

LATHAM & WATKINS

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. N.W.

SUITE 1300

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505

TELEPHONE (202) 637-2200

FAX (202) 637-2201

ORIGINAL NEW YORK OFFICE

205 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 2000
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4802
PHONE (212) 906-2000 FAX 75-4884

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE

850 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 2000
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-0925
PHONE (714) 540-2355 FAX 755-8200

SAN DIEGO OFFICE

701 16TH STREET, SUITE 2100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-5997
PHONE (619) 238-2334 FAX 626-7410

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-2562
PHONE (415) 391-2800 FAX 395-8095

SINGAPORE OFFICE

135 COMMONWEALTH DRIVE
MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA 94025
PHONE (650) 328-4500 FAX 450-2600

SINGAPORE OFFICE

80 RAFFLES PLACE, #14-20
UOB PLAZA 2, SINGAPORE 048624
PHONE + 65-535-1115 FAX 536-1711

TOKYO OFFICE

NEIN AKASAKA 6-7-5 AKASAKA MINATO-KU
TOKYO 107-0052 JAPAN
PHONE + 81-3-423-3970 FAX 3423-3971

(File No.) 1999-201

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 27, 2000

PAUL R. WATKINS (899) (973)
DAN LATHAM (896) (974)

CHICAGO OFFICE

SEARS TOWER, SUITE 5800
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
PHONE (312) 876-7700 FAX 993-9787

HONG KONG OFFICE

SUITE 2205A, 22ND FLOOR
NO. 7 QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL
HONG KONG
PHONE + 852 2522-7888 FAX 2522-7006

LONDON OFFICE

99 BISHOPSGATE, ELEVENTH FLOOR
LONDON, E.C. 4M 3AF ENGLAND
PHONE + 44 (0)20 7301 7001 FAX 304 4467

LOS ANGELES OFFICE

600 WEST 7TH STREET, SUITE 400
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-2007
PHONE (213) 496-2334 FAX 691-8762

MOSCOW OFFICE

UL'TSA BATHINA 7, 9TH FLOOR
MOSCOW 123058 RUSSIA
PHONE + 7(095) 785-1234 FAX 785-1235

NEW JERSEY OFFICE

ONE NEWARK CENTER, 6TH FLOOR
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102-3174
PHONE (973) 639-2334 FAX 639-7298

BY HAND DELIVERY

Chairman William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room 8-B201H
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Michael K. Powell
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room 8-A204C
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room 8-A302C
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Gloria Tristani
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room 8-C302C
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Susan Ness
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room 8-B115H
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: **DIRECTV Report; File No. 0094-EX-ST-1999; ET Docket No. 98-206;
DA 99-494; EX PARTE**

No. of Copies rec'd *04/*
List ABCDE

Dear Chairman Kennard and Commissioners:

DIRECTV is concerned that the Commission is being buffeted by contradictory policy cross-currents as it considers dramatic regulatory actions that will affect the future of the Direct Broadcast Satellite ("DBS") industry in the United States.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

Chairman William Kennard
Commissioners
January 27, 2000
Page 2

On the one hand, the Commission appears to be doing its utmost to recognize and continue facilitating the development of DBS as a cable-competitive service. Thus, in its most recent report to Congress on the status of competition among multichannel video programming distributors ("MVPDs"), the Commission has recognized that although the cable industry continues to serve a dominant 82% share of the MVPD market,¹ the growth in noncable MVPD subscribership is being driven by the DBS industry,² which has emerged as the cable industry's most formidable competitor.³ Furthermore, the Commission in that report noted the positive effect that the recent Congressional amendment to the Satellite Home Viewer Act ("SHVA") will have for consumers, who will for the first time be able to receive local broadcast signals on their DBS systems, thus ensuring near-complete substitutability between DBS and cable as MVPD competitors. Indeed, the Commission has expressed the hope that the revised statute will "have a significant and positive effect on MVPD competition," reiterating its belief that "increased competition is the best way to keep cable rates reasonable and in check," and stating its determination to "aggressively implement the new SHVA in order to facilitate consumer choice in the MVPD marketplace."⁴

