Background Document

WOSM Registration Fee Resolution

World Scout Bureau
Global Support Centre, Kuala Lumpur

July 2026

WOSM Registration Fee Resolution
Background Document

Introduction

At the 43rd World Scout Conference in 2024, through Resolution 2024-02, the World Scout Committee was mandated to review and propose a new registration fee model for WOSM. A Task Force was appointed to conduct a comprehensive review of WOSM's fee structure and propose an updated registration and event fee model for National Scout Organisations (NSOs).

Since then, extensive engagement with NSOs has confirmed that the current fee system is no longer sustainable or equitable. That system was approved in 2011 through Resolution 2011-02 and is based on economic and membership data that has not been updated since 2011.

Early this year (2026), a proposed WOSM Registration Fee Model was shared with the World Scout Committee (WSC) and all Regional Scout Committees. The proposal has been developed through an extensive consultation process, including engagement with NSOs across all regions, individual consultative sessions and general presentations with NSOs, targeted discussions with the most affected NSOs and highest fee-contributing members, and consultations with Regional Scout Committees. In parallel, discussions were also held with hosts of future WOSM Events to gather feedback on the proposed event fee categorisation.

To support the consultation process, WOSM launched a comprehensive information campaign, including explanatory materials, technical briefs, online campfire dialogues, and a fee calculator allowing NSOs to assess the impact of the proposed model on their registration fees. The proposal has been updated based on the feedback received, with the objective of ensuring fairness, transparency, and predictability.

The following document forms the background to the proposed draft resolution and is structured as follows:

1. Executive summary
2. Why the current system needs reform
3. Principles guiding the proposal
4. How the proposed registration fee model works
5. Technical model description
6. What does this mean for your NSO
7. Consultation and development process
8. Relationship with World Scout Events Fees
9. Summary: Why this model is the right approach for the Movement

If approved, the transition to the new registration fee model will begin in the 2026-2027 financial year. NSOs will receive their first invoices under the transition mechanism in November 2026.

1. Executive Summary

NSOs are invited to vote on two separate referendum questions:

(1) whether to approve a new registration fee model for WOSM; and

(2) whether to identify the affordability and accessibility of World Scout Events as a priority topic for the 44th World Scout Conference in 2027.

The current registration fee system was designed in 2011 and no longer adequately reflects today's economic realities and membership structures across the Movement. The proposed model seeks to distribute contributions more fairly, transparently, and predictably, without increasing WOSM's overall registration-fee income.

The proposal follows a hybrid approach. NSOs below the midpoint of the global economic distribution would pay a flat fee based on their economic capacity and membership size. NSOs at or above the midpoint would pay a fee per member, with the applicable rate increasing gradually with economic capacity. To protect NSOs from sudden changes, the model includes a five-year transition period, annual safeguards after the transition, and the continued possibility of agreeing special arrangements in exceptional circumstances.

During the consultations, NSOs repeatedly raised concerns that participation in World Scout Events has become increasingly difficult to afford, particularly for young people and NSOs with limited financial capacity. While the proposed fee model can improve the fairness of how event costs are distributed, it cannot by itself address the underlying drivers of event costs.

Hence, the second ballot question concerns World Scout Events. It recognises the broader challenge of ensuring that World Scout Events remain affordable and accessible and mandates further work on practical proposals, which are to be presented and discussed at the World Scout Conference in 2027. This was a key outcome of the consultations done by the Task Force and requires a deep and significant discussion amongst NSOs to enable long-term solutions.

2. Why the current system needs reform

WOSM's current registration fee system was frozen in 2011, following a Conference decision. While it has provided a stable and predictable basis for paying and collecting registration fees, key input parameters have also remained unchanged since then. As a result, the system no longer adequately reflects the economic realities and membership demographics of NSOs across the Movement.

Over the past fifteen years, economic conditions have evolved significantly. Some countries have experienced substantial income growth, while others have faced more limited progress or periods of economic difficulty. Membership numbers have also changed considerably across NSOs. However, these developments are not reflected in the current fee system. This has led to situations where NSOs with broadly comparable economic capacity and membership size may contribute materially different amounts and NSOs that have experienced significant membership growth or declines are still paying the same fee as before.

The current system has therefore become increasingly difficult to explain and justify. It also lacks a clear mechanism to ensure that contributions evolve in a predictable manner as economic conditions and membership numbers change over time. This has led to NSOs amending Resolution 2024-02 at the 2024 World Scout Conference, asking the WSC to present a new registration fee model. This proposed model and referendum is the result of that work.

The proposed model seeks to address these shortcomings. It updates the underlying economic and membership data, distributes contributions more fairly across the Movement, and introduces clear safeguards to ensure predictability for NSOs. The reform is not intended to increase WOSM's overall registration-fee income, but to establish a more equitable, transparent, and sustainable basis for sharing contributions.

3. Principles guiding the proposal

The proposed registration fee model was developed based on the feedback received from NSOs during all of the five regional conferences in 2025 and subsequent consultations. Across the Movement, there was broad recognition that the current system should be updated. At the same time, NSOs consistently emphasised that any new model should remain predictable, transparent, and manageable in practice.

