

WILKINSON) BARKER) KNAUER) LLP

2300 N STREET, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
TEL 202.783.4141
FAX 202.783.5851
www.wbklaw.com
Kathryn A. Zachem
202-383-3344

September 27, 2001

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 94-102, DA 01-1836
Notice of Permitted *Ex Parte* Presentation
Verizon Wireless Request for Limited Waiver of the Commission's
Phase II Rules

Dear Ms. Salas:

Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Verizon Wireless"), by its attorney, hereby notifies the Commission of a meeting yesterday with Kris Monteith, Tom Navin, Jane Phillips, Dan Grosh, Martin Leibman and Andra Cunningham, all of the Policy Division of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau; John Scott, Vice President and Deputy General Counsel – Regulatory Law, Verizon Wireless; Fran Malnati, Executive Director – Government Affairs, Verizon Wireless; and Kathy Zachem of Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP, counsel for Verizon Wireless. The instant filing is submitted in accordance with Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules.

The subject of the meeting was the pending, above-referenced Phase II waiver request, focusing primarily on Verizon Wireless' proposed Phase II implementation schedule. The participants also discussed issues regarding Verizon Wireless' current levels of analog-only subscribership and the anticipated availability of Phase II service to existing analog-only subscribers. In this regard, participants discussed Verizon Wireless' September 20, 2001 *ex parte* presentation, a copy of which is attached hereto.

Participants also discussed Verizon Wireless' proposed interim solution to deploy Grayson Wireless' network-based Phase II technology in eight counties, as well as the company's interaction with representatives of the PSAP community on this issue. Verizon Wireless representatives updated the staff on the company's interim plans as follows:

Ms. Salas

September 27, 2001

Page 2

St. Clair County, Illinois (St. Louis Market) and Lake County, Indiana (Gary East/Chicago Market) – Initially, Verizon Wireless planned to cover 50% of St. Clair County, Illinois and Lake County, Indiana by October 1st, phasing in 100% coverage of these two counties (plus the remaining six counties) by April 1, 2002, six months earlier than the FCC's rules require for those carriers choosing a network solution. The experience gained by working closely with Grayson Wireless and the St. Clair County and Lake County PSAPs has demonstrated that deploying receiver equipment to cover the counties' entire land area is more efficient than the phase-in approach. Therefore, rather than phasing in coverage, Verizon Wireless expects to provide 100% coverage of St. Clair County and Lake County by the end of this year.

Harris County, Texas; Cook County (2 PSAPs), Illinois; and St. Louis County, Missouri – With respect to the Harris County deployment effort, Verizon Wireless is focusing its efforts on converting the large number of cell sites that were not part of the original test bed, but which will be required for 100% service to that county. As Verizon Wireless' efforts in St. Clair County and Lake County have demonstrated, the company will work closely with technology vendors and the PSAPs to provide complete and accurate coverage to Harris County (as well as Cook County and St. Louis County) on or before the April 1st deadline as set forth in Verizon Wireless' waiver request.

Schaumburg, Illinois (Cook/DuPage County) and Madison County, Illinois – Consistent with the ongoing discussions it is having with the relevant PSAPs, Verizon Wireless will not be deploying an interim network-based solution in Schaumburg and Madison County. Rather, Verizon Wireless will deploy its handset-based solution in these counties pursuant to the handset-based implementation plan set forth in Verizon Wireless' waiver request.

Meeting participants also discussed potential mechanisms to promote compliance with wireless carriers' proposed implementation schedules. As previously set forth in its filings, Verizon Wireless discussed its commitment to deploy the network components of the handset-based solution as soon as its three network infrastructure vendors have compliant technologies, and those technologies can be deployed. As a related matter, we note herein the public safety community's suggestion that "the Commission should insist that the relevant equipment vendors further document their manufacturing schedules . . ." (Comments of APCO, NENA and NASNA in Response to Verizon Wireless at p. 4 (August 21, 2001)).

WILKINSON) BARKER) KNAUER) LLP

Ms. Salas


September 27, 2001

Page 3

Please contact the undersigned should you have questions regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

WILKINSON BARKER KNAUER, LLP

By:  Kathryn A. Zachem

cc: Kris Monteith
Thomas Navin
Dan Grosh
Jane Phillips
Martin Liebman
Andra Cunningham

WILKINSON) BARKER) KNAUER) LLP

STAMP AND RETURN

2300 N STREET, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
TEL 202.783.4141
FAX 202.783.5851
www.wbklaw.com
KATHRYN A. ZACHEM
(202) 383-3344
kzachem@wbklaw.com

RECEIVED

SEP 20 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

September 20, 2001

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 94-102, DA 01-1836
Notice of Permitted *Ex Parte* Presentation
Verizon Wireless Request for Limited Waiver of the Commission's Phase
II Rules

Dear Ms. Salas:

Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Verizon Wireless" or the "Company"), by its attorney, hereby notifies the Commission of permitted *ex parte* discussions between the undersigned and Thomas Navin, Deputy Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau's Policy Division. These discussions took place yesterday September 19, 2001, and Tuesday, September 18, 2001. An original and two copies of the instant filing are submitted pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules.

