Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands	)	ET Docket No. 04-186
	)	
	)	ET Docket No. 02-380
Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band	)	

To: The Commission

JOINT REPLY COMMENTS OF
THE ASSOCIATION FOR MAXIMUM SERVICE TELEVISION, INC.,
AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ONLY FIXED ACCESS TV BAND DEVICES SHOULD BE ALLOWED; THE RECORD DOES NOT SUPPORT THE INTRODUCTION OF PERSONAL/PORTABLE DEVICES INTO THE BROADCAST SPECTRUM. 3

II. AS THE RECORD SUPPORTS, CERTAIN BASELINE PROTECTIONS MUST BE ADOPTED BEFORE ANY TV BAND DEVICES ARE ALLOWED TO OPERATE IN THE BROADCAST SPECTRUM. 7

A. Protection of DTV Operations Should Be Based On Proper D/U Ratios. 8

B. Sensing Alone Will Be Ineffective To Prevent Interference; Thus Proper Techniques, Including A Geolocation Method, Must Be Implemented To Prevent TV Band Devices From Operating On A Co-Channel Within A TV Station's Protected Contour. 11

1. Current Sensing Proposals Fail To Protect Existing Services. 11

2. A Geolocation Method Must Be Implemented In Order To Provide Adequate Protection. 16

C. TV Band Devices Will Also Cause Harmful Interference To Adjacent And Taboo Channels If Allowed To Operate Within the Contour. 18

1. Operation Within An Adjacent Channel's Contour Must Be Prohibited. 18

2. Harmful Interference Is Likely From TV Band Devices Operating On Second and Third Adjacent Channels As Well As Image or Oscillator Taboo Channels. 20

D. The Commission Must Adopt Proper Out-Of-Band Emission Standards. 22

III. FURTHER TESTING MUST OCCUR BEFORE ANY TV BAND DEVICES ARE ALLOWED TO OPERATE IN THE BAND. 24

A. The Commission Should First Determine How Far Away A TV Band Device Must Be Located From A TV Receiver To Not Cause Co-Channel Interference 25

B. The Commission Should Develop A Uniform Test Methodology To Determine The Sensing Threshold Of TV Band Devices. 26

C. The Device Coalition Is Not Designing A Prototype, As Its Device Does Not Reflect The Operating Characteristics Of A Typical TV Band Device. 27

IV. ANY AUTHORIZED TV BAND DEVICES MUST OPERATE ON AN EXCLUSIVELY LICENSED BASIS. 29

V. THE COMMISSION MUST PROTECT BROADCASTERS' ABILITIES TO PROVIDE NEW AND INNOVATIVE DTV SERVICES. 33

VI. THE COMMISSION MUST PROTECT WIRELESS MICROPHONES CURRENTLY OPERATING IN THE BAND. 35

VII. THE PUBLIC SHOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON ANY FURTHER TESTING OF TV BAND DEVICES..... 36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Throughout the course of this proceeding, broadcasters, engineers, cable providers, wireless microphone manufacturers, public safety advocates, consumer electronics manufacturers and others have identified serious interference concerns and, therefore, the need for extreme caution and extensive testing before the Commission authorizes *any* TV band devices to operate in the broadcast spectrum. As the country completes the transition to digital television ("DTV"), consumers, broadcasters, and the government will continue to spend billions of dollars on new digital equipment. In addition, the advent of all-digital television will provide countless opportunities for the development of new over-the-air television services. The DTV transition, as well as these technological developments, will be seriously jeopardized if TV band devices are allowed to operate in the band before there is a real basis to believe that they will not cause harmful interference to television services.

The record clearly indicates that interference to television broadcasting, as well as to other licensed services, is a serious concern. All of the measurement and test data submitted in the record support the Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc. ("MSTV") and the National Association of Broadcasters ("NAB") technical positions. Even unlicensed advocate, the New America Foundation, *et al*. ("NAF"), now admits and confirms that the Commission's Section 15.209 out-of-band limits are inadequate, as stated by NAB and MSTV. In addition, NAF funded testing of DTV receivers by the University of Kansas shows that TV band device operation on either co-channel or adjacent channels within a TV station's contour would result in interference to TV viewers, again confirming NAB's and MSTV's previous analysis and tests. Dell, Google, *et al.*, ("Device Coalition") advocates of personal/portable devices and spectrum

sensing, provide little or no technical data or analysis to support their positions. In fact, they provide no technical analysis, or even an explanation, for their suggested sensing level which provides less protection to incumbents than that previously suggested by one of the Coalition members and for which a technical analysis, while flawed, was provided. NAB and MSTV, on the other hand, have provided measured test data within the contour and extensive technical analysis on the record to show that sensing and personal/portable operation will not protect TV viewers from interference. In addition, the Wireless Internet Services Providers Association ("WISPA") and other advocates of using the TV bands to provide broadband services, agree that personal/portable devices are best left to the existing higher frequency unlicensed bands and that the superior propagation characteristics of the TV band are unnecessary and create greater interference risks.

While MSTV and NAB support the Commission's goal to provide additional wireless broadband opportunities in underserved areas, this must and can, as the record supports, be accomplished without creating harmful interference to existing services within the television spectrum. To accomplish this goal of additional wireless broadband, certain baseline protections must be adopted in order to ensure that harmful interference to TV viewers and other licensed operations does not occur. Accordingly, NAB and MSTV urge that:

- ***As the Commission has rightly decided, no TV band devices should be permitted to operate before the DTV transition.***
- ***Any operation of TV band devices should be limited to fixed operations only. Personal and portable operations should not be permitted.***
- ***Protection of DTV operations should be based on Desired-to-Undesired (D/U) ratios.***
- ***To avoid interference to TV viewers, <u>all</u> TV band devices must operate outside the protected contour on both co- and adjacent channels. Such devices should not operate inside a TV station's protected contour on either the co-channel or first adjacent channels.***

- ***Sensing alone will be ineffective to prevent interference. Thus, proper techniques, including a geolocation method, must be implemented.***
- ***The proposed out-of-band emission limits (Part 15.209) are inadequate to protect DTV viewers and must be amended.***
- ***Any new devices allowed to operate in the broadcast spectrum should be exclusively licensed; no unlicensed operation should be allowed.***
- ***The Commission must conduct testing to ensure that the final rules sufficiently protect television viewers. The Commission must enact a rigorous enforcement program.***
- ***The Commission must protect broadcasters' abilities to provide new and innovative DTV services to the public.***
- ***Wireless microphones, and other existing services currently operating in the band, must be protected.***
- ***The public should have an opportunity to comment on any further testing of TV band devices.***

This proceeding has been ongoing for the last four years, but thus far none of the proponents of TV band devices, other than IEEE 802, have been able to develop an approach that demonstrates that these devices will not cause such interference. The Commission must not endanger important television services in the band without conclusive evidence that TV band devices will not cause harmful interference.

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands	)	ET Docket No. 04-186
	)	
	)	ET Docket No. 02-380
Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band	)	

JOINT REPLY COMMENTS OF
THE ASSOCIATION FOR MAXIMUM SERVICE TELEVISION, INC.,
AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

The record compiled in this proceeding supports a cautious and measured approach by the Commission in authorizing *any* TV band devices to operate in the television spectrum. As multiple parties note, the public is about to undergo an extensive transition to digital television.[1] While all commenting parties agree in principle on the importance of preventing interference during and after the transition to digital television ("DTV"), some parties are nevertheless willing to take great risks with the public's television service just as the transition is about to conclude.[2] The Commission should not jeopardize the transition to DTV, before or after February 2009, by introducing TV band devices into the band that will cause harmful interference to existing services.

The comments submitted into the record are comprised of varying and conflicting proposals for the technical parameters, interference avoidance mechanisms, and regulatory

[1] *See* Comments of Cox Broadcasting, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Cox Comments); Comments of Ion Media, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Ion Media Comments); Comments of Medial General, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Media General Comments).

[2] Our use of the terms, television service, TV broadcast services and TV viewers, throughout this pleading, is intended to include not only full power TV stations and its viewers but also low power television and TV translator operations and their viewing public.

schemes that will govern the use and operation of TV band devices in the broadcast spectrum. The record highlights the serious interference concerns at issue in this proceeding. Consequently, The Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc. ("MSTV")[3] and the National Association of Broadcasters ("NAB")[4] urge the Commission to proceed cautiously and only promulgate rules allowing TV band devices to operate in the broadcast spectrum if accompanied by the following limitations:

- Only fixed access TV band devices should be allowed.
- TV band devices should be prohibited from operating on a co- or adjacent channel within the TV station's protected contour.
- A geolocation method, incorporating a database, must be implemented to prevent interference; sensing will be ineffective as the exclusive means of preventing interference.
- The Commission must adopt new, stricter out-of-band emission limits for TV Band devices.
- All TV band devices must operate on an exclusively licensed basis.
- TV band devices must also protect broadcasters' abilities to provide the public with new and innovative DTV services, such as mobile and portable operation, and wireless microphones currently operating in the TV spectrum.
- The Commission must adopt an effective method of identifying interfering devices and recalling them if interference occurs.

In addition to implementing the above-mentioned protections, and as urged by many commenters, the Commission must conduct rigorous testing to ensure that the rules it adopts will actually be effective at preventing interference to television services, and all other existing services in the band, such as wireless microphones. This testing should be conducted on truly representative prototype TV band devices, under real-world conditions, and should be

[3] MSTV is a non-profit trade association of local broadcast television stations committed to achieving and maintaining the highest technical quality for the local broadcast system.

[4] NAB is a nonprofit trade association that advocates on behalf of more than 8,300 free, local radio and television stations and also broadcast networks before Congress, the Federal Communications Commission and other federal agencies, and the Courts.

publicized and submitted for public comments. Only through the establishment of sufficient technical parameters and thorough testing can the Commission ensure that any TV band devices that are released into the band will not cause harmful interference to existing services.

I. ONLY FIXED ACCESS TV BAND DEVICES SHOULD BE ALLOWED; THE RECORD DOES NOT SUPPORT THE INTRODUCTION OF PERSONAL/PORTABLE DEVICES INTO THE BROADCAST SPECTRUM.

The record clearly indicates that the Commission's decision to limit its current proposal to authorize *only fixed* TV band devices is the proper and correct course of action. There is widespread support among the commenting parties for the proposition that the Commission should not allow personal/portable devices to operate in the spectrum until it first gains experience with fixed devices and can ensure that even those devices will not cause harmful interference to existing services in the band.[5] Furthermore, it is only fixed TV band devices, rather than personal/portable devices, that advance the Commission's goal of providing increased broadband access services to underserved areas. As the record lacks both technical and policy justifications for the introduction of personal/portable TV band devices into the broadcast spectrum, they should not be permitted.

