

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

National Cable Television Association

Daniel L. Brenner
Vice President for Law &
Regulatory Policy

1724 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20036-1969
202 775-3664 Fax: 202 775-3603

July 6, 1995

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N. W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUL - 6 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: MM Docket No. 87-268
Advanced Television Systems

Dear Mr. Caton:

On June 28, 1995, the undersigned, accompanied by Brendan Clouston, TCI Communications, Inc., Robert Miron, Advance/Newhouse Communicatons, and Ted Turner, Turner Broadcasting Co. met with Chairman Reed Hundt, Commissioner Rachelle Chong, Commissioner Susan Ness and their legal assistants, and Maureen O'Connell, Senior Advisor to Commissioner Quello and Lisa Smith, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Barrett. Michael Katz, Office of Plans and Policy and Saul Shapiro, Broadcast Bureau, also attended the meeting with Chairman Hundt. The topic was the cable industry's position relating to advanced television, a copy of a summary is attached herewith.

Please associate this letter with the above captioned docket.

Sincerely,



Daniel Brenner

Attachment

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E



NCTA'S POSITION ON HIGH DEFINITION TV

RECEIVED

JUL - 6 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

What We Agree To

- We generally believe that the Commission should not adopt technical standards if the marketplace can develop those standards itself. If there is a need for standards for advanced television (ATV), it should only apply to broadcasting of ATV and should follow the proposal in the FCC Third Report and Order using digital compression and fitting in a bandwidth of 6 MHz that produces a picture of approximately 2 times the resolution of a standard NTSC image.
- The cable industry is committed to offering HDTV service to subscribers once broadcasters begin to offer it.
- Standards should be established that allow flexibility as to how the operator delivers the broadcaster's HDTV signal to the subscriber.
- We support the transition of the terrestrial broadcast system to an all-HDTV service and the return of NTSC spectrum for re-allocation by the FCC at the earliest possible time.
- We support a simulcast policy that maximizes the amount of advanced television service broadcast in the terrestrial system.
- Television broadcasters should be entitled to one channel for ATV, either to offer HDTV or, if they choose, digital standard definition TV (SDTV). They should not be entitled to "trade in" the 6 MHz allocated for one channel of digital TV for multiple nondigital signals.
- If a broadcaster does not use all 6 MHz for HDTV, any unused spectrum should be paid for if used by the broadcaster, or auctioned to any compatible users.
- Broadcasters may not offer the one free transition channel for ATV on a subscription basis.
- The FCC must prevent the must carry or retransmission consent provisions of the Act from applying to more than one signal from an ATV/NTSC service pair.

Support for our Position

- *Regarding no subscription:* The 1992 Order states:

"We will not allow broadcasters with ATV/NTSC channel pairs to use their ATV channel for a stand-alone subscription ATV service, separate from a free NTSC service." (para. 75)

- *Regarding allowing only one ATV channel per broadcaster:* The 1992 Order states:

"These effects and incentives are contrary to the reason we are awarding broadcasters a second channel -- to permit the viewing public to make a nondisruptive transition to ATV and allow the reclamation of the second channel after that transition is complete." (para. 75, emphasis added)