On the other hand, while the Commission's MVPD Competition Report correctly acknowledges the high quality of DBS service as a major competitive distinction between DBS and cable,⁵ *the Commission has proceeded to entertain proposals that threaten to radically undermine the quality of DBS service, and that pose a real and substantial threat to the continued development and growth of DBS as a cable-competitive service.*

Specifically, as you know, Northpoint Technology, Ltd., along with its affiliated companies Diversified Communication Engineering, Inc. and a number of entities operating under the name of "Broadwave" (collectively "Northpoint") has proposed to introduce a secondary terrestrial service into the 12 GHz band, which is the primary, "mission critical" frequency band used by DBS operators. Based upon recent demonstrations of its technology in the Washington, DC area conducted over the summer and fall of 1999, the purported results of which are summarized in a Progress Report submitted to the Commission this past October,⁶ Northpoint claims that its system and architecture showed "no impact to DBS," and urges the

¹ *Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in Markets for the Delivery of Video Programming*, CS Docket No. 99-230 (rel. Jan. 14, 2000) ("MVPD Competition Report"), at ¶ 5.

² *Id.* at ¶ 8.

³ *Id.* at ¶ 70.

⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 14.

⁵ *Id.* at ¶ 71.

⁶ Progress Report WA2XMY, Northpoint-DBS Compatability Tests, Washington, DC (Oct. 1999) ("Northpoint Progress Report").

Chairman William Kennard
Commissioners
January 27, 2000
Page 3

Commission to agree that "Northpoint is a viable technology and ready for deployment through the United States."⁷

As the Commission well knows, the U.S. DBS industry emphatically disagrees with this assertion. The nation's DBS operators and other interested parties have already submitted on the record detailed technical objections to Northpoint's proposed operations in the 12 GHz band.⁸ However, given Northpoint's extravagant claims regarding the ability of its terrestrial systems to coexist in the DBS downlink band with no harmful impact on DBS subscribers, DIRECTV has prepared the enclosed extensive report, "Conclusions to Date Regarding Harmful Interference From a Proposed Northpoint Technology Terrestrial System Operating in the DBS Downlink Band, 12.2-12.7 GHz," for submission in the above-referenced matters.

The enclosed report analyzes carefully and completely the results of the Northpoint Washington, D.C. tests. It also documents tests performed by DIRECTV in Spring Creek, New York, which show conclusively the interference effects of Northpoint technology on DBS transmissions, *based upon data from Northpoint's own demonstrations*. The report also documents the work of Radio Dynamics, a respected Bethesda, Maryland-based engineering consulting firm, which worked for months with DIRECTV to generate predicted interference zones surrounding Northpoint transmitter sites, and performed propagation analyses of both the coverage areas and interference zones of Northpoint transmissions based on publicly available data. Overall, the enclosed report shows how, based on the Northpoint D.C. test results, the Northpoint system poses a grave interference threat to U.S. DBS subscribers' receipt of service. In the process, the report:

- describes the ways in which Northpoint interference manifests itself relative to DBS operations;
- provides new test data, extrapolated from observations of the Northpoint D.C. tests, that demonstrate the effect of Northpoint interference on the rain performance of DBS receiving equipment;
- reiterates the interference requirements of the DBS industry under rain fades;

⁷ *Id.* at 27.

⁸ See, e.g., *Application of DIRECTV, Inc. For Expedited Review and Request for Immediate Suspension of Testing, In the Matter of Diversified Communication Engineering, Inc., Experimental Special Temporary Authorization*, File No. 0094-EX-ST-1999, Call Sign WA2XMY (June 25, 1999); *Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Operation of NGSO FSS Systems Co-Frequency, with GSO and Terrestrial Systems in the Ku-band Frequency Range*, ET Docket No. 98-206, Comments of DIRECTV, Inc. (filed Mar. 2, 1999); Reply Comments of DIRECTV (filed Apr. 14, 1999); see also *Comments of Pegasus Communications Corporation*, ET Docket No. 98-206 (Dec. 29, 1999); *EchoStar Preliminary Report on the Impact of Northpoint on the Direct Broadcast Satellite Service Based Upon Testing Performed to Date* (Oct. 29, 1999).