IEEE 802 has submitted a proposal detailing an interference avoidance regime, which MSTV and NAB encourage the Commission to adopt.[6] The technical protections afforded by IEEE 802's proposal are only aimed at preventing interference caused by fixed TV

---

[5] *See especially*, Joint Comments of MSTV and NAB, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (MSTV/NAB Comments); Comments of IEEE 802, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007); Joint Comments of Broadcasters, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Joint Comments of Broadcasters); Comments of Microphone Interests Coalition, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Microphone Interests Coalition Comments); Comments of Professional Audio Manufacturers Alliance, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (PAMA Comments); Comments of Qualcomm, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Qualcomm Comments); Comments of Shure Incorporated, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Shure Comments); Comments of Wireless Internet Service Providers Association, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (WISPA Comments); Cox Broadcasting Comments; Media General Comments.

[6] *See* IEEE 802 Comments.

band devices and will be ineffective to prevent the potential interference from personal/portable TV band devices. As Shure notes in its comments, "neither IEEE nor any other technical group has offered any comprehensive analysis and proposal for interference protection of incumbent operations by personal/portable devices."[7] The Professional Audio Manufacturers Alliance ("PAMA") also advocates waiting to introduce personal/portable devices until further testing is conducted, noting the two years IEEE 802.22 has devoted to studying the effects of fixed devices and the need for equivalent study of personal/portable devices.[8]

One of the main problems with personal/portable devices previously discussed by MSTV and NAB is that once they are allowed into the market, these devices are totally uncontrolled and can be located and operated anywhere.[9] Accordingly, it will be difficult, if not impossible to identify and resolve the interference from these devices when it occurs. As Qualcomm, states, "by limiting transmissions to fixed transmitters, the source of any interference can be readily identified so that the interference can be remedied easily and effectively."[10] Cox further explains that "given the expected popularity of personal/portable devices, interference problems would be pervasive and practically impossible to resolve if the devices are not adequately and thoroughly tested before their introduction."[11] The Commission has little, if any, ability to recall these devices after they are released into the marketplace, as can be seen from the lack of Commission action after the still ongoing problems with the FM transmitters associated

[7] Shure Comments at 8.

[8] *See* PAMA Comments at 8.

[9] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments at 35-36.

[10] Qualcomm Comments at 3.

[11] Cox Comments at 5.

with Sirius and XM products.[12] As a result of the heightened enforcement concerns personal/portable devices pose, they should not be introduced until there is concrete evidence that they will not cause harmful interference to existing services.

Furthermore, as will be discussed in more detail in Section II below, there is currently no reliable and effective method of preventing personal/portable devices from operating within the protected contour of a co- or adjacent channel DTV station, which has been shown to be required by the technical measurements submitted by MSTV/NAB and NAF. Therefore, until these technical uncertainties are addressed and proposed technical solutions are extensively and thoroughly tested and proven effective, personal/portable devices should not be permitted.

In addition to the technical uncertainties of personal/portable devices, these devices also lack a nexus to the Commission's broadband policies. One of the main goals of this proceeding has been to provide new broadband services, especially to rural and underserved areas of the United States.[13] MSTV and NAB fully support this goal, but agree with other commenting parties that it is the introduction of fixed devices, rather than personal/portable TV band devices, that furthers this goal.[14] Indeed, the interference caused by uncontrolled personal/portable devices may inhibit the deployment of fixed broadband operations. Simply

---

[12] It was discovered that FM transmitters designed for use with XM and Sirius radios did not comply with Commission regulations. A study conducted by NAB found that of the 17 devices tested, 13 exceeded the field strength ceilings for operation of unlicensed devices under the Commission's Part 15 rules. Both XM and Sirius eventually admitted that these devices were noncompliant, and the Commission ordered the manufacturers to cease producing such devices. *See Report on Part 15 FM Modulator Device*, June 2, 2006, *available at* http://www.nab.org/xert/scitech/rd062606.htm (last visited March 2, 2007). It should be noted that the interference potential of TV band devices even at powers substantially below that proposed by the Commission is far greater than these non-compliant unlicensed FM devices.

[13] *See Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands*, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, ET Docket No. 04-186, FCC 06-156 (rel. Oct. 18, 2006) (First R&O and FNPRM) at ¶ 2.

[14] *See* Comments of RoadStar Internet, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (RoadStar Comments); Cox Comments at 4; WISPA Comments.

stated, allowing personal/portable devices in the TV band will be counterproductive to the goal of promoting rural broadband, as pointed out by a number of the commenting parties below. By authorizing only fixed TV band devices to operate, accompanied by proper protections, the commission can promote a broadband plan without endangering television reception.

Indeed, even the most vocal proponents of allowing TV band devices to operate in the broadcast band ground their position in the superior propagation characteristics of this spectrum.[15] While favorable propagation characteristics may be a justification for authorizing *fixed* devices used to provide rural broadband services, most personal/portable devices have no need for the greater coverage. In fact, frequencies above 1 GHz will be more efficient for personal/portable devices since they allow for greater frequency reuse. The Wireless Internet Service Providers Association ("WISPA"), a clear advocate of using TV band devices to provide broadband services, agrees that personal/portable devices "would be best left to the higher frequency bands."[16] Roadstar Internet, another unlicensed advocate, supports this view.[17] WISPA, along with Roadstar Internet, note that while this spectrum is conducive to broadband access services, the superior propagation characteristics are unnecessary for personal/portable devices and can actually be problematic because having devices operate on an indoor basis under these conditions greatly increases the risk of interference.[18] Thus, the policy rationale for

[15] *See* Comments of Dell Inc., Google, Inc., The Hewlett-Packard Company, Intel Corp., Microsoft Corp., and Philips Electronics North America Corp., ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Device Coalition Comments) at 2. ("for the first time, the public will have access to broadband-capable unlicensed spectrum below 900 MHz, and industry will be able to offer consumers a range of new products and services that take advantage of the superior propagation characteristics of this spectrum"); Technical Comments of the New America Foundation, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (NAF Technical Comments) at 29 ("due to their low frequency, these channels would be of great value in rural areas where long-distance propagation is key).

[16] WISPA Comments.

[17] *See* RoadStar Comments.

[18] *See* WISPA Comments; RoadStar Comments.

allowing TV band devices to operate in the television spectrum is lacking with respect to personal/portable devices.

In sum, personal/portable devices pose a serious interference concern and commenters advocating for their use have failed to detail an effective means of preventing this interference. As these devices are technologically problematic, and fail to advance the goal of providing broadband services to underserved areas, the Commission should not allow personal/portable TV band devices in the broadcast band at this time.

II. AS THE RECORD SUPPORTS, CERTAIN BASELINE PROTECTIONS MUST BE ADOPTED BEFORE ANY TV BAND DEVICES ARE ALLOWED TO OPERATE IN THE BROADCAST SPECTRUM.

In order to protect existing television operations in the band, the Commission must adopt a series of baseline protections, which the record clearly supports. The vast majority of parties, including even the most vocal TV band device proponents, Dell, Google, et al. ("the Device Coalition"), have acknowledged that adequate interference protection to existing services is a necessity.[19] In order to satisfy this requirement, the Commission must establish proper desired to undesired ("D/U") ratios, prohibit operation within the contour of co- and adjacent channel DTV stations, and implement new, stricter out-of-band emission limits.

At the outset, it should be noted that IEEE 802.22 has developed a proposal for the operation of fixed devices in the broadcast spectrum, accompanied by proper technical limitations.[20] MSTV and NAB support IEEE 802.22's efforts and urge the Commission to adopt rules consistent with this proposal. This includes a prohibition on devices operating within the contour of both co- and first adjacent channels achieved through a geolocation/database component and a professional installation approach, along with other technical parameters such

[19] *See* Device Coalition Comments at 2.

[20] *See* IEEE 802 Comments.

as, Transmitter Power Control (TPC) designed to minimize the potential interference to licensed operation.[21] As IEEE 802.22 found, it will also be necessary for the Commission to establish appropriate out-of-band emission limits, because the Part 15.209 limits are not effective in this context.

A. Protection of DTV Operations Should Be Based On Proper D/U Ratios.

In order to properly safeguard DTV operations, the Commission must determine the maximum signal level at which a TV band device can operate without degrading consumers' abilities to receive over-the-air television signals. The record fully supports this position, as the majority of commenting parties have assumed that the Commission will implement D/U ratios to protect viewers from interference when they receive a weak but acceptable DTV signal.[22] The record also supports protecting all TV viewers within a TV station's protected contour and using Threshold of Visibility ("TOV") at the contour as the method of determining acceptable DTV service levels. NAF, for example, in its "technical comments," notes the Commission's historical protection of TV stations up to the grade B contour and proposes that "the protection from TV band devices similarly be at the grade B contour (perhaps with an additional few kilometers of exempt broadcasting space added to ensure that harmful interference is even more unlikely), but is open to reasonable alternatives from the broadcast community."[23] Also, the Device Coalition urges the Commission to use TOV and states that "the Commission has already

[21] *See Id.* at 6-9.

[22] *See* Comments of National Cable and Telecommunications Association, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (NCTA Comments) at Appendix A; Device Coalition Comments at 15 ("The Coalition plans to utilize TPC combined with over-the-air sensing to achieve Commission-mandated adjacent channel D/U (desired to undesired) signal ratios").

[23] NAF Technical Comments at 13.

determined that existing DTV receivers are able to provide service until the signal falls below -84 dBm (TOV) for UHF signals, and slightly higher for VHF."[24]

The Commission, in its initial White Spaces *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* ("NPRM"), proposed the following D/U ratios, which MSTV and NAB continue to believe are appropriate to protect DTV receivers from co- and adjacent channel interference: +23 dB for co-channel, -28dB for the lower first adjacent and -26 dB for the upper first adjacent.[25] The following table includes the results of NAF's University of Kansas study[26] and the study of Communication Research Centre Canada ("CRC") for MSTV.[27]

Channel	Receiver Tested	NAF/KU Measured D/U Ratios	MSTV/CRC Measured D/U Ratios
Co-channel	Receiver 1	+21	--
	Receiver 2	+19	--
	Receiver 3	+19	--
Upper Adjacent	Receiver 1	-31	-28.0
	Receiver 2	-35	-37.0
	Receiver 3	-29	-37.0
	Receiver 4	--	-40.0
	Receiver 5	--	-38.0
Lower Adjacent	Receiver 1	-21	-35.8
	Receiver 2	-29	-32.3
	Receiver 3	-29	-36.8
	Receiver 4	--	-40.3
	Receiver 5	--	-38.8

All of the test data shows variation from receiver to receiver that needs to be taken into account. The co-channel values measured by NAF/Kansas were within a few dB of

[24] Device Coalition Comments at 6.

