

ORIGINAL

**BELLSOUTH**

**BellSouth**  
Suite 900  
1133-21st Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-3351

ben.almond@bellsouth.com

**Ben G. Almond**  
Vice President-  
Federal Regulatory

202 463-4112  
Fax 202 463-4198

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

FEB - 9 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

February 9, 2000

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room TW-A325  
Washington, DC 20554

RE: 2GHz MSS Proceeding  
ET Docket No. 95-18 and IB Docket No. 99-81  
EX PARTE

Dear Ms. Salas:

This is to inform you that on February 8, 2000, David Richards and Ben Almond of BellSouth Corporation met in separate meetings with Bryan Tramont of Commissioner Tristani's office; Peter Tenhula of Commissioner Powell's office; and Mark Schneider of Commissioner Ness's office concerning the above-referenced proceedings.

The attached document was used for discussion purposes. Please associate this notification and accompanying material with the referenced docket proceedings.

If there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

  
Ben G. Almond  
Vice President-Federal Regulatory

Attachment

Cc: Bryan Tramont  
Peter Tenhula  
Mark Schneider

Handwritten: 041  
Date: 02/09/00  
Time: 08:05

**2 GHz MSS Proceedings  
ET Docket No. 95-18 &  
IB Docket No. 99-81**

**RECEIVED**

FEB - 9 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**No 2 GHz MSS Applicant Has Demonstrated Any Reason Why The Commission Should Overturn Its Public Interest Determination, in *MO&O and Third NPRM*, at ¶26, That:**

The scale of the contemplated relocation does not affect the goals of providing for the fair and equitable sharing of 2 GHz spectrum, preventing disruption to incumbent operations and minimizing the economic impact on incumbent licensees.

**FCC Policies on Relocation of Incumbent 2 GHz Microwave Licensees Have Been Determined and Reaffirmed**

2 GHz MSS licensees must pay for Fixed Service ("FS") incumbents to relocate (See Note 1)

The MSS industry's assaults are too late and without merit.

**2 GHz MSS Applicants *Again* Ask That The Established *Emerging Technologies* Policies Be Reconsidered And Guttled. They Advance *No* Substantive Reason For Eviscerating Those Policies.**

The Commission, on reconsideration, refused to change its established policy. (See Note 2)

**The Commission Has Already Determined That The Substantial Cost Associated With FS Relocation Does Not Warrant A Change In Its Established *Emerging Technologies* Policies. (See Note 3)**

**The 2 GHz MSS Industry Acts As If The Commission Is Revisiting Its Relocation Policies For Emerging Technologies. To The Contrary, The Only Issues Unresolved In The *Third NPRM* In ET Docket No. 95-18 Address Implementation Not The Underlying Policies. (See Note 4)**

**The Commission Should Reject Again ICO's Old Argument Made In Its January 19, 2000 *Ex Parte*.**

**Argument:** Relocation costs will drive up the cost of ICO's service

**Answer:** The Commission rejected this argument at ¶26 of the *MO&O and Third NPRM*. Furthermore, the Commission lacks the statutory authority to aid licensees in achieving their business plans.

**ICO's "New" Arguments Do Not Warrant Reconsideration Again Of Established Emerging Technologies Policies.**

**Argument:** Relocation costs will increase if ICO provides data transmission capabilities.

**Answer:** According to ICO, data will limit further its ability to share spectrum with FS incumbents, thereby increasing its relocation costs. BellSouth is convinced, and Industry Canada agrees, (See Note 5) that the operational realities will demonstrate that no spectrum sharing is feasible. Regardless, it is ICO's business plan that must take this into consideration. The Commission has determined that the public interest requires reimbursement for relocation.

**Arguments:** Industry Canada's approach is fairer and less onerous than the FCC's. Other countries will impose relocation costs on 2 GHz MSS.

**Answer:** Aside from the obvious inconsistency in the arguments, Industry Canada does not *require* the MSS provider to pay for relocation. It has specified January 1, 2003 (a date that may be extended) as the "earliest mandatory date for fixed frequency assignments that may be subject to displacement." IC SP 1-3 GHz, ¶5.2.4.2, p. 14. The plan does not preclude voluntary relocation. ICO neglects to mention the most significant differentiating factor between IC's situation and the FCC's situation. In Canada, there "are approximately 340 frequency assignments (in-band or adjacent band) that are currently in use in the new MSS spectrum, and that would be affected if all the spectrum were to be used." IC SP 1-3 GHz, ¶5.2.3, p. 13. In the United States, the number of microwave paths that will be affected by 2 GHz MSS implementation is over 13,000. ICO's reliance on the IC's analysis is misplaced and quite misleading.