Chairman William Kennard
Commissioners
January 27, 2000
Page 4

- provides a comprehensive analysis of predicted interference to all U.S. BSS orbital assignments from Northpoint transmissions;
- shows how these predictions compare with field measurements; and
- concludes that Northpoint has not established a technical basis for its claimed ability to co-exist with the DBS service, even on a secondary basis, and suggests that any future Northpoint demonstrations be designed to reflect typical and worst case transmitter sitings, not only best case, atypical situations.

Northpoint to date has proffered highly questionable, politicized exercises in selective data collection as "conclusive" evidence of the ability of its technology to operate at 12 GHz without interfering with DBS operations.⁹ The attached report and detailed analysis, along with tests that the DBS providers themselves will soon conduct,¹⁰ will facilitate the joining of issues at a meaningful technical level.

Furthermore, DIRECTV hopes that the quality of the analysis in the attached report will underscore the magnitude and legitimacy of DIRECTV's concern in this matter. Northpoint has in the past accused the DBS industry of "dilatory tactics" because, it is alleged, DBS operators fear Northpoint as a potential competitor.¹¹ That claim is nonsense.

The record clearly reflects that, although the Northpoint business plan has continually changed over time, DIRECTV has consistently opposed the introduction of Northpoint technology at 12 GHz -- *even* when it was being touted by Northpoint as a "complementary" rather than competitive service to DBS operations, as a means of offering local television signals to DBS subscribers.¹² The DBS industry has *never* made an effort to forestall competition from terrestrial services -- for example, when the Commission proposed the allocation of substantial

⁹ Northpoint Progress Report at 27.

¹⁰ *In the Matter of Request for Special Temporary Authorization to test for 120 days the interference caused to typical Direct Broadcast Satellite receivers from the system proposed by Diversified Communications Engineering, Inc. in the 12.2 - 12.7 GHz band*, File No. 0418-EX-ST-1999 (filed Dec. 11, 1999) (pending).

¹¹ See Northpoint STA Opposition (Dec. 21, 1999), at 4.

¹² See, e.g., *Northpoint Changes Local Plans*, Satellite Business News Fax Update (Aug. 27, 1999) (quoting Northpoint's president, and noting that while Northpoint had previously planned to offer a standalone package of local channels to complement DBS service, its business plan would now change to become a DBS alternative); *In the Matter of Northpoint Technology: Petition for Rulemaking to Modify Section 101.147(p) of the Commission's Rules To Authorize Subsidiary Terrestrial Use of the 12.2-12.7 GHz Band By Digital Broadcast Satellite Licensees and Their Affiliates*, RM No. 9245, Opposition of DIRECTV, Inc. (April 20, 1998) (opposing Northpoint rulemaking proposal to operate in the 12 GHz band as a complement to DBS service).

Chairman William Kennard
Commissioners
January 27, 2000
Page 5

spectrum to Location Multipoint Distribution Service ("LMDS") or to allow digital Multipoint Distribution Service ("MDS"). Here, DIRECTV's concern with Northpoint is not competition, but rather, is purely one of electromagnetic interference. DIRECTV worked with the Commission years ago, when DBS was a fledgling service, to ensure that secondary terrestrial microwave users were transitioned out of the DBS downlink band, and the Commission recognized at that time the interference threat such systems posed to DBS subscribers' receipt of service.¹³ DIRECTV wishes the Commission to understand that today, as DBS has become a tremendously successful, mass-market consumer alternative to cable television, the interference threat posed by Northpoint technology, which is also proposed to be deployed on a mass-market consumer basis, is greater by *orders of magnitude*.

Finally, DIRECTV wishes to reiterate that Northpoint has made a choice in choosing to proceed as it has to date. Rather than acquire spectrum that was expressly allocated for the types of terrestrial wireless services that it proposes, such as LMDS, MDS or DEMS, Northpoint instead has decided to attempt to avoid paying for such licenses, either in the aftermarket or at auction, by seeking authorization to operate on a secondary basis at 12 GHz. And Northpoint's decision has certain consequences, not the least of which is the fact that the 12 GHz band happens to be the primary, mission-critical frequency band used by DBS operators -- a ubiquitous mass-market consumer service, deployed on a nationwide basis after billions of dollars of investment by the DBS operators, that today is offering tremendous benefits to American consumers in the form of competition to incumbent cable television operators.


