PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON

1615 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5694

TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300
FACSIMILE (202) 223-7420

JEFFREY H. OLSON
COMMUNICATIONS COUNSEL

TELEPHONE (202) 223-7326

E MAIL jolson@paulweiss.com

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019-6064
TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000
FACSIMILE (212) 757-3990

62, RUE DU FAUBOURG SAINT-HONORÉ
75008 PARIS, FRANCE
TELEPHONE (33 1) 53 43 14 14
FACSIMILE (33 1) 53 43 00 23

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING
2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME
CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN
TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101
FACSIMILE (81-3) 3597-8120

2918 CHINA WORLD TOWER II
NO. 1 JIANGUOMENWAI DAJIE
BEIJING, 100004
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
TELEPHONE (86-10) 6505-6822
FACSIMILE (86-10) 6505-6830

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING
3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL
HONG KONG
TELEPHONE (852) 2536-9933
FACSIMILE (852) 2536-9622

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

FEB 13 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

February 13, 2002

By Hand

William F. Caton, Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Ex Parte: ET Dkt No. 98-206, IB Dkt No. 01-96,
File Nos. 48-SAT-P/LA-97, 89-SAT-AMEND-97,
130-SAT-AMEND-98

Dear Mr. Caton:

On February 1, 2002, the undersigned filed with the Commission several letters (with attachments) reflecting the fact that on January 31, 2002, Didier Casasoprana, Chief Engineer; Damien Garot, Manager, Products and Services, both of SkyBridge L.P.; and Diane Gaylor and the undersigned, attorneys for SkyBridge, met in person with various Legal Advisors and International Bureau staff, for the purpose of discussing matters at issue in the above-referenced proceedings. Through an oversight, the list of proceedings identified by the ex parte caption of those letters did not include a reference to IB Docket No. 01-96. This letter is submitted to correct that oversight.

As indicated below, a copy of this letter is being served on all Commission staff present at the subject meetings. Attached hereto is a copy of the document distributed at those meetings that was of relevance to IB Docket No. 01-96; a copy of this document was attached to the February 1, 2002, ex parte notifications, despite the fact that the subject letters omitted reference to IB Docket No. 01-96 in the caption.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+9
List ABCDE

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

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey H. Olson
Attorney for SkyBridge L.P.

Attachment

cc (without attachment):
Peter Tenhula, Esq.
Bryan Tramont, Esq.
Paul Margie, Esq.
Monica Shah Desai, Esq.
Thomas Tycz
Jennifer Gilsenan, Esq.
J. Mark Young
Robert Nelson
Jamil Lawrence

SkyBridge

an Alcatel company

NGSO/NGSO Sharing

IB Docket No. [illegible]-96

Washington D.C., January 31, 2002

© SkyBridge L.P.

Coordination

In an ideal world, coordination results in the greatest spectrum efficiency, but outcome depends on good faith negotiation by the parties.

In this proceeding, the applicants have diverse incentives, and the proposed systems are at vastly different stages of development.

=> Need a "default solution" for regulatory and business certainty

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Default Solution

The default solution should meet the following objectives:

- **provide sufficient access to spectrum for broadband services**
- **provide equitable access to spectrum for all applicants**
- **be technology neutral**
  - **no orbit is "best"**
    - **orbit selection depends on business decisions**
    - **a variety of orbits will permit a diversity of service offerings**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Default Solution (2)

(cont.)

- provide regulatory certainty, to permit investment in systems
- encourage coordination, to permit optimum use of the spectrum
- be compatible with non-U.S. regulatory regimes, to permit operation in foreign territories and sharing with non-U.S. licensed systems

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Proposals for NGSO/NGSO Sharing

- ***Band Segmentation*** *(FCC Options I and II)*
- ***Homogeneous Orbits*** *(FCC Option IV)*
- ***Hybrid of Above*** *(Virtual Geo Proposal)*
- ***Avoidance of In-Line Events*** *(SkyBridge Proposal and FCC Option III)*

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Band Segmentation fails to meet numerous objectives for the default solution:

- does not guarantee licensees access to sufficient spectrum to support economically-viable services
  - 1/"N" of the spectrum is not sufficient for broadband
  - availability of spectrum decreases with time, counter to business needs
  - limits carrier sizes and access methods
- introduces uncertainty regarding availability of bands, forcing operators to design for a variety of scenarios

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Band Segmentation (2)

(cont.)

