

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1994

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1776 K STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
(202) 429-7000

DAVID E. HILLIARD
(202) 429-7058

December 8, 1994

FACSIMILE
(202) 429-7049
TELEX 248349 WYRN UR

Chairman Reed E. Hundt
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 814
Washington, D.C. 20554
STOP CODE: 0101

**Re: Ex Parte Communication
PR Docket No. 93-61
Automatic Vehicle Monitoring**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Chairman Hundt:

The purpose of this letter is to set the record straight on the position of Pinpoint Communications, Inc. ("Pinpoint") on testing between wide-area AVM and Part 15 technologies. Pinpoint has been seeking tests with Part 15 interests since the spring of this year, only to have the Part 15 interests involved repeatedly pull out at the last minute. (Pinpoint has also submitted the only test data in the record that directly assess the ability of wide-area and local-area AVM systems to share. The results support the conclusion that sharing between these types of systems is practical.)

In light of the letter you received yesterday from counsel for the Part 15 Coalition ("Part 15 Coalition Letter"), you should be fully informed of some of the more recent developments concerning tests. Pinpoint and Itron, Inc. were discussing in detail tests to be conducted in Washington, D.C. on November 14 and 15, 1994, only to have Itron decline on the day Pinpoint was scheduled to send personnel and ship equipment to set up for the tests. Itron acted purportedly out of a desire to participate in more "comprehensive" tests three weeks later in California. Because there is a large base of Itron automatic meter readers ("AMRs") in the vicinity of Pinpoint's experimental AVM system in Washington, D.C., the interactions between AMRs and Pinpoint's forward *and* reverse links could have been fully tested in Washington. Nonetheless, in a spirit of cooperation, and despite that fact that Pinpoint has no installed equipment in California, Pinpoint agreed to go to the West Coast to participate in testing.

The Part 15 Coalition Letter mischaracterizes the tests that were to have been conducted in California on December 3, and 4. First, the nature of the tests and the extent to which

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

042

Chairman Reed E. Hundt
December 8, 1994
Page 2

Teletrac, MobileVision, and Southwestern Bell were intending to participate in the California tests relates to a state of affairs known to the Part 15 Coalition several weeks before the Part 15 interests unilaterally canceled the tests. Despite this knowledge which the Part 15 Coalition Letter states was the reason for canceling the tests, the Part 15 interests strung Pinpoint along for three weeks before unilaterally canceling the December 3 and 4 tests. (Indeed, Pinpoint had engineering personnel installing equipment in California for the tests when it received word of the cancellation.)

Second, the Part 15 Coalition Letter incorrectly states the nature of the December 3 and 4 tests when it says they "would have examined only the wideband forward link issue." Pinpoint and Teletrac were planning to have receiving equipment in place to assemble data from Part 15 transmissions that could be used to analyze the effects of unlicensed devices on the return link. Pinpoint and Teletrac intended to share the data with each other. Pinpoint was also planning to share its data with MobileVision and Southwestern Bell to allow them to conduct their own analyses (and understood Teletrac would do the same). Indeed, the Part 15 Coalition Letter was referring to such reverse link tests when it stated, somewhat inaccurately, "Teletrac and Southwestern Bell were planning . . . to monitor the test and, perhaps, extrapolate the *Pinpoint* test results to their own systems." (emphasis added) The reference was to reverse link tests -- wideband forward link tests would be of no interest to Teletrac and Southwestern Bell because they use narrowband forward links.

Pinpoint has not favored a partial decision in this matter. The results of AVM/Part 15 testing would be relevant to the allocation decision in general, not just the use of the wideband forward link. If test results show that virtually all Part 15 interests do not cause harmful interference to Pinpoint and also show that Pinpoint can operate without causing harmful interference to Part 15, such results would be extremely relevant to any allocation decisions. This is especially true given the positive results of Pinpoint testing with local-area technologies. Pinpoint's principal position on tests has always been, like that of the Part 15 Coalition, that the FCC should await the results of tests before making any decision. However, if the Commission is still undecided on the wideband forward link issue, Pinpoint would urge the FCC not to make a decision on that matter prematurely.

If other wide-area AVM companies have not been as willing to test as the Part 15 Coalition may have desired, that should come as no surprise. The capacity of their systems is significantly smaller than Pinpoint's. Thus, they would naturally have less incentive to engage in testing that could not only reveal that Pinpoint's wide-area AVM system is more compatible with Part 15 devices but also support a shared allocation that accommodates Pinpoint's system.

Chairman Reed E. Hundt
December 8, 1994
Page 3

If Pinpoint were to be eliminated as a potential competitor because of insufficient field data as to its compatibility with Part 15, such a result would serve their interests and those of Part 15.

Finally, despite its frustration with the successive cancellation of tests, Pinpoint believes that the testing discussions with the Part 15 community were beneficial. At long last, at least there was an informed exchange of views among the engineers who, if there are to be technical solutions, will find them. Pinpoint remains willing to test and to continue to work for ways to operate in the 902-928 MHz band on a shared basis.

Two copies of this letter are being submitted to the Secretary's office as required by Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the FCC's Rules.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Hilliard
Counsel for Pinpoint Communications, Inc.

cc: Commissioner James H. Quello
Commissioner Andrew C. Barrett
Commissioner Rachelle B. Chong
Commissioner Susan Ness
Ruth Milkman, Esq.

Lauren Belvin, Esq.
Mr. James R. Coltharp
Jane Mago, Esq.
David R. Siddall, Esq.
Mr. F. Ronald Netro
Rosalind K. Allen, Esq.
Henrietta Wright, Esq.
Counsel for the Part 15 Coalition