The success of the DBS industry and the commitment it has made to its consumers demands that the Commission proceed with extreme care in evaluating Northpoint's technical puffery. By way of comparison, the DBS industry has spent several years working through the ITU process and with the Commission to determine whether co-existence between non-geostationary satellite orbit ("NGSO") systems and DBS systems is possible at 12 GHz. Whatever the ultimate outcome of that process, which is still ongoing, the debate has been open, detailed and technically rigorous. By contrast, Northpoint has not come close to offering that type of effort or detailed analysis.

¹³ See, e.g., Public Notice, *Initiation of Direct Broadcast Satellite Service -- Effect on 12 GHz Terrestrial Point-to-Point Licensees in the Private Operational Fixed Service*, 10 FCC Rcd 1211 (1994) (explicitly reminding remaining 12 GHz terrestrial licensees of their secondary status, and stating that "[i]n view of the imminent arrival of DBS service, terrestrial 12 GHz licensees should again consider relocating their operations to other available frequency bands or alternative facilities").

Chairman William Kennard
Commissioners
January 27, 2000
Page 6

As the attached report concludes, Northpoint technology cannot be authorized at 12 GHz in any fashion unless the Commission can conclude with certainty that Northpoint's proposed terrestrial fixed service will not cause harmful interference to DBS operations. Under the most charitable view of the tests conducted by Northpoint, the Commission does not have a record before it that can remotely support such a conclusion.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary M. Epstein". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Gary M. Epstein
James H. Barker
of LATHAM & WATKINS

Enclosure

cc: Attached Service List

**Conclusions to Date Regarding Harmful Interference From a
Proposed Northpoint Technology Terrestrial System Operating
in the DBS Downlink Band, 12.2-12.7 GHz**

**DIRECTV, Inc.
January 27, 2000**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Overview of Critical Issues Regarding Interference From a Proposed Northpoint System.....	2
2.1	Interference Will Degrade DBS Signal Quality and Service.....	2
2.2	Summary of Findings and Issues from the Washington, D.C. Demonstration	13
3	Manifestation of Interference	14
3.1	The Satellite Receiver Signal Meter Description.....	15
3.2	How Interference Degrades C/N and Availability Performance	17
3.3	Discussion of Quasi-Error Free Operation and Rain Fade Margin	20
3.4	Demonstrated Loss of Availability Performance	21
4	Appropriate Protection Criteria	31
4.1	Review of the Development of NGSO-FSS Criteria.....	31
4.2	DIRECTV Concludes Protection Criteria Must Be Applicable to Proposed Northpoint Operation.....	33
5	Interference Levels Measured in Washington, D.C. Area	33
5.1	Summary of Findings.....	34
5.2	General Test Methodology	35
5.3	Measured Interference Results into DIRECTV BSS Receivers (101°)	36
5.4	Measured Interference into Echostar BSS Receivers (61.5°).....	42
5.5	Comparison of DIRECTV Field Measurements with Analytical Predictions.....	46
6	Investigation of Generalized Interference Zones Shows True Extent of Interference Threat to DBS.....	50
6.1	Generalized Interference Results Using OH Loss Model	51
6.2	Generalized Interference Zone Results Using the Flat Earth Model.....	59
7	Conclusion.....	71

1 Introduction

DIRECTV, Inc. ("DIRECTV") has spent significant effort and expense during the past six months analyzing the proposal of Northpoint Technology, Ltd. ("Northpoint") to introduce, on a nationwide basis, terrestrial wireless operations into the 12.2-12.7 GHz band, which is the "mission critical" frequency band used by Direct Broadcast Satellite ("DBS")¹ operators in the United States to downlink digital programming to U.S. consumers. Through a series of test demonstrations in the Washington, D.C. area run in the summer and fall of 1999, Northpoint now claims to have proffered sufficient evidence for the Commission to proceed in accommodating its experimental, terrestrially-based wireless technology, which would re-use the 12.2-12.7 GHz frequencies, on a secondary basis, in a manner that Northpoint claims would be effectively interference-free relative to DBS operations in the band.²

