

ICT 2025 – 1 – Final Determination

Framework for the Licensing of Satellite-Based Telecommunication Service Providers



Date: 25 September 2025

Contents

A.	Introduction	3
B.	Legal Framework	4
C.	Issues and Responses	7
C.1	Technology Neutrality.....	7
C.2	Different Service Types	8
C.3	Orbital resources and space sustainability	10
C.4	Spectrum Fees	11
C.5	Keeping Local Internet traffic on-island	12
C.6	Treatment of VSAT terminals	15
C.7	Requirement for Local Registration and Participation	15
C.8	Other Issues Raised by Respondents	16
C.9	National Resilience and Disaster Preparedness	17
D.	Final Determination	18

A. Introduction

1. The Utility Regulation and Competition Office (the ‘**Office**’, ‘**URCO**’ or ‘**OfReg**’) is the independent regulator for the electricity, information and communications technology (‘**ICT**’), water, wastewater and fuels sectors in the Cayman Islands. The Office also regulates the use of electromagnetic spectrum and manages the .ky Internet domain.
2. On 21 November 2024, the Office issued “ICT 2024 – 2 – Consultation on the Framework for the Licensing of Satellite-Based Telecommunications Providers” (the ‘initial consultation’).
3. Following on from that document, on 17 April 2025, the Office published a draft determination on the “ICT 2025 – 1 – Draft Determination Proposed Framework for the Licensing of Satellite-Based Telecommunications Providers” (the ‘draft determination’).
4. In the draft determination, the Office set out a series of proposals relating to changes in the licensing framework for the Cayman Islands which are necessary to support the introduction of satellite-based service providers (SSP). Comments to the draft determination were received by 9 May 2025 from:
 - Amazon Kuiper Systems LLC (‘Amazon’)
 - Digicel Cayman Limited (T/A ‘Digicel’)
 - Eutelsat Group (‘Eutelsat’)
 - Cable and Wireless (Cayman Islands) Limited (T/A ‘Flow’)
 - Iffi Tech Ltd
 - Rivada Space Networks (‘Rivada’)
 - Satelio IoT Services, S.L. (‘SatelloT’)
 - Starlink Cayman Islands Ltd. (‘Starlink’)
 - Viasat
 - WestTel Limited (T/A ‘Logic’)

5. This document responds to the comments received on the draft determination and provides the Office's considered responses to those comments, and presents our final determination. It is set out as follows:
- Section B details the legal framework which guides the Office in the consideration of the matters at hand, and which provides the Office with the powers necessary to enact the final determination;
 - Section C documents the comments received on the draft determination, discusses these and then provides the Office's response to the comments; and
 - Section D provides the final determination with respect to the licensing framework for satellite-based telecommunications providers.

B. Legal Framework

6. Sections of the Information and Communications Technology Act (the '**ICT Act**') which are relevant in the context of this determination include:

Section 9(2)... the Office shall -

- (a) allocate the electromagnetic spectrum for facilities and specified services within the Islands or between the Islands and elsewhere;
- (b) determine methods for assigning the electromagnetic spectrum;
- (c) issue licences authorising the use of specified portions of the electromagnetic spectrum including those used on any ship, aircraft, vessel or other floating and airport contrivance or spacecraft registered in the Islands;

Section 9(3)... the principal functions of the office are –

- (a) to promote competition in the provision of ICT services and ICT networks where it is reasonable or necessary to do so;

[...]

- (d) to determine categories of licences to be issued under this Law and the *Electronic Transactions Law*;
- (e) to licence and regulate ICT services and ICT networks as specified in the Law and the *Electronic Transactions Law*;

Section 23

- (1) The Office may grant licences in accordance with this Law;
[...]
- (5) No ICT network of ICT services licensed under this Law is required to be licensed under the *Trade and Business Licensing Law*
- (6) A licence may specify –
 - (a) the operations which the licensee may undertake under that licence; and
 - (b) the conditions to which the licensee is subject, including but not limited to pricing, service standards, Universal Service provision, infrastructure sharing, interconnection and spectrum utilisation.