- does not make efficient use of the spectrum
  - decreases amount of spectrum a system can use, even when no interference would result
  - reduces useable spectrum, due to need for guard bands
  - impedes development by operators of more spectrum-efficient solutions
- discourages use of interference mitigation techniques
  - encourages hording of exclusive spectrum rights
  - hinders service in foreign territories and sharing with non-U.S. licensed systems

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Forced Homogeneity fails to meet a number of objectives for the default solution:

- **It is not technology neutral:**
  - takes business decisions away from the licensees, and places them in the hands of the FCC
  - thwarts the business plan of a number of applicants
  - there is no rationale criteria by which the FCC could select a "winning design;" no system is inherently superior
  - prevents diversity of service offerings, and ability of new entrants to compete
- **It places US-licensed systems at a disadvantage in regions or countries that have adopted alternative sharing regimes:**
  - orbit-planning has been rejected internationally, with full U.S. concurrence and support

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Virtual Geo Proposal

The Virtual Geo proposal fails to meet a number of objectives for the default solution:

- **fails to ensure equal access to the spectrum**
- **fails to ensure sufficient access to the spectrum**
- **fails to prevent spectrum warehousing**
- **fails to facilitate coordination**
- **fails to achieve an outcome dictated by the service market, rather than regulatory decision**
- **is not technology neutral, and Virtual Geo claims to hold the intellectual property rights to its orbit**
- **fails to facilitate sharing with non-U.S. licensed systems that do not employ the same orbit**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Virtual Geo Proposal (2)

Virtual Geo's Orbit is Not Superior to Other NGSO Orbits:

- **The transmission delay impedes interactive applications and use of TCP/IP-transparent architectures.**
- **The orbit is not optimum for global services. As Virtual Geo concedes, the Virgo orbit is really more appropriate for regional GSO-like services.**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Virtual Geo Proposal (3)

The chief benefit Virgo ascribes to its orbit is its ability to accommodate a large number of systems. However,

- **The number of systems says nothing about what sorts of services can be provided, and at what cost.**
- **It has not been demonstrated that maximally-packed Virgo constellations yield any greater capacity than maximally-packed constellations of any other kind.**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Virtual Geo Proposal (4)

The problem Virtual Geo claims to solve does not exist:

- **All of the current applicants can be accommodated under the method of avoiding in-line events.**
- **The demand for future entry of Virgo-orbit systems is speculative at best.**

The spectrum requirements of existing projects should not be thrown aside to warehouse spectrum for a class of systems for which no future demand has been demonstrated. The marketplace should decide.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Avoidance of In-Line Events

Spectrum sharing via avoidance of in-line events solves the above problems:

- supported by majority of applicants
- provides equal and sufficient access to the spectrum
- is spectrum efficient
  - only satellites in interference configurations need to take steps to mitigate
  - leaves operators free to use all of the spectrum for as much of the time as possible
- prevents spectrum warehousing
- facilitates and encourages coordination among applicants

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Avoidance of In-Line Events (2)

(cont.)

- is technology neutral
  - permits technology and service choices to be dictated by the market, not the Commission
  - suitable for all proposed systems
    - satellite diversity is not required
    - uniform transmitter power is not required
- places U.S. licenses in an excellent position to adapt to foreign regulatory regimes and to coordinate with non-U.S. licensed systems

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Implementation of In-Line Avoidance



SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Implementation of In-Line Avoidance (2)

Elements that need to be defined:

- Definition of "in-line event"
- Spectrum arrangement during in-line events

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event"

SkyBridge has proposed two possibilities:

- **"arbitrarily" select a benchmark angular separation, say 10º ("simple approach")**

or

- **select more optimum angular separations specific to each pair of constellations ("detailed approach")**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach

Simple Approach:

1. Select a default angle (e.g., 10°) applicable to in-line events between most systems.

2. Provide a method for taking into account "high-power" links.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach (2)

10° is an appropriate balance for the angular separation between most systems.

- ***Any smaller, and we risk interference in the main-lobe of the terminals***
- ***Any larger, and we over-burden the operations of the systems (See Table below)***

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach (3)

Co-existing constellation	SkyBridge	Boeing	HNet	Virgo	HLink	KuBs	Pentriad
Reference constellation							
SkyBridge							
5		98.5	96.6	99.1	98.8	95.5	99
10		93.5	88.97	96.2	95.4	82	95.3
15		86	81.2	91.2	89.4	62	88.7
20		75.7	73.2	83.9	81.2	41.6	78.6
Boeing							
5	98.6		99	99.5	99.4	97.3	97.8
10	94		95.5	89	95.7	89.8	92.2
15	86.6		89.5	82.8	83.5	73.2	73.3
20	75.2		81.9	70	66.8	53.5	57.5
HNet							
5	97.2	98.2		98.4	98.3	97.4	98.4
10	90.5	92.7		93.8	93.2	89.8	93.6
15	82	83.8		87.2	85.2	78	86.4
20	71.6	73.1		79.4	75.2	63.7	77.4
Virgo							
5	99.2	99.4	99.6		99.3	97.7	100
10	97.2	98.7	98.2		97.9	91.7	97.9
15	93.8	93.2	96.3		95.3	83.5	97.1
20	89.4	87.9	94.3		93	73.5	93.3
HLink							
5	97.7	99	97.9	99.3		98.8	99.4
10	91.1	93.8	92.6	96.9		93.7	97.5
15	80.8	81.8	84.6	93.4		82	92
20	68	64.9	76.2	87.7		71	88
KuBs							
5	96.7	98.7	97.3	98.9	99.6		97.7
10	87.8	95.8	91.4	94	97.2		92.7
15	75	90	84	86	93		85
20	60	80	76	76	86		75
Pentriad							
5	98.4	95.7	98.6	87.9	99.3	96	
10	91.1	88.9	94.2	63.3	97.5	84.6	
15	83	72	87	48	94	63	
20	65	60	78	35	86	33	

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach (4)

10° separation may be insufficient to protect a system against another system using significantly higher power levels and higher off-axis gain.