DIRECTV has prepared this report to analyze the results of the Northpoint Washington, D.C. tests, and more generally, to show how, based on those test results, the Northpoint system poses a grave interference threat to U.S. DBS subscribers' receipt of service. The report concentrates on the following technical issues and provides the following information:

- describes the ways in which Northpoint interference manifests itself relative to DBS operations;
- provides new test data, extrapolated from observations from the Northpoint D.C. tests, that demonstrate the effect of Northpoint interference on the rain performance of DBS receiving equipment;
- reiterates, under rain fades the interference requirements of the DBS industry;
- provides a comprehensive analysis of predicted interference on all U.S. BSS orbital assignments from Northpoint transmissions;
- shows how these predictions compare with field measurements; and
- concludes that Northpoint has not established a technical basis for its claimed ability to co-exist with the DBS service, even on a secondary basis, and suggests that any future Northpoint demonstrations be designed to reflect typical and worst case transmitter sitings, not only best case, atypical situations.

¹ DBS is known internationally as Broadcasting Satellite Service ("BSS"), and the terms are used herein interchangeably.

² Progress Report WA2XMY, Northpoint-DBS Compatability Tests, Washington, D.C. (Oct. 1999) ("Northpoint Experimental D.C. Report"), at 27.

2 Overview of Critical Issues Regarding Interference From a Proposed Northpoint System

The Commission already has received various filings³ providing technical analyses that document the harmful interference a Northpoint system will cause to DBS service in the United States. It is clear that the use of the 12.2 GHz – 12.7 GHz band by secondary users raise extremely serious concerns for DBS operators. The following discussion outlines critical issues that the Commission must take into consideration regarding the proposed deployment of Northpoint's system.

2.1 Interference Will Degrade DBS Signal Quality and Service

Interference received from either terrestrial based transmission systems (such as the proposed Northpoint system) or from space based transmission systems (such as from non-geosynchronous orbit ("NGSO") FSS operations) will clearly degrade DBS received carrier quality. This fact has been established by both analytical methods and by field tests. This fact also has been accepted by the International Telecommunications Union ("ITU") in its technical deliberations on NGSO-FSS sharing issues.

Interfering noise from the types of sources listed above will result in an increase in the operational noise floor of a BSS receiver and directly affect the quality of service. The impact of this noise can manifest itself in two ways;

- a) a complete loss of reception under clear-sky conditions; and/or
- b) reduced availability of the signal under rain conditions.

The case of a complete loss of reception is the most obviously unacceptable interference scenario because it immediately eliminates DBS as a viable competitor to cable television. However, cases with reduced availability performance are equally serious. Both of these situations are touched upon below. A more detailed discussion of the effect of Northpoint interference on availability performance is presented in Section 3.

³ See, e.g., *Application of DIRECTV, Inc. For Expedited Review and Request for Immediate Suspension of Testing, In the Matter of Diversified Communication Engineering, Inc., Experimental Special Temporary Authorization*, File No. 0094-EX-ST-1999, Call Sign WA2XMY (June 25, 1999); *Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Operation of NGSO-FSS Systems Co-Frequency, with GSO and Terrestrial Systems in the Ku-band Frequency Range*, ET Docket No. 98-206, Comments of DIRECTV, Inc. (filed Mar. 2, 1999); Reply Comments of DIRECTV (filed Apr. 14, 1999); see also *Comments of Pegasus Communications Corporation*, ET Docket No. 98-206 (Dec. 29, 1999); *EchoStar Preliminary Report on the Impact of Northpoint on the Direct Broadcast Satellite Service Based Upon Testing Performed to Date* (Oct. 29, 1999).