[25] These values are generally the D/U ratios that are used for licensed DTV-to-DTV protection. *See Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd. 10018 ¶¶30-31 (2004) (Initial White Spaces NPRM).

[26] *See* Comments of New America Foundation- University of Kansas Interference Study, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (NAF Kansas Study) at A.11.

[27] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments at Exhibit B, Table 20.

the +23 dB value proposed by the Commission.[28] In addition, the adjacent channel data was also generally in line with the original proposals of -26 dB for upper adjacent and -28 dB for lower adjacent. The worst performance data on the upper adjacent channel was receiver 1 (-28 dB) from the CRC measurements, and the worst performance on the lower adjacent was receiver 1 (-21 dB) from the Kansas study. MSTV and NAB, therefore, believe that the above measured test data fully supports the Commission's originally proposed D/U ratios. Each study found that the D/U signal ratio should be at least as protective as proposed by the Commission, which is the approach generally used for DTV-to-DTV protection in the Commission's rules.[29]

In developing final D/U ratios, MSTV and NAB also urge further study by the Commission to determine appropriate D/U requirements when factoring in the effects of multiple interfering signals on DTV reception. While exhaustive testing has not been conducted, the CRC measurements taken show decreased performance of DTV receivers in the presence of multiple interfering signals from TV band devices. These measurements suggest that multiple interfering signals can significantly reduce the D/U ratios measured (*i.e.*, the undesired signal will cause visible interference at a lower signal level) when compared to a single interfering signal. The worst case scenario appears to occur when the interfering signals are N+x and N+2x (for example, a TV receiver tested on a desired TV channel 35 with a single interfering signal on channel 37 (x = 2) compared to the same test conducted with two interfering signals on channels 37 and 39).[30] In this case, the CRC measurements showed a degradation of the desired signal by

[28] The Kansas data was taken at TOV + 3dB. At TOV, it can be expected that the presence of additional noise would result in a further reduction in the level measured, bringing the above values further in-line with the Commission's proposal and consistent with the approach taken for DTV-to-DTV protection in the Commission's rules.

[29] *See* 47 CFR §73.623.

[30] That is, where "N" is the desired TV channel and "x" is equal to ± 1,2,3, etc.

more than 30 dB for some receivers.[31] Consequently, any Commission requirements must incorporate standards aimed at preventing multiple signals from harmfully interfering with consumers' over-the-air television reception.

B. Sensing Alone Will Be Ineffective To Prevent Interference; Thus Proper Techniques, Including A Geolocation Method, Must Be Implemented To Prevent TV Band Devices From Operating On A Co-Channel Within A TV Station's Protected Contour.

1. Current Sensing Proposals Fail To Protect Existing Services.

As many commenting parties document, the current sensing and detection threshold proposals are inadequate to prevent TV band devices from operating within the protected contour of a co-channel TV station, even though such operation will cause interference for miles.[32] The Commission accordingly cannot rely on sensing alone to protect the public's over-the-air television service from harmful interference.

GE Healthcare, for example, explains that "there are a number of scenarios in which [sensing] technology will fail to detect an occupied channel."[33] The Community Broadcasters Association ("CBA") points out that "the use of a signal sensing system is unworkable because television signal propagation is uneven and the receiving antenna in the signal sensing system is inefficient."[34] Similarly, NCTA states that "the variability of signal transmission, combined with the sometimes-extreme measures taken by cable operators to receive adequate signals, make signal sensing a poor technology for determining available

---

[31] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments at Exhibit B.

[32] *See* Comments of Community Broadcasters Association, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (CBA Comments); Comments of GE Healthcare, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (GE Healthcare Comments); Comments of Motorola, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Motorola Comments); Media General Comments; NCTA Comments; PAMA Comments; Qualcomm Comments.

[33] GE Healthcare Comments at 6.

[34] CBA Comments at 5.

spectrum for unlicensed device transmission."[35] Motorola, a leader in software-defined radio technology, correctly concludes that spectrum sensing, while promising, is not currently sufficiently robust for use as an exclusive means of recognizing and avoiding interference with protected incumbents in the TV band.[36] As IEEE 802.22 found, while sensing provides some added protection, implementing "sensing alone is insufficient to adequately and completely assure the required level of interference protection for licensed services," and must be accompanied by a geolocation approach.[37]

Parties advocating for the Commission to adopt sensing as the exclusive means of preventing interference, namely the Device Coalition and NAF, have ignored the technical problems associated with sensing in the television band.[38] First, they erroneously assume that because sensing is deployed in the UNII 5 GHz unlicensed band, the same technology will prevent TV band devices from unlawfully operating on co-channel or adjacent-channel television frequencies. Then, they assume that the only TV interference concern is TV reception in the same dwelling or in very close proximity to the TV band device.[39] However, a TV band device will transmit an interfering signal which will travel for many miles. As noted earlier, to prevent co-channel interference, a D/U ratio of +23 dB is needed. Therefore, to protect TV operations to

---

[35] NCTA Comments at 20.

[36] *See* Motorola Comments at 18.

[37] IEEE 802 Comments at 6.

[38] *See* Anant Sahai, Niels Hoven, et al., *Fundamental Tradeoffs In Robust Spectrum Sensing For Opportunistic Frequency Reuse*, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the University of California, Berkeley, *available at* http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~sahai/Papers/CognitiveTechReport06.pdf (last visited March 2, 2007).

[39] The Device Coalition, for example, claims that its proposed sensing or detection threshold of -114 dBm is 30 dB below -84 dBm, the TOV of a DTV receiver, and therefore "provides sufficient margin." In its "Example 2," the Device Coalition appears to believe that the only concern is protection to a DTV receiver co-located with a TV band device and suggests that because the received DTV signal in its example is at -105 dBm and below TOV, the TV band device would not transmit "even though it would cause no harmful interference even if it did transmit." *See* Device Coalition Comments at 6-7.

the agreed level of -84 dBm, the interfering signal must not exceed a value of -107 dBm not -84 dBm, as suggested by the Device Coalition.[40] Consequently, any interference protection method must ensure that a device, when transmitting at maximum power, is beyond the interference distance and thus a sufficient distance away from all TV viewers on both the co-channel and adjacent-channels to the television signal so as to not cause interference. While there is a consensus that TV band devices must operate outside of the protected contour of a co-channel TV station,[41] there is no such agreement on the detection threshold value necessary to ensure that this occurs or that the requisite "keep-out" distance is met.[42] MSTV and NAB submit that all of the currently proposed sensing levels will fail to protect existing services in the band. Co-channel interference distances, from even a 100 mW TV band device, are substantial and sensing will be unable to reliably ensure that harmful interference will not be caused to *all* DTV receivers and other licensed operations over these large distances. Notably, the Device Coalition has proposed a sensing detection level of -114 dBm despite the fact that Intel, a member of the Device Coalition , has previously stated that a -118 dBm sensing level is necessary.[43] MSTV, in its initial comments, and in a paper attached to this filing, has already explained why even Intel's

---

[40] 100 mW is equal to +20 dBm. The propagation loss to go from +20 dBm to -107 dBm is 127 dB. The equation for free space propagation loss is: $L_{dB} = 32.44 + 20 \log f_{MHz} + 20 \log D_{km.}$ Assuming frequency (*f*) is 600 MHz, solving for D yields an interference distance of 89 kilometers for a co-channel 100 mW device. While the above free space calculation provides an indication of the extent and seriousness of the potential interference from a 100 mW device, free space is not appropriate for such large distances. Regardless of how it is calculated, the distances will be significant. Using the FCC's F(50,10) curves for interference contours, the interference distance from a 100 mW device is a more realistic 19 kilometers. One could also limit the interference distance to the radio horizon of a TV outdoor antenna at 30 feet which is about 15 km. In any case, the interfering distances of even a 100 mW device are quite substantial and are certainly not limited to situations where TV band devices are co-located or nearby TV receivers.

[41] *See* Comments of Intel Corp, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Nov. 30, 2004) (2004 Intel Comments) at App. A; MSTV/NAB Comments at Exhibit A p.8-10; IEEE 802 Comments at 8.

[42] The Commission has proposed a sensing level of -116 dBm. *See* First R&O and FNPRM at App B, §15.707(f). The Device Coalition proposes that the detection threshold of the TV band device be set at -114 dBm (30 dB below the -84 dBm TOV level) and incorrectly asserts that this level is sufficient to protect TV viewers. *See* Device Coalition Comments at 4.

[43] *See* 2004 Intel Comments at App A.

-118 dBm level is insufficient.[44] In any event, the examples the Device Coalition utilizes to support its proposed level are flawed; they fail to account for important differences in antenna height between outdoor TV antennas and TV band devices,[45] disregard real world propagation and building attenuation, and most importantly ignore the potential interference distance of a TV band device over which protection is actually required.[46]

While NAF is a strong proponent of utilizing sensing as a means of preventing interference, the "Working Paper" it submitted into the record in support of spectrum sensing and DFS actually provides further evidence that sensing will *not* protect television viewers. [47]

---

[44] *See* Exhibit A: Bruce Franca & Victor Tawil, *Why Unlicensed Use Of Vacant TV Spectrum Will Cause Interference To DTV Viewers*; MSTV/NAB Comments at 10.

[45] In its "Example 1," the Device Coalition assumes a DTV signal with 6 dB gain outdoor antenna is -90 dBm. Assuming the building DTV signal attenuation loss at the TV band device is 15 dB and the TV band device employs a 0 dB gain antenna, the received signal at the unlicensed device will be -105 dBm. The Device Coalition therefore claims that the -114 dBm threshold will conclude that the channel is occupied with 9 dB to spare. The problem, however, is that typical outdoor TV antennas have gains higher than 6 dB. In fact, the planning factors for the DTV service are based on a 10 dB antenna. This is a 4 dB difference from the value used in the example and therefore the DTV signal level for TOV at the receiver can be 4 dB lower or -94 dBm not the -90 dBm value suggested in the example. In addition, the Device Coalition failed to take into account the fact that an outdoor TV antenna is generally mounted outside, above the roof of the house, while the TV band device will be located at a lower height above ground. The generally accepted model is to use a height of 30 feet for the TV antenna and a height of 6 feet for the unlicensed device. This difference in height means that the TV band device will receive a signal that is 7 dB lower than that of the TV antenna due to differences in antenna height. Therefore, this is an 11 dB error in the Device Coalition example, rather than a purported 9 dB margin, and sensing would have failed. This failure is with a DTV signal that is at TOV, the value that the Device Coalition claims it would protect. This failure is also for the case of only 15 dB of building attenuation when in fact building attenuation can be significantly higher.

