the AT&T Open Area Test Site (OATS) In Oklahoma City. A radio frequency anechoic room (Option 1) is not currently available at this facility. Therefore, testing will be conducted within the shielded room at the OATS facility. The possibility of using a GSM cell will also be explored.

Mounting and Orienting the Hearing Aid

The hearing aid must be positioned in the RF test field away from objects that could distort the field and in such a way that it can be manipulated for maximum interference. Previous protocols have used the following:

1. place HA in chamber in "normal use" position, rotate (clockwise) in 9O° steps in the horizontal plane, measure interference at maximum SPL (EHIMA, 1993; IEC, 1994; National Telecom Agency of Denmark, 1994),
2. use both horizontal and vertical polarization of the RF field (EHIMA, 1993),
3. gimbal style mounting device for positioning HA in the waveguide about three axes, rotate for maximum pickup (Le Strange et al., 1995), and
4. mount within the Kemar head (no reference found at present).

Discussions of the Study Design Group led to the conclusion that the Kemar head (Option 4) was not an effective means of mounting the hearing aids since it did not provide a good RF analog of the human head. Option 3 is unique to the waveguide approach which is not being used in this study. Options 1 and 2 will be combined through the user of a non-RF distorting mounting device for alignment of the HA and a *device for positioning of the phone.*

Measuring Hearing Aid Output

The output of the HA must be measured without introducing instrumentation that could distort the RF field. This has typically been accomplished by using small diameter (2 mm) plastic tubing with a length between 50 mm and 500 mm to distance the HA and the acoustic monitor (IEC, 1994). Specific examples include:

1. ear simulator (IEC 711)to audio test station, amplifier, and DAT recorder via 500 mm tubing (EHIMA, 1993; National Telecom Agency of Denmark, 1994), and
2). standard 2 cc acoustic coupler to measuring microphone (B&K4155) and measuring amplifier (B&K 2636) via 500 mm length of 2 mm Tygon© tubing (Le Strange et al., 1995)

Option 2 will be used in this study based on available models of audio monitoring equipment.

Subjective (Psycho-acoustic) Measurements

Subjective evaluation of wireless phone interference is important since the delectability and annoyance of the interference depend on the individual hearing acuity of each HA user. Delectability and annoyance levels should be determined for hearing-impaired people with hearing losses appropriate to each type of HA. Persons with normal hearing should also be included to represent worst case situations of delectability and annoyance. Delectability can be determined through the application of standard psychophysical techniques such as the method of limits or method of constant stimuli. The degree of annoyance is typically ascertained through the use of subjective scaling techniques.

Interference Source

Subjects may be presented with either actual or recorded interference signals. Specific examples include:

1. recorded interference signal together with pinknoise, "partysounds", or connected speech (EHIMA, 1993; National Telecom Agency of Denmark, 1994),

and

2. actual phone with call placed to pre-recorded message (Le Strange et al., 1995). A variation of Option 2 can be achieved through the use of the base station simulator and the cell phone loopback (talkback) mode or audio transmission from the base station.

Detectability

Interference can be recorded on DAT or generated directly with actual phones for evaluation of detectability. Any of the following schemes can be used:

1. samples of various levels of recorded interference can be replayed in random sequence at random intensity levels while subjects are asked to respond as to the presence or absence of interference,
2. subjects wearing hearing aids are tested by moving an actual phone across a number of test sites from far (4 m) to near and back while the subject indicates the presence or absence of a "buzz" (Le Stranize et al., 1995), and
3. subjects can listen through tubing to actual hearing aid output with the HA at various locations (e.g., close to phone as in listening to a call, one meter, and up to several meters). The acoustic level of interference is classified as: "not preceptible", "just perceptible", 'moderately perceptible", and "annoyingly perceptible" (Le Strange et al., 1995).

Annoyance/Usability

The interference signal is presented at random intensity levels and,/or varying distances while subjects are asked to respond with the corresponding level of annoyance. Examples of the scales used include:

1. "not annoying", "slightly annoying", "annoying", and "very annoying " (EHIMA, 1993), and
2. "usable", "sometimes usable", and "unusable" (Le Strange et al., 1995).

Tests for Detectability, and Annoyance will *be combined using a hybrid mixture of Options 2 and 3 above under detectability. This provides a more authentic test for the extent of the problem as determined by subjects listening to the actual interference.*

Experimental Variables

The experimental variables in the study consist of the independent variables which are manipulated, dependent variables which are measured, and control variables. The control variables are defined by the test environment ("test bed"), test apparatus and experimental procedure. The dependent variables include the physical measurements and characteristics of the interference levels and immunity "scores", and the subjective responses for delectability and annoyance. The independent variables represent those factors which are tested to determine their influence on the dependent measures (both objective and subjective). Potential factors in this study are presented in outline form in the following section labeled Experimental Design.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

FACTORS AND LEVELS

Hearing Aids

Hearing aid types

Behind the ear (BTE)
In the ear (ITE)
In the canal (ITC)
Completely in canal (CIC)
(ITE, ITC and CIC comprise 80% of market)

New devices vs. current patients

Specific manufacturers, models, units/model (too many?)