The proposal therefore seeks to balance the following principles:

- **Fairness.** Contributions should reflect differences in economic capacity and organisational scale. NSOs in broadly comparable circumstances should contribute broadly comparable amounts.
- **Solidarity.** Scouting is a global Movement. The fee model should recognise that NSOs have different capacities to contribute, while ensuring that all NSOs can contribute to and benefit from World Scouting.
- **Predictability and stability.** NSOs should be able to plan their contributions with confidence. Changes should be introduced gradually and should not be driven by short-term fluctuations in economic or membership data.
- **Transparency.** The methodology should be clear and based on objective and publicly available data. Each NSO should be able to understand how its contribution is calculated and how it may evolve over time.
- **Operational simplicity.** The model should be sufficiently straightforward to administer and explain.
- **Financial sustainability.** The model should provide WOSM with a stable and reliable income base to deliver its core services to NSOs and support the development of Scouting globally.

Designing a revised registration fee model requires balancing several considerations. Greater differentiation can improve fairness but may also lead to greater complexity. Regular updates help ensure that the model remains current, while safeguards are needed to preserve predictability for NSOs. The proposed model therefore seeks to strike a careful balance between the principles.

4. How the proposed registration fee model works

The proposed registration fee model determines each NSO's annual contribution to WOSM's core budget based on two factors:

- **economic capacity**, measured using Gross National Income (GNI) per capita based on the World Bank Atlas method; and
- **organisational scale**, measured using a three-year rolling average of each NSO's reported membership.

GNI per capita, based on the World Bank Atlas method, was retained as the most suitable basis for assessing economic capacity because it is transparent, internationally comparable, externally verifiable, and updated regularly. While no single indicator can fully capture the financial reality of every NSO or the affordability of Scouting for individual families, alternative indicators considered by the Task Force would have introduced greater complexity, weaker comparability, or less consistent data availability across the Movement.

The model follows a hybrid approach. Rather than applying the same calculation to all NSOs, it distinguishes between NSOs based on their position in the global distribution of GNI per capita. This reflects the fact that a single approach to calculating contributions does not work equally well across the full range of NSO sizes and capacities.

In practical terms:

- NSOs below the 50th percentile of the economic income distribution pay a flat registration fee based on their economic capacity and membership size; and
- NSOs at or above the 50th percentile pay a fee per member, with the per-member rate increasing gradually with economic capacity.

This structure allows the model to remain simple where further differentiation would add limited value, while introducing greater proportionality where differences in economic capacity and organisational scale are more material.

Flat fees for NSOs below the 50th percentile

For NSOs below the 50th percentile of the economic income distribution, the model applies a flat registration fee. Fees are differentiated by GNI bands and membership-size brackets.

This approach provides predictability and clarity for NSOs, while avoiding unnecessary complexity. At lower fee levels, small changes in economic or membership data could create volatility without materially improving fairness. For many NSOs in this segment, a clear and stable fee is therefore more appropriate than a continuously recalculated amount.

The flat-fee approach does not imply that all NSOs in this segment have the same capacity to contribute. Rather, it seeks to ensure a proportionate level of differentiation while keeping the system straightforward and manageable.

Per-member fees for NSOs at or above the 50th percentile

For NSOs at or above the 50th percentile of the economic distribution, the model applies a fee per member. Under this approach:

- NSOs with more members contribute more in absolute terms; and
- the amount paid per member increases gradually with economic capacity.

The applicable per-member rate is determined using a GNI-based curve. This allows rates to rise progressively and avoids sharp jumps between NSOs with similar economic circumstances.

Each NSO within the per-member segment contributes a minimum of USD 1’000. The highest applicable per-member rate, excluding the effect of the minimum contribution, is capped at USD 1.70 per member.

Transition and annual updates

The contribution calculated under the model represents the amount towards which each NSO transitions over a 5-year transition. This transition period and the safeguards that protect NSOs from sudden changes are explained in Chapter 6. A detailed technical description of the model, including the data sources, flat-fee brackets, calculation methodology, transition rules, and annual update mechanism, is provided in Chapter 5.

Following the transition phase, GNI and membership numbers are updated on a yearly basis, and a 2% inflation adjustment is applied.

5. Technical description of the registration fee model

[a formal technical description of the hybrid registration fee model for NSOs. The model determines annual registration fees based on:

- economic capacity, measured by GNI per capita; and
- organisational scale, measured by total registered membership.

The model applies distinct fee logics to NSOs depending on their position relative to the 50th percentile of the GNI per capita distribution and incorporates explicit transition and update rules.

Definitions and data inputs

Let:

$$\begin{aligned}
i &= \text{index for NSOs} \\
m_{i,t} &= \text{reported census membership of NSO } i \text{ in year } t \\
M_i &= \frac{m_{i,t} + m_{i,t-1} + m_{i,t-2}}{3} \\
G_i &= \text{GNI per capita of NSO } i\text{, Atlas method, current USD} \\
P_{50} &= \text{50th percentile of GNI per capita across all NSOs} \\
F_i^{\text{old}} &= \text{current registration fee of NSO } i \\
F_i^{\text{struct}} &= \text{structural fee implied by the model} \\
F_{i,t}^{\text{new}} &= \text{applied registration fee of NSO } i \text{ in year } t
\end{aligned}$$

GNI per capita is sourced from the World Bank where available and current (less than 10 years old). Should GNI not be available, the data is sourced from Regional Development Banks or private data providers.