[46] In its "Example 2," the Device Coalition postulates that a TV is attached to a 0 dB gain antenna and the received signal level is -105 dBm, a value below TOV, producing no visible picture. The Device Coalition goes on to state that since the TV band device will receive a signal of -105 dBm it will not transmit "even though it would cause no harmful interference even if it did transmit." This statement shows the Device Coalition's complete lack of understanding of the basic interference matters at hand. That is, they assume that because the TV band device in the same house as the TV receiver does not operate that no viewer will lose access to DTV service. However, in order not to cause interference the device must maintain the +23 dB D/U ratio proposed by the FCC at *all* DTV receivers within the protected contour. In other words, the device must protect each DTV receiver to a value of -107 dBm (-84 (TOV) – 23dB (D/U) ratio). As shown above, the interference contour of the 100mW device in the Device Coalition's example can be 15 kilometers or more. So the fact that the device doesn't cause interference to the TV receiver in the same house is irrelevant. The device must not cause interference to *all* TV viewers within 15 kilometers or more. NAF's own measurements show that the field strength of a TV station can vary by over 30 dB for three residences within about a mile of each other. Again, if that kind of "real world" variation is taken into account, sensing would have failed and interference would have be caused to TV viewers, over a very wide area.

[47] *See* Mark A. Sturza & Farzad Ghazvinian, *WhiteSpaces Engineering Study: Can Cognitive Radio Technology Operating In The TV White Spaces Completely Protect Licensed TV Broadcasting?*, New America Foundation Working Paper #16 (January 2007) (NAF Working Paper) (the authors suggest that current sensing techniques

As an initial matter, the results discussed in the "working paper" are based on a sensing level that is far more sensitive than the level NAF has most recently proposed that the Commission adopt to protect television services.[48] Regardless, even the stricter sensing level (-121 dBm) discussed in the "working paper" is not adequate to protect TV viewers.[49] This level fails to account for important antenna height and propagation differences between TV band devices and TV receivers, [50] which have a dramatic impact on the sensing level.[51] In addition, significant propagation variations occur over small distances and these discrepancies can also be quite significant as seen by the measurements presented in the paper.[52] Ignoring momentarily the fact that NAF failed to account for antenna height differences and additional attenuation, their claim that sensing will work is based on a measured margin of 27 dB for locations only 25 miles from the TV transmitter. However, even FCC propagation curves, show a 40 dB difference between signals at 25 miles and at a typical TV station's contour edge.[53] Thus, instead of having a

---

permit an unlicensed device to detect a signal "with over 37 dB additional attenuation compared to rooftop antennas." They suggest that spectral characteristics of the DTV signal can be used to detect the DTV signal "even with a 37 dB attenuation of the DTV signal due to the 'hidden node problem'." Finally, the authors assert that "the probability of building penetration loss exceeding 37 dB is negligible").

[48] *See Id* at 32; NAF Technical Comments at 17 (NAF utilized a sensing level of -121.3 dBm (84.3 dBm -37 dB) in its "working paper." In its Technical comments, however, NAF proposed that a "sensitivity level in the range of -110 to -115 dBm should be adequate to protect TV receivers").

[49] MSTV and NAB do not dispute the fact that technology may exist to allow spectrum sensing at a level that is 37 dB below that receivable by a DTV receiver (although work in IEEE 802.22 suggests otherwise). However, MSTV and NAB strongly disagree that sensing at this level is adequate for protection of DTV reception.

[50] The NAF paper does not provide for the fact that the TV antenna is outside and is typically at a height of 30 feet.

[51] Importantly, NAF fails to acknowledge the 17 dB physical difference in receive systems between a TV band device and an outdoor antenna used for TV reception, or for the building attenuation difference between the signal seen by the TV device and the TV antenna. Therefore the 37 dB difference claimed is much less when these real antenna height and propagation differences are taken into account. In fact, the authors own data confirms that "(t)he average variation across rooms for a given frequency was 19.8 dB."

[52] The authors' measurements show variations on the same channel at the different residences of up to 39 dB with the average difference being almost 30 dB. These variants occurred, despite the fact that the residences were located only about a mile apart.

[53] All of the measurements taken in the paper were for three residences about 25 miles from the TV transmitters. All of the locations had clear line of sight to the TV transmitting antennas with little or no terrain blockage. The authors claim that even taking the "worst case" measurements, detection at -121.3 dBm provided over a 27 dB of margin. Notwithstanding that fundamental error, all of the measurements made by the authors were at 25 miles from the TV

margin of 27 dB, sensing would have failed by more than 13 dB at similar locations closer to the edge of the TV station's protected contour. Accordingly, rather than showing that sensing is workable, a careful analysis of the paper and the data shows that sensing, even at the -121 dBm level described in the paper, will not provide protection to TV viewers.

As MSTV and NAB have previously explained, the proposal to solely utilize spectrum sensing to protect licensed services in the band mistakenly assumes that a predetermined detection threshold level will guarantee that a TV band device will operate sufficiently outside the protected television station's service area, and thus the device will not cause interference.[54] The problem, however, which is evident after a careful analysis of NAF and other sensing proponents' findings, is that signal detection and sensing alone cannot accurately predict location.

2. A Geolocation Method Must Be Implemented In Order To Provide Adequate Protection.

In order to provide sufficient protection for existing services in the television spectrum, the Commission must adopt a geolocation method to ensure that TV band devices do not operate within the protected contour of a co-channel or adjacent-channel station. IEEE 802 has proposed a geolocation/database approach to be implemented in conjunction with the professional installation of fixed devices.[55] This proposal also includes a prohibition on the

---

station transmitters. Propagation losses from a typical TV station from a location at 25 miles to locations at the edge of the protected contour are more than 40 dB based on FCC's F(50,90) curves. Assuming the same variability for houses as measured by the authors means that rather than providing 27 dB of margin, sensing even at the -121.3 dBm level would have failed to protect TV viewers by 13 dB.

[54] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments at 10-15.

[55] *See* IEEE 802 Comments at 21.

operation of indoor devices, as GPS will be ineffective indoors.[56] MSTV and NAB urge the Commission to adopt IEEE 802's geolocation/database proposal.

Adopting a geolocation system, with an accompanying database, is the only way to ensure that all TV band devices operate outside of a TV station's protected contour, as geolocation is the only technology capable of determining the precise location of a device.[57] Unlike sensing, where a weak signal could mean the device is outside of the TV station's contour or that a building is blocking the signal, geolocation determines the geographic coordinates of the device. It will also be important, however, for the Commission to maintain an up to date database of TV stations.

While other parties have submitted interesting suggestions, such as Motorola's set-top box approach,[58] the Commission should not adopt unproven methods, which are unable to provide the necessary protection to existing licensed services. Motorola's proposed approach is based in the notion that personal portable devices could enter the band if they were connected to outlets of a commercial cable TV system, because it may be practical to infer location and TV channel availability from control information provided on the cable TV feed.[59] MSTV and NAB are not opposed to further study of such an approach for this special case of personal portable devices, but as suggested by Motorola, believe that the Commission should proceed cautiously to

---

[56] *Id.* It is important to note that the inability of GPS to effectively prevent interference from TV band devices operating indoors is an important factor indicating that the Commission should not allow personal/portable devices, most of which operate indoors, to operate in the television spectrum at this time. The Device Coalition acknowledges this shortcoming in its comments, noting that while GPS technology could be used with outdoor devices, "indoor GPS receives often are unable to communicate with GPS satellites." Device Coalition Comments at 10.

[57] *See* IEEE 802 Comments at 9 ("we support the use of GPS geolocation as a means of determining the location of (and thereby predicting the service area and interference potential of) fixed base stations").

[58] *See* Motorola Comments at 19-21.

[59] *See Id.* at 23.

ensure interference protection to incumbent and protected facilities.[60] The Commission must also ensure that such special devices are fully tested and, if permitted, fully protect *both* cable television reception and over-the-air reception. In further investigation and testing of this approach, the Commission should also take into account the concerns of the NCTA and ensure that these devices protect the over 130 million analog-only receivers used in U.S. cable households.[61]

C. TV Band Devices Will Also Cause Harmful Interference To Adjacent And Taboo Channels If Allowed To Operate Within the Contour.

1. Operation Within An Adjacent Channel's Contour Must Be Prohibited.

In addition to the Commission's proposed prohibition on TV band devices operating on a co-channel basis,[62] TV band devices must also be kept out of the protected contour of TV stations on first adjacent channels. Despite acknowledging that operation within the protected contour of co-channel must be avoided, some parties incorrectly assume that affording the same protection to the contour of first adjacent channels is unnecessary. But those parties who have studied this issue have reached the opposite conclusion. MSTV and NAB have previously submitted studies concluding that operation of TV band devices within the protected contour of co- and adjacent channels must be avoided.[63] IEEE 802, after extensive analysis, has also found that in addition to the "clear" necessity of forbidding "co-channel operation within the noise limited protected contour of a DTV station,…operation on first adjacent channels within

[60] *See Id.* at 24 ("the FCC should proceed in a cautious manner at this point in time given the nascent state of spectrum sensing techniques and other spectrum access methods that must be refined to ensure interference protection to incumbent and protected facilities").

[61] NCTA Comments at 9-10.

[62] Initial White Spaces NPRM at ¶32.

[63] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments.

the noise limited protected contour of a DTV station is likewise not feasible."[64] Multiple parties in the record, including McGraw-Hill Broadcasting Company, Media General, and Cox Broadcasting, have expressed their agreement with IEEE 802's conclusion that the Commission must prevent operation of TV band devices inside both a television station's co- and adjacent protected contour.[65] Thus, the Commission should accord no weight to parties such as the Device Coalition, who allege that an "outright ban on adjacent channel usage by low power devices is not necessary or advisable" but provide no data to support their position.[66]

Furthermore, even the results of NAF's Kansas study supports a prohibition on operation of TV band devices within the protected contour of a first adjacent channel.[67] In summarizing the test results of one of its receivers, NAF stated that the device would not "cause interference to ATSC A/74 quality standard compliant receivers, nor to the other contemporary receivers tested, if the channel used for the TV signal is avoided and *if the adjacent channel is also avoided.*"[68] NAF's data validates MSTV and NAB's prior submissions contending that to meet the designated D/U ratios and thereby avoid interference to TV viewers, all TV band devices must operate outside the protected contour on *both* co- *and* adjacent channels.[69]

It is also important to note that operation of TV band devices within the protected contour will also cause harmful interference to cable television services. As NCTA has submitted in its comments to the Commission, the analysis shows that TV band devices have the potential "to cause interference to headend reception, and thus their operation should be

---

[64] IEEE 802 Comments at 8.