Phones

Phone technology (in priority order)

1. TDMA (D-AMPS) @ 800 MHz (IS-54) and 1900 MHz (IS-136)
2. CDMA @ 800 MHz (IS-95) and 1900 MHz (J008)
3. PCS @ 1900 MHz (J007)
4. GSM @ 900 MHz
5. GSM @ 1900 MHz

Participating manufacturers

Test Procedure Variables

Distance between phone/simulator and HA

Side of head

Ipsilateral (same side) vs. contralateral (opposite side)use
(important because of Class I vs. Class II standards)
Phone use by others vs. phone use by HA wearer

Relative orientation

Antenna position/field polarization
Angle of coupling (HA orientation)

REFERENCES

EHIMA (October 1993). *EHIMA GSM Project Development Phase,* Project Report (Revision A). Wemmel, Belgium: European Hearing Instrument Manufactures Association.

ETSI (February 1993). *GSM EMC Considerations,* ETSI Technical Report GSM 05.90 Version 4-0.0. Valbonne Cedex, France: European Telecommunications Standards Institute.

IEC (May 994). First IEC/CD 118-XX- Hearing aids Part XX: Electromagnetic compatibility for hearing aids - Immunity *to radio frequency fields* .

Joyner, K.H., Wood, M., Burwood, E., Allision, D., and Le Strange, R. (March 1993).

Interference to Hearing Aids by the New Digital Mobile Telephone System, Global System for Mobile Communications Standard. Sydney, Australia: National Acoustic Laboratories, Australian Hearing Services,

Le Strange, J.R., Byrne, D., Joyner, K.H., and Symons, G.L. (May 1995). *Interference to Hearing Aids by the Digital Mobile Telephone System. Global Svstem for Mobile Communications (GSM),* NAL Report No. 131. Chatswood, New South Wales, Australia: National Acoustic Laboratories, Australian Hearing Services.

National Telecom Agency of Denmark (June 1994). *Interference with hearing aids caused by GSM digital wireless telephones and DECT digital cordless telephones* Denmark: National Telecom Agency.

Short, J. (1992). EMC considerations for digital cellular radio and hearing aids (journal?) Ipswich, England: BT Laboratories.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Andrea D. Williams, hereby certify that on this 1st day of August, 1995, copies of the foregoing Reply Comments of the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association were served by hand delivery upon the following parties:

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

International Transcript Service
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 246
Washington, D.C. 20554

Andrea D. Williams

Andrea D. Willams

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Andrea D. Williams, hereby certify that on this 1st day of August, 1995, copies of the foregoing Reply Comments of the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association were served by first class mail upon the following parties:

Mr. Gary M. Epstein
Ms. Teresa D. Baer
Latham & Watkins
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Counsel for GSM MOU Association

Mr. Jonathan D. Blake
Mr. Kurt A. Wimmer
Ms. Laura F. Quinter
Covington & Burling
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Post Office Box 7566
Washington, D.C. 20044
Counsel for American Personal Communications

Mr. Frederick H. Graefe
Mr. Michael Ruger
Counsel for HEAR-IT NOW
Baker & Hostetler
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington Square Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304

Mr. Carole M. Rogin
Hearing Industries Association
515 King Street
Suite 4420
Alexandria, VA 22314

Ms. Anne-Marie Liss
Liss Communications Research
Post Office Box 16307
Arlington, VA 22215-1507

Mr. Kevin J. Kelley
QUALCOMM Incorporated
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 202
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. E. Van Cullens
Siemens Stromberg-Carlson
900 Broken Sound Parkway
Boca Raton, FL 33487

Mr. Stephen L. Goodman
Halprin, Temple & Goodman
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 650, East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005
Counsel for Northern Telecom Inc.

Mr. David C. Jatlow
Young & Jatlow
2300 N Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20037
Counsel for Ericsson

Mr. Eric Schimmel
Mr. Barry Kratz
Telecommunications Industry Association
2500 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 300
Arlington, VA 22201-3836

Mr. Tom A. Lippo
Fact Law Group
412 1st Street, S.E.
Suite One -- Lobby Level
Washington, D.C. 20003
Counsel for Nokia Mobile Phones, Inc.

Mr. James P. Tuthill
Ms. Betsy Stover Granger
Pacific Bell Mobile Services
4420 Rosewood Drive
4th Floor, Building 2
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Mr. James L. Wurtz
Ms. Margaret E. Garber
Pacific Bell Mobile Services
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Mr. Mark J. Golden
Personal Communications Industry Association
1019 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. R. Michael Senkowski
Mr. Jeff S. Linder
Mr. Eric W. DeSilva
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Counsel for Personal Communications
Industry Association

Mr. Kenneth L. Judd
Southwestern Bell Mobile Services, Inc.
17330 Preston Road
Suite 100A
Dallas, TX 75252

Mr. William B. Barfield
Mr. Jim O. Llewellyn
BellSouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 1800
Atlanta, GA 30309-2641

Mr. Henry Scott Fox
BellSouth Personal Communications, Inc.
3353 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Suite 300
Atlanta, GA 30326

Mr. Charles P. Featherstun
Mr. David G. Richards
BellSouth Corporation
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Andrew L. Tollin
Wilkinson Barker Knauer & Quinn
1735 New york Avenue, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006
Counsel for Bell South Corporation

Ms. Mary McDermott
Ms. Linda Kent
Mr. Charles D. Cosson
Ms. Kathleen M. Woods
United States Telephone Association
1401 H Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-2136

Andrea D. Williams

Andrea D. Willams