Model partitioning rule

Each NSO is assigned to one of the following regimes:

$$\text{Regime}_i = \begin{cases} \text{Flat-fee model} & \text{if } G_i < P_{50} \\ \text{Per-member fee model} & \text{if } G_i \geq P_{50} \end{cases}$$

Sub-categorisation

Within the income distribution, NSOs are further grouped into sub-categories based on percentile splits of log-transformed GNI per capita:

WB Group	Sub-category	Definition (Percentiles of ln GNI per capita within group)
A	A1	≤ P50
	A2	> P50
B	B1	≤ P50
	B2	> P50

C	C1	≤ P50
	C2	> P50
D	D1	≤ P25
	D2	P25–P50
	D3	P50–P75
	D4	> P75

For the purpose of the registration fee model:

- Sub-categories A1, A2, B1, B2 and C1 are relevant for the flat-fee segment;
- NSOs above the global 50th percentile fall into the per-member fee regime. The C2 and D sub-categories are therefore not used to determine flat fees but are included here to ensure consistency of categorisation across WOSM fee structures.

This ensures consistency of categorisation across WOSM fee structures, while applying different fee logics to different segments.

Flat-fee size model (NSOs below the 50th percentile)

For NSOs with $G_i < P_{50}$, the registration fee depends on membership size and GNI level.

Brackets

Let Si denote the applicable GNI sub-category of NSO (i).

- Let membership brackets be defined as: $[B_1, B_2, \dots, B_K]$
- For each GNI sub-category (s), let the corresponding flat fees be defined as: $[F_1, F_2, \dots, F_K]$
- NSO (i) belongs to membership bracket k if: $B_{k-1} < M_i \le B_k$
- The structural fee is then: $F_i^{struct} = F_k$

An overview of the brackets and the corresponding flat fees is provided below:

World Bank (sub-category)	Three-year rolling average of Membership.	Corresponding Flat Fee.
A1	≤ 1000	$ 400
	1001-2000	$ 500
	2001-3000	$ 600
	3001-4000	$ 700
	4001-5000	$ 800
	5001-10000	$ 900
	10001-100000	$ 1’000
	Each additional 100'000	$ 1’000
A2	≤ 1000	$ 500
	1001-2000	$ 600
	2001-3000	$ 700
	3001-4000	$ 800
	4001-5000	$ 900
	5001-10000	$ 1’000
	10001-100000	$ 1’100
	Each additional 100'000	$ 1’100
B1	≤1000	$ 600
	1001-2000	$ 800
	2001-3000	$ 1’000
	3001-4000	$ 1’200
	4001-5000	$ 1’400
	5001-10000	$ 1’600

	10001-100000	$ 1’800
	Each additional 100'000	$ 1’800
B2	≤1000	$ 700
	1001-2000	$ 900
	2001-3000	$ 1’100
	3001-4000	$ 1’300
	4001-5000	$ 1’500
	5001-10000	$ 1’700
	10001-100000	$ 2’000
	Each additional 100'000	$ 4’500
C1	≤ 1000	$ 1’000
	1001-2000	$ 1’500
	2001-3000	$ 2’000
	3001-4000	$ 2’500
	4001-5000	$ 3’000
	5001-10000	$ 4’000
	10001-100000	$ 8’000
	Each additional 100'000	$ 20’000

<u>Increment for very large NSOs (if applicable)</u>

For NSOs exceeding a maximum bracket B_K, an incremental rule applies: $F_i^{\text{struct}} = F_{s_i,K} + \left\lfloor \frac{M_i - B_K}{\Delta} \right\rfloor \delta_{s_i}$

where:

- Δ = membership block size (100’000 members),
- δ_{s_i} = incremental fee per additional block for sub-category s_i.

For NSOs with more than 10 million members, the structural fee is capped at USD 160’000.

Per-member fee model (NSOs at or above the 50th percentile)

For NSOs with $G_i \geq P_{50}$, fees are determined by a continuous per-member fee rate derived from a GNI-based interpolation curve. Let the calibration points on the GNI distribution be defined as:$(G^{(1)}, r^{(1)}), (G^{(2)}, r^{(2)}), \ldots, (G^{(J)}, r^{(J)})$

where:

- $G^{(j)}$= GNI per capita value at calibration point j,
- $r^{(j)}$= rate parameter at calibration point j

The calibration points include relevant points of the GNI distribution, such as the 50th, 75th and 90th percentiles and the maximum value. They satisfy:

$G^{(1)} = P_{50}$
$G^{(J)} = \max_i G_i$

- The calibration parameters are used to derive the piecewise-linear curve.
- Each NSO in the per-member fee segment pays a minimum registration fee of USD 1’000.
- No NSO pays more than 30% of all fees invoiced, to avoid concentration risk
- Excluding the minimum fee, the maximum applicable per-member fee rate is USD 1.70. Accordingly: $r_i \leq 1.70$ USD

Application of the curve:
For NSO (i), identify the interval (j) such that: $G^{(j)} \leq G_i < G^{(j+1)}$

Let $a^{(j)}$and $b^{(j)}$ denote the intercept and slope parameters applicable to interval (j), as reported in Sub-chapter "technical tables".