Section 26

- (1) A person who wishes to apply for a licence or the renewal of a licence shall, in accordance with a procedure determined by the Office submit an application for consideration by the Office, and the application shall be in the prescribed form and accompanied by such fees as may be determined by the Office.
- (2) The Office may where necessary, before granting or renewing a licence under this section, take into account the following matters —
 - (a) whether the applicant possesses the technical qualification necessary to perform fully the obligations attached to the licence for which the applicant is applying;
 - (b) whether, during the term of any current or prior licence, if any, the applicant has complied with all terms, conditions, specifications and requirements of any licence, order, directive, rule or regulation pertaining to such licence;
 - (c) whether the applicant intends to perform the obligations attached to the licence for which the applicant is applying in a period of time which, in the opinion of the Office, is reasonable;
 - (d) whether the applicant is a fit and proper person to be granted a licence;
 - (e) whether the interests of subscribers, purchasers and other users of ICT services or ICT networks will be protected
 - (f) whether competition among providers of ICT services and ICT networks will be promoted;
 - (g) whether the applicant has, at the date of application for a licence or proposes to have within a specified time after a licence has

been issued, participation by Caymanians and, if so, the nature and extent of any such participation, including without limitation, the level of beneficial ownership by Caymanians, if any, and any participation by Caymanians as directors, management or otherwise;

- (h) whether research, development and introduction of new ICT services and ICT networks will be promoted;
- (i) whether foreign and domestic investors will be encouraged to invest in the ICT sector; and
- (j) whether the public interests of and the security interests of the Islands will be safeguarded.

Section 82

- (1) A person who operates an ICT network or provides ICT services specified in accordance with section 23(2) contrary to that section commits an offence and is liable, on conviction on indictment, to a fine of fifty thousand dollars and to imprisonment for five years, and if the offence is a continuing one to a further fine of ten thousand dollars for every day or part of a day during which the offence has continued.

7. Sections of the Utility Regulation and Competition Act (the '**URC Act**') which are relevant in the context of this determination include:

Section 6(2) In performing its functions and exercising its powers under this Act or any other Law, the office may -

- (n) issue, suspend, vary or revoke licences, permits and exemptions;

Section 12

- (1) The Cabinet may, after consultation with the Board, give to the Office general and lawful directions in written form as to the policy to be followed by the Office in the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers under this Act or any other Law, and the Office shall give effect to such directions.
- (2) Any direction given by the Cabinet shall be published in the Gazette but no such direction shall apply in respect of a matter pending before the Office on the day on which the directions are published.

C. Issues and Responses

C.1 Technology Neutrality

8. One issue which appeared in several responses was that of ‘technology neutrality’.
9. Flow stated that there was no need for the Office to define a specific class of licence as the service being delivered to end consumers by SSP would be the same as that already defined by other licence types and that any service licence should be technology neutral. They also wished to ensure a level playing field; and to ensure that the terms and conditions applied to one type of licensee would not be materially different to those applied to another.
 - **Flow:** "cannot support the introduction of a new class of major ICT licence (Type H) for Satellite Service Providers (SSPs) because it inherently establishes an unlevel playing field among providers of the same service."
10. Others argued that it is right to define a separate class of licence for satellite services to recognise their unique characteristics.
 - **Sateliot** stated that it "Strongly support OfReg's proactive approach in recognizing the distinct nature of satellite-based services and proposing a fit-for-purpose licensing framework."
 - **Amazon Kuiper** "commends OfReg for its ongoing efforts to update its licensing framework to reflect the significant technological evolution of satellite-based connectivity offerings." Further, it "appreciates OfReg's recognition that a technology neutral approach does not require "service neutrality" and that there are "unique characteristics" of satellite-based service that justify different treatment from terrestrial fixed or mobile services, even where end-user experiences may be similar."
 - **Rivada** "welcomes and supports the Office's Draft Determination, and the development of a licensing framework tailored to satellite-based telecommunications services."
 - **WestTel** "agrees with OfReg's conclusion that a separate licence type for a Satellite Service Provider (SSP) is necessary in the Cayman Islands."

11. **The Office's Response:** Whilst the Office recognises the concerns of some stakeholders with regards to technology neutrality, there are fundamental differences in the way satellite versus terrestrial-based services are delivered and the terms of any licence should reflect this in the same vein that fixed and mobile services are differentiated. Take for example, the issue of infrastructure sharing, it would not be relevant to include this in the licence of a satellite-based operator, but it is appropriate for terrestrially-based telecommunications licensees. Similarly, any terms associated with space sustainability would not be expected to be included in the licence for terrestrially-based licensees.
12. For clarity, the individual satellite terminals which will be used to access the SSP services are not considered tangible infrastructure as it is defined in Section 2 of the Interconnection and Infrastructure Sharing Regulations¹.
13. Respecting the views of all parties, the Office nevertheless concludes that a separate class of licence for satellite-based service providers is important to reflect the different service delivery method and associated operational characteristics.

