous rules that apply? E.g. detailed audit/checking procedures?

- Can more finance be added to Structural Funds to strengthen the scheme or support more outputs/beneficiaries by using satellite services?

WG2 – Deliverable 3

1 Comments on the draft

- General comment: Who is the audience? What is the objective?
- Poland: now a clear plan for Fiber with certitude that there will be white areas. But no plan to address those yet.
- Slovenia: basis document is now old and will not last until 2020. But nothing better for the time being.
- Hungary: bbd strategy promised to be issued by end of June. Will need an iteration on deliverable 3.
- Upload national strategies to SABER website
- All deliverables: A peer review process would be beneficial, outside SABER, in 2/3 different languages.

2 List of suggested amendments

- Need an Executive summary in a publishable fashion (flyer on a website) with conclusions.
- Need for a glossary in each deliverable, the same in each deliverable. The best being that we do not need a glossary using a language understandable by all.
- In the Introduction, position the satellite solution within the full portfolio of BBD solution
- Include a summary table of the case studies with:
  - Positive and negative experiences (like the ones presented by Giorgio in the morning)
  - Lessons learnt (e.g if we had chosen an ISP with better satellite knowledge)
  - What happened after the case study (if information available)
  - Assessment of where satellite is best suitable and adopted

- Then recommendations
- Why is a subsidy needed for CPE? No consensus, need for further investigation in SABER network.
- The price of the CPE is not the only issue: notion of risk. Will it be sustainable?
- Or because it is part of the backhaul so considered as an item that should be paid by public funds
- need to run an investigation in SABER network and report the conclusion in deliverable 3
- NBP: mention also that satellite is the best way to combine broadcast and internet in a unique solution.
- Add a new UK case to be provided by Alex
- Detailed amendments to be sent directly to the author.

3 Conclusions/Recommendations

- Procurement: OK with recommendations of rather MPA
- Registration portal: Best would be regional government
- Multiple calls with limited duration: agreed
- Need openness and honesty when communicating about satellite capabilities
- Need a targeted marketing towards specific users groups: typically ask the regions for their database of HH located in white areas.

4 List of proposed FAQs

- What is the difference between sat TV and sat BBD? Can I use the same kit, same dish?
- What is the difference with mobile broadband?
- Is VOIP working on satellite?
- How does the weather affect the connection?
- What is the restriction about data traffic? What is the download/upload performance?
- Do you need an authorisation to install a dish?

- Can I install the dish myself?
- What's the fastest speed you can get?
- What happens if you have several users in the same area?

WG3 – Deliverable 4

1 Comments on the draft

- Mention LTE in the Techno Economic Analysis
- Yes but for existing services to be in line with the scope of the deliverable
- Public authority point of view : not what but how can we provide ?
- Maybe improve the information about satellite e.g why volume matters ?
- We should not replace experts of other technologies
- Make the techno eco part lighter and more focused on Satetllite BB !!
- What can be the highest level of Demand Aggregation (DA)? Where the possibility to aggregate stops ?
- What can be reasonably aggregated in order to obtain expected results?
- DA Depends from country to country
- DA at Regional level seems however to be the reasonable level
- DA Result : better value for money

2 List of suggested amendments

- No amendments to the D4 so far some time needed to digest the content

3 Conclusions / Recommendations

- Focus on core strength / techno eco
- Take regional level as the highest level for DA

4 List of proposed FAQs

- 2 levels : Public authority (PA) point of view and end user point of views
- for PA: Where and how can a PA get the relevant information (technical, commercial, presence etc.)

- Do enlarge the scope of users (SMEs, telepresence, etc…)

WP 2 Next steps

To receive feedback in relation to the workshop Luisella asked to all participants to fill in the anonymous questionnaire included in the folder delivered at the beginning of the day. The result and analysis of the feedbacks can be checked in Annex III.

Luisella proceeded asking to the partners involved in the redaction of the first draft documents the availability to cooperate on the final amendments of WP2 deliverables on the basis of the WS discussion and possible feedback From the EU Commission especially on the Guidelines for satellite broadband procurement. Partners confirmed.

Vittorio and Luisella announced that they will ask to DG Connect for a prorogation of the deadline for the submission of the final deliverables. In any case they asked the partners to agree to the following deadlines:

- Amendments to all the 3 deliverables documents + FAQ By April 30st
- Last draft of all the 3 deliverables will be sent by May 8th for the formal acceptance by the partners.
- May 10 the deliverables will be sent officially approved.

Saber partner agreed. Vittorio and Luisella will communicate immediately the new deadlines if DG Connect approve a prorogation for the submission.

Vittorio announced that he will launch a doodle to verify the date and location of the next Workshop on WP3.

Before concluding the Work Shop, Vittorio and Luisella thanked all the partners that were directly involved in the first draft process of the deliverables documents.