The per-member fee rate r_i is then given by $r_i = a^{(j)} + b^{(j)} G_i$

Within each interval, the per-member fee rate increases linearly with GNI per capita. The structural fee is calculated as: $F_i^{\text{struct}} = M_i \cdot r_i$ subject to the minimum fee and the cap set out above.

The parameters are calibrated to ensure aggregate revenue neutrality and manageable fee adjustments across NSOs. The resulting structural fee represents the steady-state fee before the application of transitional constraints.

Transition Mechanism

To avoid abrupt changes, the model applies a five-year linear transition from the current fee to the structural fee.

Let: $\Delta_i = F_i^{struct} - F_i^{old}$. The applied fee in transition year $t \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ is given by: $F_{i,t}^{new} = F_i^{old} + \frac{t}{5} \cdot \Delta i$ After completion of the transition period: $F_{i,t}^{new} = F_i^{struct}$for all $t > 5$. The transition applies symmetrically to increases and decreases and is rule-based for all NSOs.

Annual updating and inflation adjustment (post-transition)

During the five-year transition period, the applied fee evolves solely according to the transition rule set out above. No annual re-baselining or inflation adjustment is applied during this phase.

Once the transition period is completed, the model enters its steady-state operational phase, in which fees are updated annually as follows:

Annual structural update
Each year (t), the structural fee is recalculated using updated inputs: $F_{i,t}^{struct} = f(\mathrm{G}_{i,t}, M_{i,t})$

where:
- $\mathrm{G}_{i,t}$is the updated GNI per capita of NSO (i) in year (t)
- $M_{i,t}$is the updated three-year rolling average membership of NSO (i) in year (t).

Inflation adjustment
After recalculating the structural fee, a fixed inflation adjustment of 2% per annum is applied. Let the resulting uncapped updated fee be: $F_{i,t}^{uncapped} = F_{i,t}^{struct} \times (1.02)$

Annual change limit:
The applied fee may not increase or decrease by more than 10% relative to the fee applied in the previous year. Accordingly: $F_{i,t}^{\text{new}} = \min\left\{1.10 \cdot F_{i,t-1}^{\text{new}},\ \max\left[0.90 \cdot F_{i,t-1}^{\text{new}},\ F_{i,t}^{\text{uncapped}}\right]\right\}$

This ensures that:
- fees remain responsive to changes in economic capacity and membership; and
- nominal fee levels evolve in a predictable manner over time; and
- annual increases and decreases remain manageable for NSOs.

Technical Tables

The per-member fee schedule is defined as a piecewise linear function of GNI per capita. For each interval of the GNI distribution, the applicable per-member fee rate is determined using the corresponding intercept and slope parameters reported below.

Y	0	0.1	0.3	0.75	1.1	1.7
	min	Q1	Q2	Q3	90th	Q4
GNI	190	2485	7695	26702.5	54045	98280
Intercept	-0.005374823	-0.005374823	-0.005374823	0.408192375	0.366938	
Slope	2.82885E-05	2.68401E-05	2.36749E-05	1.28006E-05	1.36E-05	

The calibration parameters support the systematic construction of the curve. They are not fixed per-member rates through which each segment must pass. The operative parameters for calculating fees are the interval-specific intercepts and slopes.

6. What does this mean for your NSO?

Each NSO can review its current contribution, future contribution under the proposed model, and five-year transition path using the online fee calculator. Questions regarding the underlying data or calculation can be directed to Annie Weaver at annie.weaver@scout.org

Predictability was one of the most consistent priorities raised by NSOs during the consultation process. The proposed model therefore includes several safeguards to prevent abrupt changes and allow NSOs to plan their contributions with confidence.

Five-year transition period

The new model will not take effect immediately in full. Instead, each NSO will transition gradually from its current contribution to the amount calculated under the new model over a period of five years.

Each year, one fifth of the difference between the current contribution and the contribution under the new model will be applied. This approach applies symmetrically: fee increases and decreases are both phased in gradually.

During the transition period, each NSO’s contribution path is pre-defined. Fees are not recalculated annually based on new economic or membership data, and no inflation adjustment is applied during this period. This provides NSOs with a clear basis for medium-term financial planning.

Safeguards after the transition period

Once the five-year transition period is complete, fees will be updated annually using the most recent available economic and membership data. This ensures that the model remains current and does not gradually become outdated again.

Several safeguards continue to apply following the transition period:

- membership is measured using a three-year rolling average, reducing the impact of short-term fluctuations;
- annual increases and decreases are capped at 10%, preventing sudden changes from one year to the next;

- a fixed annual inflation adjustment ensures that fee levels evolve gradually and predictably over time; and
- the contribution of any individual NSO is subject to an overall cap of 30%, ensuring that WOSM does not become excessively dependent on a single organisation.

Exceptional circumstances

The model is designed to provide a fair and predictable basis for contributions across the Movement. At the same time, WOSM recognises that exceptional circumstances may affect an NSO's ability to meet its contribution. As per the Policy concerning payment of Registration Fees, the existing possibility for NSOs experiencing temporary financial difficulties to seek assistance will remain available. This discussion should be initiated by NSOs and should occur before their invoice becomes overdue.