**Argument:** ICO also wants the FCC to apply a "remaining useful life valuation method" to incumbent equipment and a cap of \$2300 on compensation for replacement equipment in the uplink bands.

**Answer:** In Docket 95-157, on April 30, 1996, the Commission adopted the transition rules implementing its *Emerging Technologies* policies. The Commission specifically rejected this argument. Those rules require ET licensees to provide incumbents with "comparable facilities." §§101.71 (Voluntary negotiations), 101.73 (Mandatory negotiations) and 101.75 (Involuntary relocation procedures). (See Note 6.) ICO continues to ask the Commission to assume the role of financial underwriter. The Commission does not have the statutory authority to perform that role and has repeatedly rejected that notion.

Notes:

1. In *Memorandum Opinion and Order and Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in ET Docket No. 95-18 ("MO&O and Third NPRM")*, 13 F.C.C.R. 23949 (1998), the Commission, at ¶15, rejected the MSS Coalition's petition for reconsideration seeking relief from the relocation obligation imposed on emerging technologies licensees in the 2 GHz band.

Our *Emerging Technologies* policies require new service providers in the 2 GHz bands to compensate incumbents who are required to relocate. These policies apply regardless of the nationality, service or technology of the new entrant

2. In the *MO&O and Third NPRM*, at ¶16, the Commission stated:

We . . . decline to deviate from established policy. Accordingly, we affirm our decision to impose on MSS licensees authorized by this Commission to operate in the 2 GHz emerging technologies band, whether foreign or domestic, the obligation to relocate those licensees with whom they cannot share spectrum to comparable facilities elsewhere in the spectrum.

3. At ¶26, of the *MO&O and Third NPRM*, the Commission stated:

We recognize that the relocation of FS incumbents nationwide would be a large undertaking, but find that this does not constitute a basis for abandoning our *Emerging Technologies* policies. . . . We find that the scale of the contemplated relocation does not affect the goals of providing for the fair and equitable sharing of 2 GHz spectrum, preventing disruption to incumbent operations and minimizing the economic impact on incumbent licensees.

4. The *MO&O and Third NPRM*, at ¶¶47-48, recounts the history of and reaffirms the Commission's *Emerging Technologies* policies. The only outstanding issues in the *Third NPRM* are limited to implementation of the relocation rules. Those limited issues are:

1. Application of the sunset rule of §101.79 (¶49)
2. Application of the good faith guidelines of §101.73 (¶49)
3. Ten years or another time period for the sunset date for voluntary negotiations (¶49)
4. The length of the voluntary and mandatory negotiation periods (¶50)
5. The beginning date for the voluntary negotiation period (¶50)
6. Application of the cost reimbursement formula in the *Microwave Cost-Sharing* proceeding or an even division between the initial MSS relocater and a subsequent MSS licensee (¶51)

5. Industry Canada, SP 1-3 GHz, October, 1999, "Amendments to the Microwave Spectrum Utilization Policies in the 1-3 GHz Frequency Range," ("IC SP 1-3 GHz") at ¶5.2.3, p. 13 ("There was general agreement that co-ordination would not be practical for the co-existence of MSS and FS services in the same bands.").

6. In the *First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making in WT Docket No. 95-157*, 11 F.C.C.R. 8825, at 8844, the Commission stated:

In the Cost-Sharing Notice, we also sought comment on whether and how depreciation of equipment and facilities should be taken into account, and whether it would be appropriate for a PCS licensee to compensate an incumbent only for the depreciated value of the old equipment. . . . We are persuaded by incumbents, however, that *compensation for the depreciated value of old equipment would not enable them to construct a comparable replacement system without imposing costs on the incumbent, which would be inconsistent with our relocation rules*. We therefore conclude that the depreciated value of old equipment should not be a factor when determining comparability.

(Emphasis added; footnotes omitted.)