[65] *See* Comments of McGraw-Hill Broadcasting Company, Inc., ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (McGraw-Hill Comments) at 3; Media General Comments at 2; Cox Broadcasting Comments at 4.

[66] Device Coalition Comments at 15.

[67] *See* NAF Technical Comments at 27.

[68] *Id.* (emphasis added).

[69] *See* Exhibit B, figure 3.

restricted within the Grade B contour and coordinated with headends outside the Grade B boundary."[70] Consequently, the Commission cannot simply assume that viewers deprived of free, over-the-air service will be able to switch to pay, cable television services (nor, of course, would such an assumption be appropriate from a public interest perspective). The only means to preserve access to local television service is to prohibit TV band devices from operating with the protected contours of co-channel and adjacent channel TV stations.

2. Harmful Interference Is Likely From TV Band Devices Operating On Second and Third Adjacent Channels As Well As Image or Oscillator Taboo Channels.

In addition to the co- and adjacent channel prohibitions within the contour, measurements by CRC and the University of Kansas indicate that to maintain the proper D/U ratios needed to prevent interference, restrictions on TV band devices' operations may also be necessary on other channels. For example, measurements show that there is the risk of harmful interference from TV band devices operating on second and third adjacent channels, as well as certain taboo channels and combination of channels. Despite NAF's contentions that TV band devices will cause limited interference in such circumstances, the data from the Kansas study proves that harmful interference will occur. In its technical comments, NAF uses data with a desired signal of -68 dBm. However, both NAF and the Device Coalition agree that broadcast operations should be protected, not to a level of -68 dBm which occurs well inside a TV station's protected contour, but to the protected contour, a level of -84 dBm.[71] But data from the Kansas study's receiver measurements, using a desired signal level close to -84 dBm, shows that interference will be caused on *all* channels measured.[72]

---

[70] NCTA Comments at 6.

[71] In its working paper, NAF correctly uses a TOV value of -84.3 dBm. *See* NAF Working Paper at 32.

[72] *See* Exhibit B, figure A.11.

CRC measurements also suggested that harmful interference will be caused on other channels. These measurements suggest caution with regard to TV band devices operating on channels N+7, N+14, and N+15.[73] As noted by NAF in its technical comments, the received signal level 10 meters away from a TV band device transmitting with 100 mW is -28 dBm. To protect a DTV set receiving a desired signal at -84 dBm, the D/U ratio must be less than -56 dB (-84 dBm-(-28 dBm)). As can be seen from the following table of CRC measurements, two of the five receivers tested (receivers 1 and 3) failed to provide that level of performance on channel N+7 and three of five receivers (receivers 1, 3 and 4) failed to provide that level of performance on channel N +14 and N +15. The results suggest that operation on these channels should not be permitted, at the very least with regard to channels N +14 and N +15, given that interference would be caused to the majority of the DTV receivers tested.

Channel	Receiver Tested	Measured D/U Ratio
N+7	Receiver 1	-42.1
	Receiver 2	-78.6
	Receiver 3	-51.6
	Receiver 4	-72.1
	Receiver 5	-64.6
N+14	Receiver 1	-35.1
	Receiver 2	-60.6
	Receiver 3	-37.1
	Receiver 4	-46.6
	Receiver 5	-55.6
N+15	Receiver 1	-30.6
	Receiver 2	-59.1
	Receiver 3	-34.1
	Receiver 4	-45.6
	Receiver 5	-54.6

[73] NAF's Kansas study measured receiver performance across a number of channels, but it failed to measure on channels N+7 and N+14.

D. The Commission Must Adopt Proper Out-Of-Band Emission Standards.

Unless proper out-of-band emission limits are adopted, existing services in the television band will suffer from significant and harmful interference. MSTV and NAB have submitted two extensive technical studies documenting the problems with the current out-of-band emission standards; these studies conclusively show that devices operating at the §15.209 emission levels will cause interference to TV receivers.[74] MSTV and NAB are not alone in this contention, however, and the record contains ample discussion of the inadequacies of these limits in the television band. IEEE 802, for example, has found that the §15.209 emission limits are not restrictive enough to adequately protect incumbent services.[75] Motorola has consistently submitted studies into the record stating that these limits are insufficient,[76] and in its most recent comments point to the fact that the §15.209 out-of-band emissions limits exceed the current §73.687(e) levels, which are applicable to full power TV transmitters.[77] Even NAF, in its technical comments, admits that the emission limits currently proposed by the Commission "are inadequate."[78]

Those parties advocating for application of the current Part 15.209 limits to TV band devices fail to provide any technical evidence or data to support their position. The Device Coalition, for example, merely states that §15.209 "provides more than adequate out of band emission limits."[79] Other like-minded parties, such as Tropos, while professing that TV

---

[74] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments at Exhibits B & C.

[75] *See* IEEE 802 Comments at 26-27.

[76] *See* Comments of Motorola, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Nov. 30, 2004) (2004 Motorola Comments) at 12 ("Part 15.209(a) emission levels do not provide adequate protection to TV receivers within the protected contour").

[77] *See* Motorola Comments at 11, note 21. Motorola states that low power TV Band devices operating on channel 14 within 100 meters of a land mobile base station would interfere with incumbent land mobile base receivers operating immediately below 470 MHz.

[78] See NAF Technical Comments at 23.

[79] See Device Coalition Comments 29.

operations should be protected, go so far as to suggest that out-of-band emissions should be even higher than §15.209 permits and that TV band devices should be exempt from the §15.209 limits.[80] Once again, this position is not accompanied by any technical discussion of how existing services in the band will be protected in the absence of adequate emission limits. The lack of technical discussion is quite understandable, however, given that no such evidence or data exists.

As MSTV and NAB have previously explained, Part 15.209 emission limits have never been utilized for devices actually operating within the broadcast spectrum itself.[81] It is important to note that currently, the television band is a "restricted band" where no unlicensed operations are permitted. As such, any devices causing out-of-band emissions in the television band operate far from the actual band and typically well below the Part 15.209 limits; accordingly, unwanted emissions at the levels provided in Part 15.209 rarely seep into the television band. But if allowed to operate in the broadcast band, TV band devices will be allowed generate energy on any frequency, even on a nearby channel that is being used for TV transmission and reception.

Even the most rudimentary technical analysis conclusively demonstrates that the Part 15.209 limits are completely inadequate to protect TV viewers. The Part 15.209 emission limit in the UHF TV band is 200 microvolts/meter at a distance of 3 meters (the equivalent of 46 dBu). Accordingly, the out-of-band energy permitted under §15.209 is actually 5 dB higher than the 41 dBu value used to define a TV station's protected contour. This is highly problematic and will certainly cause interference. These unwanted (or out-of-band) emissions from a TV band device can be on a channel that is being used for TV operations. Consequently, rather than

[80] *See* Comments of Tropos Networks, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Tropos Comments) at 13-14.

[81] *See* MSTV/NAB Comments at 24.

being 5 dB higher than the value at the protected contour, such emissions have to be 23 dB lower to avoid interference and meet the Commission's proposed co-channel D/U ratio of +23 dB. This analysis clearly shows that the Part 15.209 limits are inadequate and emissions must be significantly reduced to avoid interference to television viewers.

III. FURTHER TESTING MUST OCCUR BEFORE ANY TV BAND DEVICES ARE ALLOWED TO OPERATE IN THE BAND.

The record presents a clear consensus that further testing is necessary before any TV band devices are permitted to operate within the broadcast spectrum. Testing, not only in the laboratory but also in the field, is critical to ensure that these devices do not cause interference to TV viewers and other licensed low power operations. CTIA - The Wireless Association, for example, urges the Commission to "ensure that the interference protection regime it adopts in this proceeding be based on actual tests and rigorous analyses that conclusively demonstrate that all authorized services are protected."[82] Ion Media similarly states that the Commission must "test fixed TV band devices extensively prior to any introduction to ensure protection to television viewers."[83] Even proponents of allowing TV band devices to operate in the band, such as the Consumer Electronics Association ("CEA") and NAF encourage the Commission to conduct appropriate tests. CEA asserts that the "Commission must engage in rigorous testing to create a sufficient interference protection regime."[84] NAF acknowledges that "the Commission should carefully weigh the benefit of permitting such services and use in such bands, subject to rigorous testing."[85]

---

[82] Comments of CTIA-The Wireless Association, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (CTIA Comments) at 4.

[83] Ion Media Comments at 1.

[84] Comments of the Consumer Electronics Association, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (CEA Comments).

[85] NAF Comments at 5.

It is imperative that the Commission's testing establish effective interference avoidance methods. To this end, the Commission must determine an appropriate minimum distance for TV band devices to operate outside the protected contour. Furthermore, MSTV and NAB, along with IEEE 802 and others, also urge the Commission to establish a uniform testing methodology to evaluate these TV devices using "real world" over-the-air television signals. In order to do this, the Commission must have actual, representative prototype devices, which up to this point are absent from this proceeding.

A. The Commission Should First Determine How Far Away A TV Band Device Must Be Located From A TV Receiver To Not Cause Co-Channel Interference

As already discussed, there is no debate that co-channel TV band devices must operate outside of the protected contour in order to avoid causing interference to existing services. To advance the Commission's testing goal, MSTV and NAB urge the Commission to first determine, either through computation, measurement, or both, the minimum co-channel distance a TV band device should be separated from a TV receiver so as not to cause interference.[86] The co-channel interference distance, also known as the "keep-out" region, is the distance where a TV band device (portable or fixed) operating at maximum power will always be far enough away from every DTV receiver not to cause interference.[87]

In order for the Commission to determine the co-channel interference distance, it must first establish the level of protection required for DTV receivers. As previously noted, the level of protection agreed upon by all parties is the TOV signal level at the protected DTV

[86] See *IEEE 802.22-1/1038r10* document in the November 2006 folder *available at* http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/22/ (last visited March 2, 2007).

[87] The interference distance is the most basic parameter that needs to be determined for sensing.

contour of a television station.[88] After factoring in the D/U ratio previously discussed,[89] in order to protect a DTV receiver from interference by TV band device, the TV band device signal level measured at the input of the DTV receiver terminal has to be less than or equal to -107 dBm[90] (-84 dBm – (+23 dB) = -107 dBm). MSTV and NAB, therefore, urge the Commission to conduct similar calculation and/or laboratory and field trials with any TV band device submitted for testing to determine the co-channel interference potential of these devices and establish an appropriate "keep out" region.