7. Consultation and development process

The proposed registration fee model has been developed through a multi-stage process, building on earlier work within WOSM and extensive engagement across the Movement.

Feedback from the regional conferences

As a first step, the Fee Task Force engaged with NSOs during all the regional conferences in 2025. These discussions focused on the shortcomings of the current system and the principles that should guide a revised approach.

While perspectives differed across the Movement, several priorities emerged consistently. NSOs emphasised that a revised model should:

- distribute contributions more fairly across the Movement;
- reflect differences in economic capacity and organisational scale;
- remain predictable and manageable for NSOs;
- avoid unnecessary complexity and volatility; and
- provide WOSM with a sustainable and reliable income base.

This feedback, shared with NSOs in December 2025, informed the design of the proposed model and the balance it seeks to strike between fairness, predictability, transparency, and simplicity.

Development and testing of the proposal

Based on this feedback, the Task Force developed and tested different approaches to registration fees. This included reviewing the economic and membership data used in the model, assessing alternative structures, and considering how changes could be phased in without creating sudden adjustments for NSOs.

The Task Force also assessed different indicators of economic capacity. GNI per capita, based on the World Bank Atlas method, was retained as the most suitable basis for the model because it is transparent, comparable across countries, and updated regularly. Further information on the choice of indicator and the alternatives considered is provided in the Frequently Asked Questions on Treehouse.

The proposed hybrid model emerged from this process. It combines predictable flat fees for NSOs below the midpoint of the global economic distribution with a progressively increasing per-member contribution for NSOs at or above that threshold.

Consultation on the proposed model

Following the development of the proposal, WOSM launched an extensive consultation process to allow NSOs to understand the model, assess its implications, and provide feedback.

This consultation included:

- briefings with Regional Committees;
- technical presentations and open information sessions for NSOs;
- discussions at regional and global meetings;
- bilateral exchanges with NSOs;
- campfires to foster exchange among NSOs;
- an online fee calculator allowing each NSO to review its individual fee path; and
- supporting materials, including explanatory documents, frequently asked questions, and an explainer video.

The consultation process provided an opportunity to clarify the model, address questions, and identify areas where additional explanation or safeguards were needed. Feedback from NSOs was consistently taken into consideration throughout the process, and adjustments were made where applicable.

Finalisation of the proposal

The feedback received during the consultation process informed the final proposal submitted for approval. Overall, the response to the proposed registration fee model during technical sessions, bilateral discussions, and campfire sessions was broadly positive. Many NSOs recognised the need to update the current system and welcomed the emphasis on fairness, predictability, and a gradual transition.

Some NSOs requested further clarification on the use of GNI per capita as the main indicator of economic capacity, including the rationale for choosing this measure and the alternatives considered. Further information on this point is provided in the Frequently Asked Questions.

A significant part of the discussion also focused on the affordability and accessibility of World Scout Events. While registration fees and event participation fees are distinct, NSOs expressed a strong interest in understanding the relationship between the two and in ensuring that World Scout Events remain accessible in the future. This feedback is reflected in the second question submitted to NSOs as part of the ballot.

A detailed overview of the consultation and engagement process is provided in Annex I.

8. Relationship to World Scout Events Fees

Registration fees and participation fees for World Scout Events are related, but distinct. Registration fees are the annual contributions paid by NSOs to WOSM’s core budget as per their constitutional membership obligation. Event participation fees are individual fees, determined separately for each World Scout Event, based on the event budget and following discussions between the event host and WOSM. The applicable participation fees are approved by the WSC.

The review of the registration fee model has nevertheless highlighted a broader concern regarding the affordability and accessibility of World Scout Events. This issue was raised consistently during the consultation process. In considering how the event fee structure should evolve, three possible approaches were assessed.

Updating the existing categories

One option considered, was to retain the existing A–D category structure and simply update both the World Bank income-group boundaries and the GNI per capita data used to classify NSOs.

However, this would lead to significant upward movements across the existing categories:

- 26 NSOs would move from category A to category B;
- 2 NSOs would move from category A to category C;
- 31 NSOs would move from category B to category C;
- 4 NSOs would move from category B to category D; and
- 17 NSOs would move from category C to category D.

Under the current event-fee structure, these movements could result in substantial increases in participation fees for many NSOs. Simply updating the existing categories would therefore risk creating financially unsustainable outcomes and could further reduce the accessibility of World Scout Events. Hence, this approach was not further pursued.

De-linking registration fees and event fees

A second option would be to de-link registration fees and event-fee categories entirely. A similar approach was implemented in the 2010s, when event-fee categories were updated separately to better reflect the economic realities faced by NSOs. However, this led to significant complexity and confusion. Operating two categorisation logics in parallel made the system harder to explain and maintain. Ultimately the WSC reversed this decision in the 2017-2020+1 Triennium.

It would also not address the underlying affordability challenge: regardless of how NSOs are categorised, the overall cost of delivering and attending World Scout Events would remain unchanged.

For these reasons, a fully separate categorisation system for event fees was not considered an appropriate solution.