C.2 Different Service Types

14. Several respondents suggested that the Office may want to distinguish between providers who deliver service direct to consumers, as opposed to those who provide connectivity for existing major ICT licensees.
 - **Eutelsat** “kindly request OfReg to consider the two distinct business models of satellite operators, as follows, when determining the scope of the SSP License: 1. NGSO/GSO satellite operators, or local/national satellite service providers that provide direct in-country commercial services, such as those that: sell satellite terminals to consumers; provide direct ISP and other radio services directly to end-users; 2. NGSO/GSO network operators, that only provide satellite capacity and back-haul connectivity solutions to third party businesses, such as MNOs and telcos, or to maritime/aviation satcom providers. The satellite operator is thus not involved in the direct provision of services in-country.”

¹ Information and Communications Technology Authority (Interconnection and Infrastructure Sharing) Regulations, 2003

- **Rivada** “respectfully requests the Office to distinguish between: Satellite Operators (wholesale providers such as Rivada, who supply capacity to local service providers); and Satellite Service Providers (including vertically integrated operators that serve end users directly, as well as local service providers that deliver satellite-based services to end users using capacity acquired from satellite operators).”
 - **Viasat** “suggests 3 classes of licence: 1. Providing services directly to consumers; 2. Providing services to existing ISPs; and 3. Providing ESIM services to maritime and aviation users only” and that “only type 1 should require licensing. Type 2 should use a registration system.”
 - **Sateliot** asked the Office to “recognize that certain SSP provide wholesale-only business models.”
 - **Iffi Tech** suggest a particular class of license relating to operation of satellite communications that are not general population oriented.
15. In addition, Flow requested clarity between the use of a Type E1 or E2 licence and the proposed Type H licence.
16. **The Office’s Response:** The regulatory framework already recognises two classes of satellite provider:
1. Those providing international satellite connectivity only to existing major public ICT licensees. In this case, the satellite provider does not require a licence, but the major ICT licensee needs to possess the necessary VSAT (Type E1 or E2 licence) and spectrum (Type S) licences. This licensing approach is already covered under the section 23(2)² notice.
 2. Those providing connectivity only to ESIM or in emergency situations. Satellite providers in this case would not require a licence. These uses of satellite services are covered through the ESIM notice³ and the Type 200 licence issued by the Office respectively.

² See Section 23(2) Notice published on the Office’s web-site:

<https://www.ofreg.ky/viewPDF/documents/2024-11-21-09-14-47-The-Utility-Regulation-And-Competition-Office.-G22-S117.pdf>

³ See: <https://www.ofreg.ky/viewPDF/documents/ship-radio/2023-08-02-01-03-16-2023-06-01-ESIM-Rules.pdf>

17. This framework aims to address the provision of connectivity directly to consumers (including direct-to-handset/device) which would be licensed as a Type H licensee. In this case ‘consumers’ includes anyone that does not have a major public ICT licence which could include businesses as well as individuals, the distinction being that a Class-H licence covers services provided by a licensee, instead of their consumption.
18. The determination set out in this document covers the licensing of satellite service providers who wish to provide a service directly to consumers. There is therefore no need for the Office to define additional licence types for satellite providers as requested by a number of respondents as the other uses identified are already covered by the existing licensing framework.

C.3 Orbital resources and space sustainability

19. Viasat raised the issue that when considering applications for an SSP licence, the Office should consider both fair sharing of orbital resources as well as space sustainability.
 - **Viasat** "At the very least, OfReg should require, as a pre-condition to licensing, that SSPs submit, in detail, what steps they will take to ensure space sustainability, including how the SSP plans to deorbit its satellite after its useful life."
20. **The Office's Response:** Whilst recognising the need to ensure fair play in the use of orbital resources as well as to support space sustainability, other than international obligations which the UK may make on behalf of itself and its overseas territories, neither the ICT nor the URC Act oblige the Office to include any requirements in relation to these issues.
21. Notwithstanding this, the Office wishes to ensure that it is contributing to ongoing initiatives to protect the planet's environment including space indeed section 87(1)(a) of the URC Act requires that the office "*protect public health, safety or the environment*".
22. The Office shall therefore include in the licenses of any SSPs, requirements to meet any agreed international programmes, policies, regulations or laws that relate to protecting orbital resources and those supporting space sustainability.