B. The Commission Should Develop A Uniform Test Methodology To Determine The Sensing Threshold Of TV Band Devices.

MSTV and NAB urge the Commission to establish a uniform test methodology, along with evaluation criteria, to determine the sensing threshold of TV band devices. While MSTV and NAB do not support sensing as the primary means of preventing interference to existing services, if it is used as a secondary method, it must be tested. For the past six months, IEEE 802.22 has been working on a test plan to evaluate the various sensing proposals and define a common methodology to determine the sensing threshold for TV band devices.[91] The proposed test plan is intended to simulate the actual performance of a TV band device in the field and lays out the required laboratory tests to determine the sensing level of a particular device.

---

[88] The agreed upon TOV signal level at the edge of the contour is -84 dBm, when measured at the input of the DTV receiver terminal.

[89] The Commission has previously proposed that a TV band device must operate at a signal level that is 23 below the TV signal , i.e., a co-channel D/U ratio of +23 dB, to prevent interference. *See* Initial White Spaces NPRM at ¶¶30-31.

[90] This level is only 9 dB above the proposed sensing threshold level by the Commission. Such a margin is not sufficient to account for propagation variability and the "hidden node" problem.

[91] *See IEEE 802.22-6/0202r02* document in the January 2007 folder *available at* http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/22/ (last visited March 2, 2007).

To that end, it describes in detail the nature and type of tests required, including block diagrams, minimum hardware required for testing and step-by-step test procedures.[92]

MSTV/NAB encourage the Commission to select the proposed IEEE 802.22 test plan, or a similarly crafted one, to determine and verify the sensing threshold of a TV band device. The IEEE 802.22 test plan has the benefit of being currently evaluated by the IEEE 802 wireless technical community and it continues to undergo an extensive peer review.

C. The Device Coalition Is Not Designing A Prototype, As Its Device Does Not Reflect The Operating Characteristics Of A Typical TV Band Device.

While the majority of commenters agree that testing is necessary, the problem still remains that in the four years since the original Notice of Inquiry ("NOI") was issued in this proceeding,[93] not a single party has developed a prototype TV band device sufficient for such testing. More recently, the Office of Engineering and Technology released a Public Notice inviting the submittal of prototype TV Band devices for testing.[94] In response to that notice, the Device Coalition claimed that it would submit such a device, and in an *ex parte* comment submitted in February, it very briefly described this device.[95] The Device Coalition's description of its device suggests that it will not be at all representative of a typical TV band device, despite the Commission's express desire to test the interference characteristics of devices that are likely

[92] For example, the test plan encompasses three different threshold detection tests to determine the sensing level of a TV band device. The first test uses laboratory generated TV and wireless microphone signals. The second test uses field-captured signals, and the third uses the same field-captured signals in the presence of strong incumbent adjacent and taboo TV signals. The measurements are conducted for a probability of detection and false alarm. Comparison between these three tests will yield the desired results.

[93] *In the Matter of Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band*, Notice of Inquiry, 17 FCC Rcd. 25632 (2002).

[94] *See Office of Engineering and Technology Invites Submittal of Prototype TV Band Devices For Testing*, DA 06-2571 (rel. Dec. 21, 2006). The Commission stated that it plans to conduct testing to assess the potential interference from low power devices operating in the TV bands. Such an assessment can not be made if devices are not representative of actual devices that may deployed.

[95] *See Ex Parte* of Dell Inc., Google, Inc., The Hewlett-Packard Company, Intel Corp., Microsoft Corp., and Philips Electronics North America Corp., ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Feb. 5, 2007) (Device Coalition *Ex Parte*).

to actually be placed in the band. Further, the Device Coalition's device even fails to comport with its own proposals with regard to the technical rules and regulations for devices in the TV band.

For example, in response to FCC questions, the Device Coalition states that the device will operate with a bandwidth of 4.5 MHz, thus providing a 1.5 MHz (0.75 MHz +0.75 MHz) "guard band" between adjacent channels.[96] Yet the Device Coalition's own comments provide no recommendation for such a guard band. In fact, in response to further inquiry by OET, the Device Coalition suggests that wider bandwidths, while not in this "prototype," are "under consideration." Similarly, the Device Coalition suggests that its device will employ an external wideband discone antenna of 2 dBi with an omni-direction and vertical polarization pattern. The use of a discone antenna with vertical polarization suggests that the Device Coalition is trying to take advantage of discrimination between the horizontally polarization used by TV and the vertical polarization used by the device. However, such polarization discrimination can not be relied in practice and certainly not for low power TV band devices that can be installed and deployed in any manner whatsoever. Furthermore, in its comments the Device Coalition proposes that the antenna gain be limited to 0 dBi.

Simply put, this so-called "prototype" cannot form a basis upon which to craft rules capable of protecting the public's television service from the *actual* devices intended for the TV band. In light of these and other substantial shortcomings, MSTV and NAB urge the Commission to require that an adequate prototype for testing be developed, and found not to cause harmful interference, before any TV band devices are authorized to operate.

[96] The Device Coalition has also suggested that the out-of-band limits should be at the 15.209 level but there is no indication that the "prototype" device will operate at this level. On the contrary, the use of a narrow band emission and guard bands suggest that the intent is to reduce the out-of-band levels below 15.209.

Furthermore, although its "prototype" will provide more protection to licensed services than proposed for actual devices by the Device Coalition's comments, careful and proper testing will likely show that parameters much stricter than those proposed by the Device Coalition and others are necessary to protect existing licensed services. The Commission should accordingly ensure that any rules it adopts are as restrictive as the parameters determined necessary to operate any "prototype" in a non-interfering manner.

IV. ANY AUTHORIZED TV BAND DEVICES MUST OPERATE ON AN EXCLUSIVELY LICENSED BASIS.

Parties advocating for an unlicensed regime have failed to address the accountability, efficiency, and financial benefits of a licensed regime. Because of these important concerns, MSTV, NAB and many other commenting parties have urged the Commission to authorize TV band devices to operate in the television spectrum on an exclusively licensed basis.[97]

Commenters advocating licensed "white spaces" have identified a variety of benefits associated with a licensed system, and the corresponding problems with unlicensed spectrum. The CBA, for instance, encourages the Commission to license TV band devices allowed to operate so that "incumbent licensees will have some method to identify the sources of any received interference."[98] Cox Broadcasting is concerned that any "decision to place unlicensed devices into the band essentially would be irreversible, and the incentive and ability to innovate in the band would diminish rapidly given that no party can prevent overcrowding."[99]

---

[97] *See* Comments of Brattle Group, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Brattle Group Comments); Comments of KJLA, LLC, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (KJLA Comments); Comments of Entravision Holdings, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Entravision Comments); CBA Comments; Cox Broadcasting Comments; Ion Media Comments; Joint Comments of Broadcasters; McGraw-Hill Comments, Media General Comments; Qualcomm Comments.

[98] CBA Comments at 3.

[99] Cox Comments at 6.

Noting the same technological and innovation concerns, Qualcomm submitted comments additionally addressing the efficiency aspect of a licensed system, explaining that in a licensed system, users "would have powerful incentives to negotiate agreements with potentially affected TV stations, to use the White Space spectrum for its highest and best use."[100]

Also, the Brattle Group has submitted an extensive analysis into the record evaluating the benefits of a licensed "white spaces" approach.[101] The Brattle Group's findings reiterate the basic points MSTV and NAB have already submitted into the record: interference standards will be more effective in a licensed regime, there are better incentives to innovate in a licensed system, and the economic benefits to the public are substantial, among other reasons.[102]

While some parties have advocated for unlicensed use, they ignore the high risk that if TV band devices are allowed to operate on an unlicensed basis, they will devastate the television spectrum. CEA, for example, argues that "unlicensed devices (e.g., 802.11 Wi-Fi devices and cordless phones) have proven to be of significant value to consumers, the global economy, and they reflect efficient spectrum use."[103] This ignores the fact that there are no primary communications services to be protected in the 2.4 GHz band. Further, despite such contentions, the 2.4 GHz band is far from a victory for unlicensed advocates, and in fact supports a licensed approach for the broadcast spectrum. Cordless phones in the 2.4 GHz band have "reap[ed] devastating effects on 802.11b WLANs" because the technologies used are not

---

[100] Qualcomm Comments at 5.

[101] *See* Brattle Group Comments.

[102] *See Id.*

[103] CEA Comments at 2-3. The Device Coalition also points to the 2.4 GHz band as a supposed success story, explaining that it was a "junk band" before the deployment of Wi-Fi but now houses "over one billion devices." *See* Device Coalition Comments at 23.

compatible for minimization of interference.[104] Even unlicensed advocates, such as WISPA and RoadStar, admit that the 2.4 GHz band is an example of the dangers of unlicensed devices.[105] As WISPA notes, "we do NOT wish to see a spectrum issue similar to the current 2.4 GHz WiFI band," where "channel 6 has become all but useless for large-scale, wide area deployments."[106] The Commission should not risk the same result occurring in the television spectrum.

Furthermore, parties advocating for unlicensed devices to operate in the television band ignore important differences in the types of unlicensed devices currently operating and the proposed TV band devices, as well as differences in spectrum designated for unlicensed use. These variations have important effects on the potential for unlicensed devices to cause interference if allowed to operate in the television spectrum. NAF has argued that history supports the success of unlicensed devices, and points to the 2.4 GHz band and Bluetooth and other Wi-Fi devices for support.[107] As Jerry Brito of George Mason University notes in a recent scholarly article, "many unlicensed applications—such as Wi-Fi and Bluetooth—are nonetheless viable because they are by and large deployed in relatively small spaces that are controlled privately by one party."[108] This can minimize any potential interference, but when an "unlicensed (or nonexclusive licensed) use of the band extends beyond a privately controlled domain, the benefits of enforcement are no longer internalized by one party."[109] The proposed TV band devices, on the other hand, have substantial interference distances, up to many kilometers, that are clearly not controlled by a single private party. Thus, these broadband TV

---

[104] *See Interference from Cordless Phones*, Wi-Fi Planet, April 15, 2003, *available at* http://www.wi-fiplanet.com/tutorials/article.php/2191241 (last visited March 2, 2007).

[105] *See WISPA* Comments; RoadStar Comments.

[106] WISPA Comments.

[107] NAF Comments at 18-19; 37-45.

[108] Jerry Brito, *The Spectrum Commons in Theory and Practice*, 2007 Stan. Tech. L. Rev. 1 (2007) at ¶83.