A more differentiated categorisation system

The proposed approach is therefore to update the existing categorisation system while introducing a greater degree of differentiation within the current categories. A per country overview can be found in Annex II. Similar to the approach taken for registration fees, the aim is to reflect national economic realities more accurately without creating individualised fees for each NSO.

By introducing additional sub-categories, the revised structure would allow participation costs to be distributed more fairly between NSOs with different levels of economic capacity. The fees applicable to each sub-category would continue to be determined separately for each event, taking account of the event budget.

A more differentiated structure would improve the distribution of participation fees, but it would not by itself solve the broader affordability challenge. The precise effect on individual participation fees will depend on the cost of each event. Participation fees are also only one part of the overall cost of attending World Scout Events. Travel, visas, equipment, and other expenses continue to affect the ability of young people and NSOs to participate.

Addressing this challenge requires a broader discussion across the Movement about the type of World Scout Events we want to deliver in the future. This includes questions around the scale and complexity of events; the financial and operational risks associated with hosting them; the standards and delivery models used for conferences and other convention-style events; and the growing costs of safety, security, and risk management, including in the context of a changing climate.

These are not straightforward questions. Choices that reduce costs may also require trade-offs in terms of scale, format, participant experience, or the range of services provided. They require further research and a substantive discussion among NSOs, so that clear expectations can be reflected in future event requirements and bidding processes.

For this reason, the second ballot question asks NSOs to identify the affordability and accessibility of World Scout Events as a priority topic for further work. The introduction of additional sub-categories will provide a fairer basis for distributing event participation fees, but would not in itself determine whether the fee paid by an individual NSO increases or decreases. This will depend on the overall budget of each event and the participation fees agreed with the event host. The WSC will work with event hosts, bidders, Regions, and NSOs to develop actionable proposals ahead of the 44th World Scout Conference in 2027.

In July, the WSC agreed to introduce the new sub-categorisation, subject to approval of the new fee model by National Scout Organisations. The revised categorisation would apply to World Scout Events from the 2027–2030 triennium onwards.

9. Summary: Why this model is the right approach for the Movement

No registration fee model can eliminate all trade-offs. The proposed model nevertheless provides a stronger basis for sharing contributions across the Movement because it:

- **reflects today's realities**, by using updated economic and membership data rather than parameters that have remained largely unchanged since 2011;
- **improves fairness**, by ensuring that NSOs with broadly comparable economic capacity and organisational scale contribute broadly comparable amounts;
- **recognises differences across the Movement**, by applying a simple flat-fee approach where further differentiation would add limited value and a more progressive per-member approach where differences in capacity are more material;
- **protects NSOs from sudden changes**, through a five-year transition period, rolling membership averages, and safeguards on annual adjustments;
- **remains transparent and verifiable**, by relying on objective data and a clear methodology that NSOs can review through the online fee calculator;
- **does not seek to increase WOSM's overall registration-fee income**, but to distribute contributions more fairly across the Movement; and
- **provides a sustainable basis for the future**, by ensuring that the model can evolve gradually as economic conditions and membership numbers change over time.

The proposal seeks to balance fairness, solidarity, predictability, and simplicity. It provides a more equitable and future-proof basis for financing WOSM's work in support of Scouting around the world.

Annex I - Overview NSO consultations

Targeted engagements, regional, cross-regional, bi-laterals with NSOs, future events hosts and external organisations

Date	Audience
May 2025	• **Fee Focus Group:** Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Philippines, Portugal, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States
July 2025	• **European Scout Conference** • World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (**WAGGGS**)
September 2025	• **Africa Scout Conference** • **WSC WOSM Events Oversight Group**
October 2025	• **Asia-Pacific Scout Conference** • International Catholic Conference of Scouting (**ICCS**)
November 2025	• **Interamerican Scout Conference**
November 2025	• **Arab Scout Conference**
Continuous	• **Fee Focus Group:** Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Philippines, Portugal, Thailand • **Bilaterals incl. engagements with SG:** United Kingdom, United States
January 2026	• **NSO Leadership Gathering:** Australia, Brazil, Canada, Czechia, Egypt, France, Hong Kong, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Philippines, Senegal, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States
February 2026	• **Africa Scout Committee** • **Arab Scout Committee** • **Asia-Pacific Scout Committee** • **European Scout Committee** • **Interamerican Scout Committee** • **Fee Focus Group:** Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Honk Kong, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Philippines, Portugal, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States

	• **Multiple NSOs - European Region:** South-East Europe Meeting: Bulgaria, Greece, Israel, Malta, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia
March 2026	• **Chairpersons of the Audit and Finance Committee and WOSM Treasurer** • **Multiple NSOs - Asia-Pacific Region** International Commissioners Forum (nearly full regional participation): Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Fiji, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Macao, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Scouts of China, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Viet Nam. • **Multiple NSOs - Interamerica Region** o Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Paraguay o Caribbean NSOs: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Guyana • **Bilaterals incl. engagements with SG (13):** Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Czechia, Denmark, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, Tanzania, Türkiye. • **Future World Scout Event hosts**
April 2026	• **Multiple NSOs - European Region:** Italy, Spain, Poland, Hungary • **Bilaterals incl. engagements with SG (10):** Argentina, Bahrain, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Palestine, Peru, Qatar, South Africa, Switzerland, and United Arab Emirates (UAE).
May 2026	• **Technical briefings (2):** 41 participants in total • **Bilaterals incl. engagements with SG (7):** Algeria, Bhutan, Colombia, Hong Kong, India, Panama, and Sierra Leone.
June 2026	• **Dialogue Campfires (2):** Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Czechia, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Zambia. • **Bilaterals incl. engagements with SG (3):** Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Indonesia.

