

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Request by Globalstar, Inc. to Expand Its	)	RM-11339
Ancillary Terrestrial Component (“ATC”)	)	
Authority to Encompass Its Full Assigned	)	
Spectrum	)	

---

**COMMENTS OF IRIDIUM SATELLITE LLC**

Iridium Satellite LLC (“Iridium”) hereby submits these comments in response to Globalstar, Inc.’s (“Globalstar”) Petition for Expedited Rulemaking for Authorization to Provide Ancillary Terrestrial Component (“ATC”) Services in its Entire Spectrum Allocation.<sup>1</sup> In its Petition, Globalstar acknowledges that its proposed rule change could result in interference to Iridium’s co-primary operations in shared spectrum. Globalstar, however, fails to explain how such interference will be prevented if its proposed rule changes are granted. Accordingly, the Commission should dismiss Globalstar’s Petition as technically infirm.<sup>2</sup>

The FCC has repeatedly acknowledged the importance of protecting incumbents from co-

---

<sup>1</sup> Request by Globalstar, Inc. to Expand Its Ancillary Terrestrial Component Authority to Encompass Its Full Assigned Spectrum, RM-11339 (filed June 20, 2006) (“Petition”).

<sup>2</sup> The FCC regularly denies petitions for rulemaking on the grounds that the petitioner has failed to provide the necessary information to prove the proposed rule or rule modification is in the public interest. *See, e.g., Petition for Rulemaking to Establish Standards for Determining the Standing of a Party to Petition to Deny a Broadcast Application*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 82 FCC 2d 89, ¶ 11 (1980). Iridium limits its comments solely to Globalstar’s lack of a technical interference analysis in its Petition and does not comment on the substance of the Petition.

channel and adjacent channel interference in a variety of contexts.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, in the order adopting the regulatory framework for ATC operations, the FCC specifically prohibited the deployment of ATC by a separate terrestrial operator on the basis that such operations would pose an unacceptable risk of harmful interference to the existing and planned operations of licensed MSS operators.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, the FCC typically requires an affirmative showing that incumbent operations will not be adversely affected prior to approving a change in service rules. For example, in the broadcast context, the FCC requires an affirmative showing that incumbent operations will be protected before a licensee may request a license modification.<sup>5</sup>

In its Petition, Globalstar alleges that by expanding its ATC authorization, it will be able to assign channels for MSS and ATC in a manner best calculated to balance geographic and time-of-day demand and achieve increased flexibility in service offerings, “while still protecting co-frequency and adjacent licensees from harmful interference.”<sup>6</sup> Globalstar, however, fails to present *any* technical evidence demonstrating that ATC operations across its entire band will not cause interference to other incumbent licensees currently providing service in the same and

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *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*, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 16 FCC Rcd 4096 (2000) (adopting technical criteria so that NGSO FSS operations can share spectrum with incumbent services without causing unacceptable interference to them).

<sup>4</sup> *Flexibility for Delivery of Communications by Mobile Satellite Service Providers in the 2 GHz Band, the L-Band, and the 1.6/2.4 GHz Bands*, Report and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 18 FCC Rcd 1962 (2003).

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., *Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Boulder Town, Levan, Mount Pleasant and Richfield, Utah)*, Report and Order, DA 06-956, ¶ 4 (May 5, 2006) (dismissing a petition for rulemaking because it was “defective” in that it failed to protect another licensee from interference and finding that “rulemaking proponents are required to protect both the license and the construction permit site of stations at the time of filing”).

<sup>6</sup> Petition at 14.

adjacent bands as Globalstar.<sup>7</sup> In addition, Globalstar expressly admits that its ATC operations could cause interference to Iridium's incumbent operations.<sup>8</sup> In particular, Globalstar admits that three interference scenarios will arise out of its use of its entire spectrum for ATC: Globalstar ATC operations into Iridium satellites (including both Iridium's uplink and downlink), Iridium's uplink into Globalstar ATC base stations, and Iridium downlink into Globalstar ATC base stations.<sup>9</sup> Globalstar then fails to provide any information on how it will protect Iridium from this type of interference.<sup>10</sup>

Accordingly, given that Globalstar has failed to provide any technical analysis regarding the likelihood of interference, and even admits that interference to Iridium's current operations is possible, the FCC must dismiss Globalstar's current Petition for Rulemaking to allow it to provide ATC across its entire band.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Donna Bethea Murphy

Donna Bethea Murphy  
Vice President, Regulatory Engineering  
Iridium Satellite LLC  
6701 Democracy Blvd., Suite 500  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
301.571.6200

Dated: August 28, 2006

---

<sup>7</sup> Instead, Globalstar relies on broad assertions that it has previously operated without causing interference to others. *Id.* at 17, 20-24.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 22-24.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 22.

<sup>10</sup> Despite Globalstar's assertions to the contrary, Iridium is actively using the 3.1 MHz of spectrum that it shares with Globalstar.