[109] *Id.*

band devices would be more effectively regulated in a licensed system. As Intel has previously argued to the Commission in the context of the 3650 to 3700 MHz spectrum, "exclusive licensing is the best way to foster long range, wireless broadband deployment."[110]

The Commission should be focused on four main reasons why a licensed system is more beneficial:

First, as discussed above, the accountability of any TV band devices allowed to operate in the broadcast spectrum is a huge concern. A licensed system will better allow the Commission to keep track of all operators and control any interference that might occur. As the Land Mobile Communications Council explains, if TV band "devices are permitted to proliferate on an unlicensed basis, and if the expected interference problems arise, it will be extraordinarily difficult to resolve them as there will be no way to identify and contact the offender."[111]

Second, a licensed system will most efficiently make use of any available "white spaces" that may exist. Incentives are a driving force in any system, and scholars studying spectrum allocations have found, that an unlicensed system is not preferable, because "the costs created by the sender are borne by the users as a whole, but the benefits accrue to the sender," which can created a tragedy of the commons whereby "each individual is tempted to defect, and enough do so that the resource becomes overwhelmed."[112] In a licensed system, however, licensees will have strong incentives to decrease noise levels and the corresponding interference.

Third, a licensed system benefits the economy and American taxpayers more effectively than an unlicensed system. Spectrum is a valuable resource, but in an unlicensed

---

[110] Notice of Ex Parte Presentation of Intel, ET Docket Nos. 04-151 & 02-380 (filed March 3, 2005).

[111] Comments of Land Mobile Communications Council, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Land Mobile Comments) at 8.

[112] Stuart Minor Benjamin, *Spectrum Abundance and the Choice Between Private and Public Control*, 78 NYU L. Rev. 2007 (2003).

system the public is unable to reap any economic benefits. In an article discussing the lack of licensed spectrum for wireless services, the authors found that an unlicensed system for cellular services "deprives consumers--under very modest assumptions-- of tens of billions of dollars annually in lost benefits."[113]

Fourth, the Commission has already dedicated ample spectrum to unlicensed use. In light of the interference and accountability concerns, the possibility that the spectrum will become unusable, and the economic losses in an unlicensed system, the Commission should authorize TV band devices to operate on an exclusively licensed basis.

V. THE COMMISSION MUST PROTECT BROADCASTERS' ABILITIES TO PROVIDE NEW AND INNOVATIVE DTV SERVICES.

As the transition to DTV becomes a reality for broadcasters and its viewers, the Commission must not let the introduction of TV band devices stifle or inhibit the provision of new DTV services and devices. Just as NTSC analog TV operations saw the introduction of color, stereo sound, and closed captioning, DTV has the capability to provide an even richer and more diverse range of new and innovative services for its viewers.

Broadcasters, consumer electronics manufacturers, and associated industries are discussing the development of "backward-compatible" extensions to the current Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC) DTV standard. These extensions, which are actively being pursued in the ATSC standards process, will ensure that viewers with legacy DTV receivers continue to receive the DTV services they now enjoy in addition to portable and mobile reception of DTV broadcast signals by new classes of mobile and handheld devices. In this regard, Samsung and Rohde & Schwarz recently demonstrated their proposed Advanced-VSB

[113] Thomas W. Hazlett, Matthew L. Spitzer, Advanced Wireless Technologies and Public Policy, 79 SCA L. Rev. 595 (2006).

(A-VSB) approach at the January 2007 consumer electronics show.[114] Additionally, just last week Harris announced a competing system proposal, further fuelling development activity in this area.[115]

By using these enhanced DTV signals, services to a number of devices including fixed (conventional DTV receivers), fixed/portable (household devices), mobile (vehicle mounted), and handheld/portable (PDA, cell phone, laptop) will be possible. New products will likely include vehicular receivers, cell phones capable of receiving over-the-air broadcasting, laptop computers with integrated DTV tuners, and new "smart TV receivers" with integrated storage and computing capabilities. In addition to traditional broadcasting, new programming and services could be developed to support these mobile and handheld receivers. This includes:

- Real-time video streams- such as free/advertiser supported, subscription-based, and navigation data for vehicular use.
- Non real-time services- such as data or chip-casting, video-on-demand (VOD), pay-per-view (PPV), and electronic sell-through for delivery of short video clips, news updates, and sports highlights.

To further improve coverage of these new services, the use of multiple low power DTV transmitters, in addition to the main transmitter, are being considered by the Commission.[116]

In summary, DTV offers the ability to provide consumers with exciting new services and products. However, many of these new devices and services, such as mobile and portable operations, may operate with lower signal levels and require additional protection within the DTV station contour. The Commission should not create any rules concerning TV band devices that might compromise the current DTV protections and the promise of these new

---

[114] *CES 2007 Best Buzz Awards* , *available a*t http://www.insightmedia.info/emailblasts/ces2007bestbuzz.htm (last visited March 2, 2007).

[115] *Harris Launches New Mobile DTV Standard for Broadcasters*, *available at* http://www.tvtechnology.com/pages/s.0014/t.1680.html (last visited March 2, 2007).

[116] *See Digital Television Distributed Transmission System Technologies*, Clarification Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 20 FCC Rcd. 17797 (2005).

licensed primary DTV services. TV band devices must therefore provide greater levels of protection than those currently provided for DTV to DTV operations.

VI. THE COMMISSION MUST PROTECT WIRELESS MICROPHONES CURRENTLY OPERATING IN THE BAND.

The same interference concerns plaguing existing television operations in the band are relevant for wireless microphone services currently operating in the broadcast spectrum. The Commission must ensure that any regulations it adopts protects these important operations, as its obligation to protect all incumbents operating in the spectrum includes wireless microphone services.

Wireless microphones play a vital role in the delivery of sports, entertainment, and news to the public. MSTV and NAB agree with the Microphone Interests Coalition description that "wireless microphones are essential for numerous productions and events that define American culture," and thus interference from new devices would harm not only the entertainers but the public as a whole.[117] PAMA explains that "wireless microphones have in fact become so ubiquitous, and the entertainment and information industries now rely so thoroughly on them, that it would be virtually impossible to return to wired microphones."[118] Wireless microphones are used in live performances, by sports teams to communicate with one another on the sidelines, and by news gatherers in the field. These critical uses will be threatened if the Commission does not take special care to protect the wireless microphone services operating within the TV band.

Multiple parties have submitted comments identifying the wireless microphone interests at stake in this proceeding and the need for further testing specifically aimed at

[117] Microphone Interests Coalition Comments at 3.

[118] PAMA Comments at 3.

preventing interference to these services.[119] RTNDA focuses on the role wireless microphones play for news professionals and asks that the Commission "study the real-world effects" of TV band devices on wireless microphones.[120] Both the Recording Artists' Coalition and The Recording Academy have reminded the Commission of its obligation to protect *all* incumbents and urged that the Commission include wireless microphones in its further testing in order to satisfy this obligation.[121]

The technical interference protections discussed above are integral to the protection of wireless microphone services. As Shure has detailed in its comments to the Commission, in order to protect wireless microphones, personal/portable devices should not be allowed to operate, and TV band devices should be prohibited from operating within the protected contour of co- or first adjacent channels.[122] The Commission must also consider any additional protections necessary to protect incumbent wireless microphone services in the band before allowing any TV band devices to operate. Failing to do so will jeopardize important sports, entertainment, and news services.

VII. THE PUBLIC SHOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON ANY FURTHER TESTING OF TV BAND DEVICES.

The Commission has made clear that it will be conducting testing of TV band devices in the coming months,[123] and while this is extremely important, it will only be effective if this testing is publicized and parties have an opportunity to comment. There is overwhelming

---

[119] *See* Comments of Radio-Television News Directors Association, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (RTNDA Comments); Comments of The Recording Academy, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (Recording Academy Comments); Shure Comments; Microphone Interests Coalition Comments; PAMA Comments.

[120] RTNDA Comments.

[121] *See* Comments of Recording Artists' Coalition, ET Docket No. 04-186 (filed Jan. 31, 2007) (RAC Comments); Recording Academy Comments.

[122] *See* Shure Comments at 6-8, 11.

[123] First R&O and FNPRM at ¶15.

support in the record for the idea that any Commission testing should be publicized and confirmed by participating parties. Ion Media encourages the Commission to "allow for verification of its testing so that interested parties can draw reasonable conclusions about the prospects for harm to the public rather than guess about the sufficiency of proposed standards."[124] Likewise, Media General asks that the Commission publicize its test results as soon as possible because "verification of testing will allow interested parties to draw reasonable conclusions about the prospects for harm to the public rather than guess about the sufficiency of proposed standards."[125] Even NAF, in advocating for the introduction of TV band devices asks that the Commission in conducting its testing, "ensure that the process is transparent and open to all stakeholders."[126]

The interference rules developed by the Commission in this proceeding are integral to a successful deployment of TV band devices into the spectrum; without proper rules, existing services in the band will suffer severe and irreparable interference. Yet until the Commission actually receives real-world devices and is able to test those devices, the competing arguments remain largely academic. As the testing of any prototype devices will occur after the formal notice-and-comment period has concluded, in order to give interested parties the requisite opportunity to comment, the Commission must publicize its testing and allow parties to respond. Ensuring such an opportunity is prerequisite to the development of rules that will protect the public's digital television service from debilitating interference.

[124] Ion Media Comments at 2.

[125] Media General Comments at 2.

[126] NAF Comments at 7.

CONCLUSION

The transition to digital television, along with other important existing services in the television band, are at risk if proper protections are not adopted before TV band devices are allowed to operate in the broadcast spectrum. MSTV and NAB urge the Commission to adopt the protections described above before allowing *any* TV band devices to operate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marsha J. MacBride

Marsha J. MacBride
Jane E. Mago
Ann West Bobeck
Lynn Claudy
Kelly Williams
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS
1771 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 429-5430 (tel.)
(202) 775-3526 (fax)

/s/ David L. Donovan

David L. Donovan
Victor Tawil
Bruce Franca
ASSOCIATION FOR MAXIMUM SERVICE TELEVISION, INC.
P.O. Box 9897
4100 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20016
202-966-1956 (tel.)
202-966-9617 (fax)



Jonathan D. Blake
Matthew S. DelNero
Jodi M. Steiger*
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-2401

Its Attorneys

March 2, 2007

* Admitted only in Virginia; not admitted in the District of Columbia, and supervised by principals of the firm.

EXHIBIT A

MSTV
MAXIMUM SERVICE TELEVISION

Harming the DTV Transition

WHY UNLICENSED USE OF VACANT TV SPECTRUM WILL CAUSE INTERFERENCE TO DTV VIEWERS

By Victor Tawil and Bruce Franca

Executive Summary

This paper responds to New America Foundation's (NAF's) July 2006 Issue Brief, entitled, *Why Unlicensed Use of Vacant TV Spectrum Will Not Cause Interference to DTV Viewers*.