23. At the minimum the Office will impose proportionate licence conditions that require SSPs to:

- (a) file a debris-mitigation plan consistent with ITU-RR Article 22 and ISO 24113;
- (b) certify, at renewal, that end-of-life disposal has been executed as filed; and
- (c) notify the Office of any on-orbit collision risk events within 72 hours.

C.4 Spectrum Fees

24. The Office proposed to introduce Spectrum Fees for satellite services based on the total bandwidth used, where the bandwidth of a channel is defined as the comparable channel used by other services in the same frequency range. A number of comments were received on this proposal:

- **Sateliot** wished to “ensure that spectrum fees are proportional to the bandwidth used and allow flexibility to scale channels reflecting the dynamic nature of service evolution.”
- **Amazon Kuiper** “requests that OfReg reconsider its proposal to define a channel for each frequency range “based on those which apply to other services with which the spectrum is shared” in determining fee allocations for satellite operators.”
- **Eutelsat** is of the view that “imposing spectrum fees based on bandwidth may not be the appropriate measure to ensure its efficient use.”
- **Starlink Cayman Islands** wished to confirm the spectrum fees which would apply.

25. **The Office’s Response:** The section 23(2) notice states that annual Spectrum Fees apply to:

“All transmitters/transponders other than those licensed under Table 2 or those otherwise exempted by the office”

26. The explanatory notes further state that:

“Each transmission frequency or channel is required to be licensed.”

27. In order to implement the requirements of the section 23(2) notice, it is therefore necessary to define what represents a ‘channel’. The Office has determined channel sizes based on those applicable to other services which share the same radio spectrum, as set out below.

Frequency Range	Channel Size
Below 470 MHz	12.5 kHz
470 MHz – 7.125 GHz	5 MHz
7.125 – 37 GHz	28 MHz
Above 37 GHz	100 MHz

28. As the section 23(2) notice states that this applies to all transmitters and transponders, it will apply to both uplink and downlink frequencies. This will cover the total range of frequencies used for up and downlinks and will be charged annually. This reflects the current pricing of use of spectrum for VSAT (Type E1 or E2 licences) by Major ICT licensees.

C.5 Keeping Local Internet traffic on-island

29. On 29th May 2020, the Cabinet issued the ‘Utility Regulation and Competition (Information and Communications Technology) Directions, 2020’, (the ‘**2020** Directions’⁴) where the Cabinet directed the office to “take measures to ensure local internet communication remains onshore”.
30. To achieve this, the 2020 Directions specifically required the Office to:

“[oversee] the establishment of ICT peering point (infrastructure) for the exchange and handing off of local traffic between ICT service providers’ networks;” [...]

“[safeguard] the ICT sector, by taking the necessary steps of inserting this issue as a condition for licensees to operate an ICT service in the Islands, if necessary [...]”

⁴ <https://www.ofreg.ky/viewPDF/documents/legislation-regulations/2024-11-20-07-16-50-URC-ICT-Directions-on-Local-Internet-Traffic-Onshore-2020.pdf>

31. In the draft determination the Office posited that when the 2020 Directions were written, the provision of internet via satellite could not have reasonably been foreseen and thus the directions were not intended to apply to SSP.
32. With regards to the Office's interpretation of the 2020 Directions, respondents raised the following issues:
- **Flow:** "Flow remains very concerned about the differential treatment of SSPs in exempting SSPs from peering with other terrestrial operators to keep locally generated and terminated telecommunications traffic onshore." Further, "The Office's proposal to exempt SSPs from keeping local traffic local, while burdening terrestrial providers with the requirement, could be viewed as anti-competitive, favoring satellite providers over terrestrial providers. This could lead to legal challenges if the regulatory framework unfairly restricts the ability of terrestrial providers to compete with SSPs."
 - **Digicel:** "Digicel disagrees with the proposed position taken by OfReg in relation to the applicability to SSPs of keeping local internet traffic onshore while the Directive remains on the books."
 - **WestTel:** "WestTel's view is that Cabinet should be re-engaged to review and update the ICT Directions 2020. If Cabinet aligns with OfReg's position that SSP services are out of scope of the requirement to keep local traffic onshore, there should be a discussion around the need for terrestrial network licensees to also comply with the requirement since all licensees should be treated equally. WestTel firmly believes this clarification with Cabinet should be resolved before any SSP licences are issued."
33. **The Office's Response:** The Office's interpretation of the Cabinet's original intentions were set out in our draft determination. It is our assertion that when the Directive was put in place, the availability of internet connectivity via satellite and the associated jurisdictional regulatory issues could not have reasonably been foreseen. For example, it wasn't until the year following the Directive was issued that satellite-based internet began to become a reality with, for example, beta-testing of the Starlink network beginning in 2021, and yet another year before full commercial services began.