Annex II – Event fee Sub-Categorisation

(Note: if approved, this new categorisation will go into effect from the start of the 2027-2030 triennium)

Countries of NSOs	GNI per capita Atlas method (current USD) 2024 (or earlier (available)	New Category	New Sub-category	WOSM Region
Afghanistan	$ 370	A	A1	Asia-Pacific
Albania	$ 9’910	C	C2	European
Algeria	$ 5’370	C	C1	Arab
Angola	$ 2’840	B	B2	Africa
Antigua and Barbuda	$ 21’150	D	D1	Interamerican
Argentina	$ 13’530	C	C2	Interamerican
Armenia	$ 7’810	C	C2	European
Aruba	$ 35’570	D	D2	Interamerican
Australia	$ 62’680	D	D4	Asia-Pacific
Austria	$ 54’760	D	D4	European
Azerbaijan	$ 7’330	C	C1	European
Bahamas	$ 37’020	D	D3	Interamerican
Bahrain	$ 28’090	D	D2	Arab
Bangladesh	$ 2’820	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Barbados	$ 25’140	D	D2	Interamerican
Belarus	$ 8’260	C	C2	European
Belgium	$ 55’290	D	D4	European
Belize	$ 7’150	C	C1	Interamerican
Benin	$ 1’430	B	B1	Africa
Bhutan	$ 3’730	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Bolivia, Plurinational State of	$ 4’160	B	B2	Interamerican
Bosnia and Herzegovina	$ 8’790	C	C2	European
Botswana	$ 7’750	C	C2	Africa
Brazil	$ 9’930	C	C2	Interamerican
Brunei Darussalam	$ 36’020	D	D3	Asia-Pacific
Bulgaria	$ 15’370	D	D1	European
Burkina Faso	$ 850	A	A2	Africa
Burundi	$ 260	A	A1	Africa
Cabo Verde	$ 4’950	C	C1	Africa
Cambodia	$ 2’550	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Cameroon	$ 1’700	B	B1	Africa
Canada	$ 53’400	D	D3	Interamerican

Chad	$ 940	A	A2	Africa
Chile	$ 15’750	D	D1	Interamerican
China, Scouts of	$ 34’165	D	D2	Asia-Pacific
Colombia	$ 7’040	C	C1	Interamerican
Comoros	$ 1’590	B	B1	Africa
Congo	$ 2’280	B	B1	Africa
Congo, Democratic Republic of the	$ 670	A	A1	Africa
Costa Rica	$ 15’620	D	D1	Interamerican
Côte d'Ivoire	$ 2’530	B	B2	Africa
Croatia	$ 22’250	D	D1	European
Curaçao	$ 22’590	D	D2	Interamerican
Cyprus	$ 32’870	D	D2	European
Czechia	$ 29’560	D	D2	European
Denmark	$ 72’540	D	D4	European
Dominica	$ 10’230	C	C2	Interamerican
Dominican Republic	$ 10’280	C	C2	Interamerican
Ecuador	$ 6’430	C	C1	Interamerican
Egypt	$ 3’510	B	B2	Arab
El Salvador	$ 5’120	C	C1	Interamerican
Estonia	$ 28’880	D	D2	European
Eswatini	$ 3’590	B	B2	Africa
Ethiopia	$ 1’100	A	A2	Africa
Fiji	$ 5’820	C	C1	Asia-Pacific
Finland	$ 51’650	D	D3	European
France	$ 45’160	D	D3	European
Gabon	$ 7’790	C	C2	Africa
Gambia	$ 880	A	A2	Africa
Georgia	$ 8’110	C	C2	European
Germany	$ 55’090	D	D4	European
Ghana	$ 2’310	B	B1	Africa
Greece	$ 22’730	D	D2	European
Grenada	$ 10’510	C	C2	Interamerican
Guatemala	$ 5’780	C	C1	Interamerican
Guinea	$ 1’440	B	B1	Africa
Guinea-Bissau	$ 990	A	A2	Africa
Guyana	$ 20’140	D	D1	Interamerican
Haiti	$ 1’760	B	B1	Interamerican
Honduras	$ 3’020	B	B2	Interamerican
Hong Kong	$ 57’070	D	D4	Asia-Pacific
Hungary	$ 20’770	D	D1	European
Iceland	$ 82’200	D	D4	European
India	$ 2’650	B	B2	Asia-Pacific

