

ORIGINAL EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

LAW OFFICES

GOLDBERG, GODLES, WIENER & WRIGHT

1229 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

ORIGINAL

HENRY GOLDBERG
JOSEPH A. GODLES
JONATHAN WIENER
W. KENNETH FERREE
SHERYL J. LINCOLN
HENRIETTA WRIGHT
THOMAS G. GHERARDI, P.C.
COUNSEL

(202) 429-4900
TELECOPIER:
(202) 429-4912

e-mail:
general@g2w2.com

RECEIVED
JUN 12 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

June 12, 2000

BY HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Magalie R. Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals, 445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: ET Docket No. 99-231
Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's
Rules Regarding Spread Spectrum Devices
--- *Ex Parte Filing*

Dear Ms. Salas:

The attached letter regarding the above-referenced proceeding was e-mailed by David King of Proxim, Inc. to Chairman William E. Kennard at the end of the business day on June 9, 2000.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry Goldberg
Attorney for Proxim, Inc.

cc: Dale Hatfield
Julius Knapp
Ari Fitzgerald
Mark Schneider
Bryan Tramont
Peter Tenhula
Adam Krinsky

Attachment

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

Chairman Kennard,

It was a pleasure meeting you at Supercomm and discussing the Commission's proposal to modify its Part 15 spread spectrum rules. Given the limited time we had to talk at the show, I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded me to expand on my comments.

First, I absolutely concur with your statement that Dale Hatfield and the OET are the right people to resolve any technical issues related to wideband frequency hopping. The OET has thoroughly evaluated the technical issues raised here for not only the twelve months since the NPRM in ET Docket 99-231 was issued last June, but during the eight months leading up to the NPRM. Suffice it to say that the opposition's claims of undue interference and questionable system performance have proven groundless, based on both demonstrable test results as well as simple logic. Any further technical claims by the opposition at this point are intended simply to delay final action by the Commission.

Working closely with the OET, the HomeRF Working Group has agreed to a compromise involving scaled-back power levels that are considerably lower than those permitted for existing narrowband frequency hopping systems, as well as for the existing direct sequence systems favored by the opposition. Please note that these reduced power levels are also well below those allowed today for wideband frequency hopping wireless LANs in Japan, a country with far less cable or DSL deployment than in the U.S. In consultation with the OET, HomeRF also accepted compromises related to channel overlap and hopping rates in order to address concerns raised by the opposition.

When compared to existing direct sequence systems, broadband HomeRF wireless networks will cost less, provide vastly superior support for toll-quality multi-line telephony and other isochronous services (such as streaming audio and video), and be far better suited for use in high density multi-tenant apartments and dormitories. Despite these advantages, for the past year or so, the only wireless LANs offering 10+ Mbps performance available in the marketplace have been direct sequence LANs. This competitive imbalance occurred because of a fluke in the Part 15 rules, which permitted 10+ Mbps direct sequence without a rulemaking proceeding, but required rulemaking to enable broadband frequency hopping. Recognizing this anomaly, OET resolved to expedite the rulemaking process and has done its utmost to do so despite the opposition's concerted efforts to bog down the process. Even now, the opposition is attempting to delay the Commission's vote on the OET's compromise proposal.

For the past year, direct sequence vendors, in an attempt to dominate "mind share" in the market, have told potential customers, analysts and investors that the FCC will never approve wideband frequency hopping. Every day that the vote is delayed allows them to perpetuate that story and increases the lead time for HomeRF developers such as Compaq, Intel, Motorola, Proxim and Siemens to introduce next generation broadband HomeRF products. Further delay also prevents cable companies, such as AT&T and Charter Communications (both of whom have filed letters urging quick approval), competitive DSL providers and fixed wireless access firms from deploying low cost,