2.1.1 Complete Loss of Reception is Clearly Unacceptable

It is undisputed that if a Northpoint system were deployed in the DBS downlink band, there would be a number of areas surrounding *each* Northpoint terrestrial transmitter where interference levels would prevent *entirely* the reception of DBS signals. Northpoint defines these areas as "Mitigation Zones," identified as areas where site shielding would be required to mitigate the interference problem.⁴ However, from the standpoint of DBS system design, such site shielding runs directly counter to the viability of DBS operations, and cannot be allowed for business and competitive reasons.⁵

"Consumer friendly" operation is fundamental to a successful BSS. DBS providers have made a tremendous effort, and spent hundreds of millions of dollars, to simplify the operation of DBS receive terminals – for example, by introducing small antennas, using circular polarization, designing home receiving equipment to be easily self-installed, and so on. The existence of a significant number of mitigation zones, regardless of size, would create significant negative publicity and place an unacceptable mitigation burden on DBS customers that simply was not intended when the 12 GHz band was allocated for primary DBS operations. The very existence of these numerous mitigation zones – which Northpoint admits will cause "harmful interference to DBS reception" – would demand that special treatment be provided on an installation-by-installation basis to ensure high quality service to all DBS users. For those installations located within the mitigation zone, costly shielding would be needed to reduce interference to acceptable levels. This added complexity runs directly counter to the ubiquitous nature of DBS. All DBS customers have a right to interference-free reception of DBS signals, and the right to self-install and operate their own equipment without the complication of costly add-ons to "mitigate" such interference.

Further testing of the areas close-in to a Northpoint transmitter is needed to properly characterize the size of the mitigation zone around each such transmitter. For the Washington, D.C. demonstration, the area immediately around the transmitter was difficult to access because of numerous buildings, structures and foliage. These objects either blocked the Northpoint signal (from both a reception and an interference point of view), or prevented access to desired test sites. Any further testing should place the transmitter at a typical height in an open and unpopulated area to allow full characterization of the near-in regions to accurately determine the size of the mitigation zone.

⁴ See Progress Report WA2XMY, Northpoint -DBS Compatibility Tests, Austin, TX (Dec. 1998), at 5; see also Progress Report WA2XMY (Jan. 8. 1998) (acknowledging existence of exclusion zones around terrestrial Northpoint transmitters that will cause "harmful interference to DBS reception").

⁵ Note also that Northpoint users would not require shielding from DBS transmissions.

2.1.2 Degradation of DBS System Performance

Apart from a complete loss of DBS signal reception in the mitigation zone around each Northpoint transmitter, the second manifestation of Northpoint interference is loss of DBS system availability performance. To clearly establish this manifestation as an observable fact, DIRECTV set up a controlled test of the phenomenon in Spring Creek, New York. In this recent test, two identical satellite receivers were fed a live DBS signal from a common antenna. One receiver, however, was injected with an extra fixed amount of noise from a noise generator, simulating interference from either a Northpoint system or, equivalently, an NGSO-FSS system.

Two interference test cases were run. In the first test case, a sufficiently high amount of noise was added to clearly establish the interference phenomenon. For the second test case, an amount of interference close to that measured at the Ericsson Memorial/Polo Field site (Washington, D.C. Demonstration) was used. The primary results were as follows:

1. During a significant rain event during the first test, the receiver with added interference experienced 90 minutes of outage, while the interference-free receiver experienced only 13 minutes of outage.
2. During a significant rain event during the second test, the receiver with added interference experienced 1 minute 40 seconds of outage, while the interference-free receiver experienced no outage.

The Spring Creeks tests unequivocally demonstrate the harmful interference effect that Northpoint-like interference has on DBS system availability during rain. When interference is added, a BSS receiver suffers more frequent and longer rain outages. The increase in outage time depends critically on the level of external interference. Details of the Spring Creek tests are presented in Section 3.4 below.⁶

2.1.3 ITU Accepted Protection Criterion Limits DBS Unavailability Degradation

Limits on signal availability degradation and restrictions on signal loss under clear-sky conditions have been accepted by the ITU as valid protection criteria for GSO BSS services.