Indonesia	$	4’910	C	C1	Asia-Pacific
Iraq	$	6’030	C	C1	Arab
Ireland	$	80’650	D	D4	European
Israel	$	52’910	D	D3	European
Italy	$	38’590	D	D3	European
Jamaica	$	7’210	C	C1	Interamerican
Japan	$	36’000	D	D2	Asia-Pacific
Jordan	$	4’430	B	B2	Arab
Kazakhstan	$	12’090	C	C2	Asia-Pacific
Kenya	$	2’090	B	B1	Africa
Kiribati	$	3’660	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Korea, Republic of	$	36’750	D	D3	Asia-Pacific
Kuwait	$	40’770	D	D3	Arab
Latvia	$	21’630	D	D1	European
Lebanon	$	3’700	B	B2	Arab
Lesotho	$	1’180	B	B1	Africa
Liberia	$	760	A	A1	Africa
Libya	$	6’890	C	C1	Arab
Liechtenstein	$	95’220	D	D4	European
Lithuania	$	27’150	D	D2	European
Luxembourg	$	84’650	D	D4	European
Macao	$	45’960	D	D3	Asia-Pacific
Madagascar	$	510	A	A1	Africa
Malawi	$	570	A	A1	Africa
Malaysia	$	11’650	C	C2	Asia-Pacific
Maldives	$	11’640	C	C2	Asia-Pacific
Mali	$	1’030	A	A2	Africa
Malta	$	36’730	D	D3	European
Mauritania	$	2’120	B	B1	Arab
Mauritius	$	12’970	C	C2	Africa
Mexico	$	12’850	C	C2	Interamerican
Moldova, Republic of	$	6’880	C	C1	European
Monaco	$	45’160	D	D3	European
Mongolia	$	5’380	C	C1	Asia-Pacific
Montenegro	$	12’210	C	C2	European
Morocco	$	3’840	B	B2	Arab
Mozambique	$	550	A	A1	Africa
Myanmar	$	1’210	B	B1	Asia-Pacific
Namibia	$	4’240	B	B2	Africa
Nepal	$	1’470	B	B1	Asia-Pacific
Netherlands	$	62’520	D	D4	European
New Zealand	$	47’580	D	D3	Asia-Pacific

Nicaragua	$	2’510	B	B1	Interamerican
Niger	$	680	A	A1	Africa
Nigeria	$	1’700	B	B1	Africa
North Macedonia	$	8’300	C	C2	European
Norway	$	98’170	D	D4	European
Oman	$	19’520	D	D1	Arab
Pakistan	$	1’430	B	B1	Asia-Pacific
Palestine, State of	$	2’710	B	B2	Arab
Panama	$	18’010	D	D1	Interamerican
Papua New Guinea	$	2’900	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Paraguay	$	6’300	C	C1	Interamerican
Peru	$	7’500	C	C1	Interamerican
Philippines	$	4’470	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Poland	$	21’590	D	D1	European
Portugal	$	26’910	D	D2	European
Qatar	$	77’290	D	D4	Arab
Romania	$	17’600	D	D1	European
Russian Federation	$	15’320	D	D1	Asia-Pacific
Rwanda	$	1’040	A	A2	Africa
Saint Lucia	$	12’640	C	C2	Interamerican
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	$	11’060	C	C2	Interamerican
San Marino	$	53’890	D	D3	European
Sao Tome and Principe	$	2’850	B	B2	Africa
Saudi Arabia	$	35’630	D	D2	Arab
Senegal	$	1’680	B	B1	Africa
Serbia	$	11’610	C	C2	European
Seychelles	$	17’460	D	D1	Africa
Sierra Leone	$	820	A	A2	Africa
Singapore	$	74’750	D	D4	Asia-Pacific
Slovakia	$	23’560	D	D2	European
Slovenia	$	31’790	D	D2	European
Solomon Islands	$	1’910	B	B1	Asia-Pacific
South Africa	$	6’110	C	C1	Africa
South Sudan	$	1’050	A	A2	Africa
Spain	$	33’550	D	D2	European
Sri Lanka	$	3’860	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Sudan	$	710	A	A1	Arab
Suriname	$	5’690	C	C1	Interamerican
Sweden	$	58’190	D	D4	European
Switzerland	$	95’220	D	D4	European
Syrian Arab Republic	$	710	A	A1	Arab
Tajikistan	$	1’650	B	B1	Asia-Pacific

Tanzania, United Republic of	$ 1’210	B	B1	Africa
Thailand	$ 7’100	C	C1	Asia-Pacific
Timor-Leste	$ 1’650	B	B1	Asia-Pacific
Togo	$ 1’080	A	A2	Africa
Trinidad and Tobago	$ 19’740	D	D1	Interamerican
Tunisia	$ 3’880	B	B2	Arab
Turkey	$ 13’460	C	C2	European
Uganda	$ 1’020	A	A2	Africa
Ukraine	$ 5’210	C	C1	European
United Arab Emirates	$ 51’550	D	D3	Arab
United Kingdom	$ 49’470	D	D3	European
United States of America	$ 83’490	D	D4	Interamerican
Uruguay	$ 21’650	D	D1	Interamerican
Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of	$ 3’820	B	B2	Interamerican
Vietnam	$ 4’490	B	B2	Asia-Pacific
Yemen	$ 740	A	A1	Arab
Zambia	$ 1’220	B	B1	Africa
Zimbabwe	$ 2’400	B	B1	Africa

World Scout Bureau
Global Support Centre
Kuala Lumpur

scout.org