34. Notably, our published consultation on the draft determination was specifically sent to the Government along with other interested stakeholders. Neither the Government nor Cabinet has seen fit to respond to or reject the interpretation of the Directive made by the Office.
35. The Office continues to assert that the fact that satellite networks are fundamentally unable to meet the requirement to keep local internet traffic within the jurisdiction, and that satellite internet was not reasonably foreseeable at the time the directive was written, strongly supports our contention that the Directive was not meant to apply to such services. Arguably, advocating for the imposition of a licensing requirement that is, in practice, unattainable, could be construed as creating unnecessary barriers to innovation and the introduction of new services, or serving commercial self-interest rather than advancing or servicing consumer interest.
36. The Office recognises the competition concerns expressed by stakeholders regarding the absence of a peering obligation for satellite service providers. While it is acknowledged that satellite networks are presently unable to comply with the Cabinet's 2020 Directive requiring the retention of local internet traffic on-island, the Office considers it appropriate to adopt a pragmatic approach that balances innovation, market entry and consumer interest and demands.
37. Accordingly, the Office will impose a conditional requirement on SSPs to connect to a common Internet Exchange Point (IXP) or to peer with other operator's networks within a specified period of 2 months following the occurrence of either of the following triggers:
- The IXP offering a direct-to-satellite gateway; or
 - The SSP deploying a Cayman-based gateway.
38. Until one of these triggers is met, peering will remain a best-efforts obligation for SSPs. This approach ensures that the Directive's underlying policy objectives are advanced in a proportionate and technically feasible manner, while also fostering innovation and the introduction of new services to the market.
39. In addition, the Office recognises that satellite-based services provide important redundancy and resiliency benefits in the event of major cable outages or natural disasters, ensuring continuity of communications for the jurisdiction. This reinforces the need for a proportionate approach that does

not impose unachievable obligations on SSPs, while still advancing competition and consumer protection objectives.

40. The Office has therefore concluded that the requirement that local internet traffic should remain on-island will be applied specifically in circumstances where SSP licensees have the technical capability to do so.

C.6 Treatment of VSAT terminals

41. Most respondents agreed with the Office's proposals to include VSAT terminals as part of the licence of SSPs. Few significant comments were made in this respect:

- **WestTel** proposed that the Office impose a licence fee for each satellite user terminal covered by the Class licence, which be paid when the equipment is imported into the country.
- **Flow** requested that the Office "Consider requiring a registration for all VSAT terminals."

42. **The Office's Response:** The Office does not impose a licence fee for each mobile device nor fixed wireless access terminal when they are imported into the country. Similarly, registration of all user devices is not required for other network types.

43. The Office therefore considers that it would not be equal nor transparent treatment to require SSP licensees to pay a fee for each satellite user (VSAT) terminal imported into the country nor to register all devices.

C.7 Requirement for Local Registration and Participation

44. With respect to the necessity for entities to be registered locally, the following comments were made:

- **Digicel:** "OfReg must require local licensing of all service providers delivering internet access to local consumers, irrespective of delivery platform. It must also mandate local legal representation and compliance contacts for enforcement and accountability." Further, "support the conclusion that SSP applicants shall be subject to local incorporation requirements, but we would like to kindly note that such requirement shall only be relevant to service

providers or satellite operators who serve the consumer market directly.”

- **WestTel:** “firmly believes that all SSP licensees must be locally registered; however, OfReg could have some flexibility with regards limited Caymanian ownership participation ‘if there are valid and justifiable reasons for doing so’.”

45. **The Office’s response:** Section 23(5) of the ICT Act states that:

No ICT network or ICT services licensed under this Law is required to be licensed under the Trade and Business Licensing Law (2019 Revision).

46. This means that ICT licensees are not required to obtain a Trade and Business Licence. Notwithstanding this, anyone who wishes to provide an SSP service in the Cayman Islands will be required to be a locally registered entity appropriately licensed by the Office.