⁶ As a side note, the purported conclusions on the impact of Hurricane Floyd on the Washington demonstration are based on very unscientific measurements and observations. The test technique failed to have a control receiver not subject to interference that could have served as a reference. Furthermore, the location chosen by Northpoint for these rain observations exhibited almost no interference, making any observations of the effect of interference on unavailability meaningless. Further discussion on this topic can be found in Section 3.4.2.

It is noted that availability protection is usually expressed as a limit on the degradation allowed in unavailability performance, which is the inverse of availability performance.

In particular, the United States has agreed in ITU forums to move forward with regulatory interference limits on the operation of NGSO-FSS systems in the BSS bands. These limits are based primarily on criteria that (1) limit the increase of BSS operational unavailability caused by interference from all non-GSO FSS systems to a maximum of 10%, and (2) protect BSS reception under clear-sky conditions. These newly developed criteria are the result of two years of intense work in the international regulatory arena.

If interference generated by a Northpoint system is noise-like (that is, low-level wide-band QPSK digital modulation that appears as noise to the demodulator in a BSS receiver), the BSS receiver cannot distinguish between non-GSO FSS interference and Northpoint interference. The effects of interference from both sources will lead to reduced BSS system performance via the same means -- that is, by increasing the BSS receiver noise.⁷ Under these conditions it is essential that the criteria developed for NGSO-FSS interference be applied to Northpoint, and that the total increase in BSS system unavailability *from all sources* be -- at most --10%. The ITU interference criterion that should be applied to Northpoint is discussed in more detail in Section 4 below.

2.1.4 Washington, D.C. Field Observations Confirm DBS Signal Degradation

DIRECTV made a significant effort to observe interference into DBS receivers during the Washington, D.C. demonstration. The observations concentrated on two specific geographic locations relative to the Northpoint transmitter that DIRECTV predicted would be especially vulnerable to Northpoint transmissions.

As explained below and in more detail in Section 5, measurements made in these two areas confirm interference levels that are well above the levels allowed for NGSO-FSS systems.

2.1.4.1 Predicted Interference Geometries

DIRECTV predicted areas of high interference by analyzing the horizon gain characteristics of a typical DBS receive antenna, the planned boresight and

⁷ As described in document 10-11S/156, a contribution to JWP 10-11S prepared by DIRECTV, the interfering signal can be treated as white gaussian noise if it is sufficiently uncorrelated with the desired signal. However, in cases in which the desired and interfering signal are somewhat correlated, as in the case when the interfering signal is of the same modulation type as the desired signal, it is believed that the degradation may be more severe than suggested by using a white gaussian noise assumption.

pattern of the Northpoint transmit antenna, and the locations of currently active DBS satellites.

To understand how this was done, we first note that Northpoint transmitters are located on the horizon relative to DBS receive antennas. Therefore, DBS receiver antenna sensitivity at the horizon is important.

In this plane, DBS antennas have two sensitive gain regions directed behind the antenna. These regions are caused by spillover from the antenna feed past the edge of the reflector. As shown in figure 2.1.4.1-1, these sensitive regions are identified as "spillover lobes," and are shown in the shape of "butterfly wings" when depicted in a polar plot of antenna gain sensitivity. These spillover lobes are located symmetrically off the back of the antenna beginning at about 48-degree angles from centerline. The gain values shown in Figure 2.1.4.1-1 come from measured data that was first published in the DIRECTV discussion on interference from terrestrial sources in 1994.

DBS Antenna Horizon Gain Characteristics




Figure 2.1.4.1-1: DBS Receive Antenna Horizon Gain Sensitivity

When one of these sensitive regions is directed toward a Northpoint transmitter, there is a strong potential for interference.

For the Washington, D.C. demonstration, Northpoint elected to direct the main beam of their transmit antenna at an azimuth angle of 113 . Noting that the active DBS satellites serving the United States during the demonstration were

located at 61.5°, 101°, and 119° West Longitude ("W.L."), interest quickly settled on two particular alignments for investigation. As can be seen in Figure 2.1.4.1-2, DBS earth stations located generally along an azimuth bearing of 108° from the Northpoint transmitter will have one of the two spillover lobes aimed at the transmitter. Similarly, DBS earth stations located generally along an azimuth bearing of 167° from the Northpoint transmitter will have one of the two spillover lobes aimed at the same transmitter. It is noted that victim DBS earth stations do not have to be located precisely along these azimuth bearing angles, but can suffer interference when in their general vicinity. Figures depicting the extent of these regions can be found in Sections 2.1.4.2 and 5.5.