- **This is not an issue on the downlink. The EPFD limits constrain all systems to similar power levels.**
- **On the uplink, however, systems are not as tightly constrained.**

It is therefore necessary to define an alternative separation angle for the potential case where 10° does not adequately protect a system from a "high-power" uplink of another system.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach (5)

Defining "high-power" uplink:

"an on-axis EIRP in excess of 18 dBW/m^2/40 kHz

and

an off-axis EIRP at 10° or above in excess of –10 dBW /m^2/40 kHz

for any system terminal"

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach (6)

Both prongs of the definition are important:

- **A terminal with a relaxed antenna pattern may not adversely affect other systems if its power is low (which may be the case for a LEO).**
- **A terminal with a high on-axis power (such a MEO or HEO) may not adversely affect another system if its antenna performance or diameter is high.**

10° separation angle is insufficient only when a system employs both a high power and a relaxed antenna pattern.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Simple Approach (7)

If a system employs "high-power" uplinks:

- **The system can decrease its power and/or increase its antenna diameter and/or performance to reduce its off-axis power density,**

or

- **During in-line events with another system, both systems can employ a larger separation angle, such as 20°.**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Detailed Approach

As an alternative to the "simple" approach of selecting a single benchmark separation angle, it is also possible to customize the angle based on the link budget and performance objectives of each system:

- **Based on methodologies used within the ITU-R to develop the regime for GSO/NGSO sharing**
- **Avoids the need to deal separately with the "high-powered" links**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Detailed Approach (2)

1. Determine sync loss threshold of the victim system (I/N_{TH}).

2. Select an initial value for the angular separation of the systems (start with a small angle).

3. Run a complete simulation generating the distribution of I/N levels created by the interfering system.

4. Convolve it with the rain fade to get the total degradation distribution.

5. Compare the total degradation with the degradation due only to rain to determine the unavailability increase due to the interfering system.

6. If the unavailability increase is greater than 7%, select a larger angular separation and repeat from step 3. If it is less than 7%, select that angle.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Defining "In-Line Event" – Detailed Approach (3)



© SkyBridge L.P.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

Defining "In-Line Event" – Detailed Approach (4)

Simulations should represent "typical" operations, not worst-case:

- **Assume one full-time, full-power terminal per center of each beam of the interfering satellite**
- **Assume interfering system terminal is co-located with the victim earth station**
- **Assume "best-elevation" tracking**

ITU-R Recommendation 1325 provides guidance on appropriate assumptions.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Spectrum Arrangements During In-Line Events

It will be easy for each operator to program its system to adhere to the plan:

- **In-line events will be predictable in advance.**
- **The pattern of events will be repetitive over time.**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Spectrum Arrangements During In-Line Events (2)

Available Ku-band segments come with various sharing conditions. They are not fungible.



The spectrum arrangement should provide each system equal access to bands with similar sharing conditions.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Spectrum Arrangements During In-Line Events (3)

Each similar band segment needs to be split among the two or more systems involved in a given in-line event.

- **default**
  - **based on, for example, date of launch**
- **permit licensees to agree among themselves based on individual preferences**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Spectrum Arrangements During In-Line Events (4)

Example for Two Systems:



SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

In-Line Avoidance - Impact on Systems

Most of the time, systems will be unconstrained.

During in-line events, systems can cope with the necessary frequency constraints via a number of techniques:

- **Satellite diversity**
  - **Circular orbit systems have this ability**
  - **HEO orbit systems should have this ability**
    - **Denali states that its system has some such ability.**
    - **Examination of the Virgo system indicates that it does too.**
- **Frequency diversity**
- **Design to operate in less bandwidth**
    - **Virgo proposes to operate in less than half the allocated spectrum.**

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

In-Line Avoidance - Impact on Virgo

Virtual Geo not only states that it can operate in less than half of the spectrum, but offers to do so.

Virgo would be constrained only in the event of in-line configurations involving three or more systems, the likelihood of which Virtual Geo finds so remote that it has proposed ignoring the possibility. *(Virtual Geo NPRM Comments, App. 1, at 4)*

- **Virgo can operate under Option III without any significant system modifications and without any significant reduction in capacity.**
- **In fact, Virgo would have greater spectrum access under Option III than under its own proposal, and would essentially never have less than its stated requirements.**

Virgo's proposal does nothing but promote Virtual Geo's business objectives for its patented orbit, and completely disrupts the technical and business plans of the other applicants.

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.

Avoidance of In-Line Events

- Accommodates all proposed systems in an equitable manner, without requiring significant system modifications
- Is simple to implement, avoiding long-term FCC involvement in administering the sharing regime

SkyBridge
an Alcatel company

© SkyBridge L.P.