47. Further, section 27(2)(g) allows the office to take into account, when issuing a licence:

whether the applicant has, at the date of application for a licence or proposes to have within a specified time after a licence has been issued, participation by Caymanians and, if so, the nature and extent of any such participation, including without limitation, the level of beneficial ownership by Caymanians, if any, and any participation by Caymanians as directors, management or otherwise;

48. It is therefore not an absolute requirement that an ICT licensee should have significant Caymanian participation, however it is a consideration which the Office will take into account upon receipt of an application for a licence.

C.8 Other Issues Raised by Respondents

49. Flow insisted that a draft SSP licence together with the terms and conditions associated with it be provided for consultation.

50. **The Office’s Response:** The purpose of the consultation on the draft determination was to set out areas where licences for SSPs would differ from those of existing Major ICT licensees. Those differences have been

clearly defined and will be incorporated into the licences of any SSP. The Office considers that the draft conditions specific to SSPs was previously published and consulted on. Accordingly Flow and all other interested parties have been provided with an opportunity to opine on the specific conditions.

C.9 National Resilience and Disaster Preparedness

51. The Office also notes the importance of telecommunications solutions which do not rely on existing terrestrial infrastructure. Recent large scale outages on international submarine cables serving the Cayman Islands as well as to services which are domiciled in other jurisdictions; outages on terrestrial service networks and the risk of damage to local terrestrial infrastructure during natural disasters, underscore the vulnerability of the Islands' current connectivity framework. In such circumstances, the availability of a satellite-based solution would significantly strengthen national resilience.
52. This position is reinforced by Hazard Management Cayman Islands (HMCI), the Government agency responsible for national disaster preparedness and continuity of operations. In correspondence received in May 2025, the Director of HMCI stated:

Our national emergency preparedness and continuity of operations are currently at significant risk due to the Islands' reliance on what I understand to be two aging submarine cables for international internet connectivity. This was made evident during the 2024 hurricane season, when one of these cables failed at a time when the country was under threat from a Category 4 storm. Had the remaining cable also failed, I understand that the Cayman Islands would have been completely cut off from international communication save for those who had access to satellite phones, with profound implications for public safety, emergency response, access to external assistance and economic stability.

Satellite internet services present a critical solution to this vulnerability by offering a non-terrestrial, infrastructure-independent mode of connectivity... Establishing satellite internet capability within the national ICT framework is not just prudent – it is necessary.

53. The Office therefore considers the development of a licensing framework for satellite service providers not only as a matter of regulatory modernisation and competition policy, but also as a critical step in safeguarding the Cayman Islands’ national resilience, emergency preparedness, and disaster recovery capacity.

D. Final Determination

54. The Office has determined the following:

- There shall be a new class of major ICT licence: (Type H) Satellite Service Provider (SSP). All rules, requirements terms and conditions associated with Type A, B or C licences (including the provision of legal intercept, outage reporting and payment of all fees and royalties) will apply with the exception of:
 - the requirement to peer with other terrestrial operators to keep all locally generated and terminated telecommunications traffic onshore. This will only be required for SSP licensees who have the necessary infrastructure to effect it, or if the IXP instigates a direct-to-satellite gateway;
 - any requirements which patently and obviously do not apply to satellite-based networks, such as terrestrial infrastructure sharing; and
 - requirements to meet any internationally agreed orbital-debris or space-sustainability programmes promulgated by the ITU, ISO, UNOOSA or the United Kingdom acting for the Cayman Islands.
- Spectrum fees for Type H licences will be levied on a ‘per channel’ basis both for uplink and downlink frequencies. Fees will be proportional to the full bandwidth of the spectrum used to provide the service. Channels shall be defined as follows:

Frequency Range	Channel Size
Below 470 MHz	12.5 kHz
470 MHz – 7.125 GHz	5 MHz
7.125 – 37 GHz	28 MHz
Above 37 GHz	100 MHz

- The application fee for a Type H licence shall be CI\$3500.00 and the renewal fee shall be 50% of this value.
- The use of Very Small Aperture Terminals (VSAT) associated with the provision of a service by an SSP will be included within the SSP licence.
- Introduction of a definition of the (Type 9) Internet Service Provider licence in the section 23(2) notice, as follows:
 - “The provision of internet (or other data) services to homes or businesses through wireline, wireless terrestrial or satellite means”
- The introduction of a new class of ICT service: (Type 17) Connectivity Service Provider. This covers the provision of private end-to-end connectivity (voice or data), that is not connected to the PSTN or Internet.
- The application fee for a Type 17 licence shall be CI\$1500.00 and the renewal fee shall be 50% of this value. Licensees already providing this service shall have their licenses modified to include this service type without a fee.

END