Figure 2.1.4.1-2: Washington, D.C. Demonstration Alignments of Interest

2.1.4.2 Measurement Results

DIRECTV made interference measurements along the 108° azimuth bearing at a site called "Ericsson Memorial/Polo Field." At this site, an *eight count drop* was recorded in the Echostar receiver signal meter, which corresponds to an

approximate 84% increase in unavailability.⁸ This is far, far in excess of the 10% increase in unavailability allowed for *all* NGSO-FSS systems. Note that the Northpoint transmit antenna peak gain azimuth had reportedly been set at 113°, quite close to the sensitive 108° bearing of interest.

DIRECTV made interference measurements along the 167° azimuth bearing at the "Iwo Jima Memorial" site. A three count decrease in a DIRECTV receiver signal meter reading was recorded with the Northpoint transmitter on. This means that a DBS receiver at this site would suffer a 15.4% increase in unavailability due to Northpoint interference. This is also higher than the interference that will be allowed from the aggregate of all NGSO-FSS systems.

These measurements by DIRECTV taken during the Northpoint Washington, D.C. demonstration clearly show unacceptable and harmful levels of interference into DBS receivers. Additional data taken by DIRECTV and by Northpoint at other sites also show interference levels above those allowed for single and multiple NGSO systems, and are discussed further in this report. Thus, the presence of unacceptable interference zones during the Washington demonstration has been shown conclusively.

2.1.4.3 Predicted Interference Levels

To generate predicted interference zones surrounding Northpoint transmitter sites, DIRECTV enlisted the help of Radio Dynamics, a respected engineering consulting firm.⁹ This company, based in Bethesda, Maryland, performed propagation analysis of both the coverage areas and interference zones of Northpoint transmissions based on publicly available data. Radio Dynamics used the well-accepted OH Loss propagation model. Details on this analysis can be found in Section 6.

The results of this analysis are shown in Figure 2.1.4.3-1. The figure shows zones for interference into receivers looking at the Echostar satellite at 61.5° W.L. In this figure, the yellow area represents a predicted unavailability impact of 2.86 % on a DBS receiver, equivalent to the unavailability higher than that allowed by a single NGSO system. Green represents a predicted unavailability impact of 10% or greater on a DBS receiver, that is, an interference level above that of all NGSO-FSS systems combined.

Five sites (black dots) are also shown in the figure. These represent the approximate geographic location of some test sites where either DIRECTV or Northpoint took signal meter degradation readings. Selected signal meter

⁸ See also Echostar Satellite Corporation, *Preliminary Report on the Impact of Northpoint on the Direct Broadcast Satellite Service Based Upon Testing Performed to Date* (Oct. 29, 1999) ("Echostar Preliminary Report"), at 7.

⁹ A description of the Radio Dynamics firm can be found at www.radyn.com.

degradation values taken by either DIRECTV or Northpoint were converted to an equivalent loss in unavailability performance. A direct comparison can then be made between the calculated amounts of degradation shown by the yellow and green areas and the selected field observations. (Note that this conversion for the Northpoint measured points is only an approximation since no calibration of their receivers' signal meters is available.)

The figure shows some reasonable correlation between the field data and the predictions, especially in the shape of the interference zone. However, some questions do remain. For example, the measured interference at Site 7 (Ericsson Memorial/Polo Field) was significantly higher than predicted.

Because DIRECTV did not have independent confirmation of Northpoint transmit power, true Northpoint antenna pointing angle and pattern, and other factors, it was not possible to draw firm conclusions on the true extent of the interference zones other than recognizing that the results confirm the predicted sensitive zones.




Figure 2.1.4.3-1: Predicted Interference, USA Today Site into Echostar / 61.5° W.L.

2.1.5 Generalization of Geometry to All DBS Orbital Slots