The subject of the discussions was Verizon Wireless' pending Phase II waiver request and, in particular, confirmation of the Company's commitment to comply with its obligations to transition its embedded base of subscribers, including analog subscribers, to ALI-capable handsets. The Commission imposed both interim benchmarks accounting for *all* new handset activations and a requirement to achieve 95 percent penetration of location-capable handsets among its embedded base of subscribers by December 31, 2005.¹ Verizon Wireless' reply comments of August 31, 2001 discussed the extent to which Verizon Wireless provides analog cellular service. To confirm, Verizon Wireless' digital coverage is expected to reach nearly 100 percent of its service areas by the end of 2003, its number of customers with analog-only handsets is steadily declining, and the Company will introduce and marketing and targeted

¹ See Verizon Wireless, Updated Phase II E911 Report and Request for Limited Waiver, CC Docket No. 94-102, filed July 25, 2001, at 14, 20; 47 C.F.R. §§ 20.18(g)(1)(ii)-(iii) (the "interim benchmarks") and (g)(1)(v) (the "2005/95 percent requirement").

incentives encouraging customers to acquire ALI-capable handsets.² These implementation efforts and market trends discussed in its reply comments will assist in ensuring that Verizon Wireless will meet the interim benchmarks and, ultimately, the prescribed 95 percent penetration level.

Verizon Wireless' manner of addressing non-ALI capable handsets is as the Commission intended. The Commission "recogniz[ed] that handset-based solutions present problems in achieving universal coverage, because callers without ALI-capable handsets, such as roamers and those using older handsets, might not receive Phase II ALI" but nevertheless determined "that concerns associated with non-ALI-capable handsets and roamers can be addressed and minimized or eliminated within a reasonable time."³ In adopting the 2005/95 percent requirement the Commission sought to "ensure that the public safety goals of this proceeding are achieved within a reasonable period *regardless of normal handset churn*" and ensure "that Phase II extends to all wireless callers as quickly as is reasonably possible."⁴ In fact, the 100 percent new activation benchmark of the Commission's rules applies only to *digital* handsets, thus underscoring the Commission's expectation that the embedded base of analog handsets would be phased out over time.

Thus, in adopting interim benchmarks and the 2005/95 percent requirement, the Commission directly addressed concerns that handset-based solutions might not adequately account for a carrier's non-ALI capable handsets. The Commission's treatment of comments in this proceeding further underscores this point. Opponents of handset-based solutions argued that handset-based solutions should not be allowed because of their inability to immediately provide Phase II capabilities for the embedded base of handsets, and the Commission expressly acknowledged these concerns.⁵ In spite of these arguments, the Commission concluded that "the benefits of a reasonable a phase-in approach for handset-based ALI solutions justify and outweigh the drawbacks, including any possible additional delays in ALI deployment."⁶ As a related matter, proponents of handset-based solutions argued that handset churn would ensure expeditious deployment of ALI-capable handsets among a carrier's embedded base of subscribers.⁷ The Commission struck a balance between these two approaches by adding a

² See Reply Comments of Verizon Wireless, CC Docket No. 94-102, filed August 31, 2001, at 7, 9.

³ See *Revision of the Commission's Rules To Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, Third Report and Order*, 14 FCC Rcd 17388, 17404 ¶ 31 (1999).

⁴ See *Third Report and Order*, 14 FCC Rcd at 17412 ¶ 52 (emphasis added), *modified in relevant part*, *Fourth Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 15 FCC Rcd 17442, ¶ 36 (2000) (extending requirement one year from December 31, 2004 to December 31, 2005).

⁵ See *Third Report and Order* at 17399 ¶ 20, 17404 ¶ 31; Comments of TruePosition in CC Docket No. 94-102, filed June 17, 1999, at 5-6 and n.10.

⁶ See *Third Report and Order* at 17399 ¶ 21.

⁷ See Comments of SnapTrack in CC Docket No. 94-102, filed June 17 1999, at 16.


WILKINSON) BARKER) KNAUER) LLP
Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary
September 20, 2001
Page 3

2004/100 percent embedded base requirement (later amended to 2005/95 percent) as a
"backstop" approach.⁸

Please contact the undersigned should you have questions regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

WILKINSON BARKER KNAUER, LLP

By:  Kathryn A. Zaehem

cc: Kris Monteith
Thomas Navin
Dan Grosh
Jane Phillips
Martin Liebman