Over the next few years, consumers will spend billions of dollars in new digital equipment. Broadcasters have spent billions of dollars converting their operations from analog to more efficient digital operations. The benefits of a successful transition to digital television should not be jeopardized over speculative and unproven unlicensed operation and devices.

The issue is about interference to TV sets and the risk to TV consumers and viewers. The selection of the correct regulatory regime, licensed or unlicensed, is essential to ensure adequate safeguards for protecting TV consumers. The current unlicensed proposal fails to provide this level of safeguard.

The "burden of proof," that the so-called vacant TV spectrum can be used without causing interference to TV viewers, should be on those that want to make use of that spectrum. This approach has been a long-standing cornerstone of spectrum policy. However, to date, the proponents of unlicensed operations have provided little or no technical studies and conducted no laboratory testing. No field studies have been carried out of any unlicensed device designs to show that this technology will protect TV viewers. Moreover, proponents of an unlicensed regime have not demonstrated any effective mechanism for preventing or policing interference. Advocates, such as NAF, merely cite to potential theoretical solutions, with no hard evidence that any of these solutions will work in the real world.

This paper shows that interference to consumers' TV reception from unlicensed devices is a serious concern. Specifically, the paper addresses three types of interference, *out-of band, adjacent and co-channel*, from unlicensed devices:

A. *Out-of-band interference* is interference from energy that is generated by an unlicensed device on channels or frequencies outside the channel actually being used for communications purposes.* This energy can appear as interference or additional noise in a TV receiver on the TV channel being received by the viewer.

This paper shows that the proposed requirements for out-of-band emissions are inadequate and that unlicensed devices complying with these requirements would cause interference to DTV sets at distances up to 78 feet. Out-of-band interference can occur on any channel. Even when the unlicensed device is correctly operating on a so-called unused channel, this out-of-band energy can interfere with other channels that are being used by TV viewers. This interference can go through walls and can have an adverse impact on TV reception to surrounding neighbors.

MSTV has conducted laboratory testing and field studies showing that unlicensed operation at the FCC's proposed *out-of-band* limits will cause interference to TV viewers. NAF asserts *inter alia* that MSTV has not provided sufficient details of its testing. As pointed out in this paper, MSTV has made three detailed technical reports publicly available, including *"step-by-step" instructions* on how to replicate the MSTV video. MSTV's laboratory testing was conducted by the Communications Research Center (CRC) of Canada, a preeminent government communications laboratory, and testing and model validity were confirmed using two different signals to simulate out-of-band emissions. These test results and studies show that the proposed out-of-band limits

* For the purpose of this paper, out-of-band interference includes both out-of-band and spurious emissions from an unlicensed device that results from the modulation process; harmonic and parasitic emissions; and, intermodulation and frequency conversion products.

for unlicensed devices need to be revised to avoid interference to TV reception.

B. *Adjacent channel interference* is interference that occurs when the unlicensed device is operating on a channel next to or adjacent to a channel that is being used for TV reception and the unlicensed device is in proximity to the TV receiver. For example, a viewer watching TV channel 20 could receive adjacent channel interference from an unlicensed device operating on either TV channel 19 or 21.

MSTV provides a technical analysis demonstrating that unlicensed devices operating on adjacent channels could cause harmful interference at distances up to 2500 feet in weak signal reception conditions. Interference areas of 300 to 600 feet around an unlicensed device are very likely. The analysis concludes that adjacent channel use within the TV service area must be avoided.

C. *Co-channel interference* is interference that occurs when unlicensed devices transmit either inadvertently or deliberately on the same channels that are being used for TV reception. This type of unlicensed operation can cause interference to TV viewers over an area of more than 75 square miles.[†]

NAF and others assert that listen-before-talk (LBT) or spectrum-sensing technology that is used for protection of 5 GHz radar systems can be used to avoid co-channel interference. This technology is not sufficient to prevent co-channel interference to consumers' TV receivers. The paper explains that the ability of unlicensed devices to detect 5 GHz radar systems does not translate into the ability of unlicensed devices to protect DTV reception. They are completely different problems.

NAF and others confuse the problem of transmitter detection with the real issue of protecting TV reception from interference. Protecting a 5 GHz radar receiver is far easier technically than protecting DTV reception using LBT and sensing technologies. Some of the factors that make the 5 GHz protection scenarios technically easier and less critical than protecting DTV reception are:

- The radar receiver to be protected is co-located with the radar transmitter whose emissions can be "sensed," making protection of the radar receiver relatively easy and straightforward technically. In contrast, TV receivers are not co-located with the TV transmitter, but rather are located throughout the TV station's service area. For protection of TV viewers, there is no signal that can be sensed to tell an unlicensed device how close it is to a TV receiver or viewer.

- Because the path between the radar receiver/transmitter and the unlicensed device, including any losses, is the same and reciprocal, the selection of an appropriate detection signal level will provide adequate protection to the radar receiver. In other words, protection of the radar under clear or unobstructed path conditions will provide protection for all situations. In contrast, the paths (and losses) from the TV transmitter to TV receivers and the unlicensed device are not the same and are not reciprocal. In addition, the paths (and losses) from the unlicensed device to the TV receivers are also not the same or reciprocal. The detection signal level needed in one situation will not provide adequate protection in other situations. The detection signal level must account for all potential interference conditions and all paths (and all losses) between the TV receivers and the unlicensed device both inside and outside the TV service area.[‡]

- While the radar signal is bursty and non-continuous, the signal level itself is strong, which simplifies detection. In contrast, the signal level required for DTV detection is very weak. For example, NAF suggests a level of -129 dBm which is a level about *four million times weaker* than the -64 dBm level a 5 GHz unlicensed device must detect.

[†] This interference area is based on an Intel analysis for a 100 milliwatt unlicensed device that suggests that the required separation distance is 5 miles outside the service area. See, comments of Intel Corp, in ET-Docket No. 04-186, dated November 30, 2004, at p. 17 and Appendix A.

[‡] The detection signal level must ensure that the unlicensed device is located a sufficient distance outside the TV service area to prevent interference. To do that, all paths both inside and outside the service area must be investigated to make certain that this signal level never occurs at a closer distance.

- Radar systems are robust and can effectively deal with interference. Radars must deal with unwanted reflections from non-targets and active jamming by the enemy. Errors in detection and inadvertent unlicensed operation do not result in significant degradation of the radar system. In fact, for equipment approval purposes, 5 GHz unlicensed devices need only to accurately detect the radar signal 80% of the time. In addition, if one assumes that the detection threshold is directly related to the maximum potential interference distance, the potential interference from an unlicensed device operating at 5 GHz to a radar is only 100 meters. In contrast, TV receivers cannot reject interference from unlicensed devices. Any co-channel unlicensed operation in the TV band caused by errors in detection will result in widespread interference to viewers that can extend for 5 miles or more from the unlicensed device. Detection by the TV band unlicensed device must be correct 100% of the time to avoid harmful interference.

- Antennas for unlicensed devices at 5 GHz are small, efficient and have a uniform performance across the 5 GHz band. In contrast, building a small, efficient and practical antenna to detect "occupied channels" that operates with a uniform performance across the VHF and UHF TV channels is extremely difficult and complex.

The paper also points out several fundamental flaws made by the unlicensed proponents concerning the use of this detection technology as a co-channel protection mechanism. For example, Intel presumes that reception of a weak signal will mean that the unlicensed device is far enough outside the TV station's service area not to cause interference and that weak signals never occur within the service area. However, signal level detection alone cannot accurately predict location. A weak signal level may mean that you are far from the transmitter or it may mean that you are behind an obstruction such as a building or a hill. Under Intel and NAF's detection approach, these localized dead spots[§] become locations where an unlicensed device can transmit and potentially cause interference over a 75 square mile area or more. Finally, in developing its detection threshold, Intel fails to properly take into account building losses, multipath degradation and propagation variability, resulting in a margin that is woefully inadequate and would result in significant harmful interference to DTV viewers.

This paper also makes clear that contrary to NAF's assertions, tremendous progress has been made in IEEE 802.22 towards the development of a standard for fixed access wireless broadband operations in the TV bands that will appropriately protect TV viewers. Primarily designed to meet the important need for broadband services for rural America, this standard is in its final evaluation and testing phase and is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

The paper shows that the FCC's Equipment Authorization Program does not provide sufficient interference and enforcement protections. For example, a recent NAB study of Part 15 devices operating in the FM broadcast band shows widespread non-compliance of Part 15 devices with the FCC rules.[**] Other examples of the lack of compliance and enforcement are also noted.

While NAF's latest document acknowledges the validity of a number of MSTV's interference concerns, NAF continues to cling to the argument that these concerns can be solved by FCC rules and then chastises the Commission for taking time for appropriate technical solutions to be developed. NAF disparagingly states the "FCC's proposed rulemaking is pending but currently inactive." This is clearly not the case. The FCC has recently announced a projected schedule for proceeding on unlicensed operation in the TV broadcast bands that includes important and necessary field and laboratory testing.[††] Good spectrum management like good medical care is premised on "first, do no harm." Developing technical solutions to unlicensed devices using the TV spectrum without

[§] Areas of weak signal strength or " dead spots" commonly occur with the use of radio. For example, many people have experienced this phenomenon from time to time with the use of mobile phones.

[**] See, *A Report to National Association of Broadcasters Regarding Study and Measurements of Part 15 Devices Operating in the FM Broadcast Band*, prepared by Dennis Wallace of Meintel, Sgrignoli, & Wallace, dated June 2, 2006.

[††] See FCC Public Notice, *Office of Engineering and Technology Announces Projected Schedule for proceeding on Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands*, ET Docket No. 04-186, DA 06-1813, released September 11, 2006.

causing interference is a complex problem that needs to be addressed by solid technical analysis, backed by field tests, studies and data. NAF and the unlicensed device proponents have supplied none.

The broadcast industry believes that the expert technical organizations, the FCC and IEEE, should be allowed to do their job in a deliberate and timely fashion. Unfortunately, the legislative proposal now before the Senate authorizes unlicensed devices to be placed into the broadcast band within 270 days, irrespective of whether these problems are resolved. Through legislative fiat, it jumps over the basic scientific and engineering testing necessary to determine which types of devices and services can occupy the TV band without causing interference. Instead, the legislation substitutes "certification" as the primary engineering mechanism to avoid interference. However, without such basic testing, the statutory language that certified unlicensed devices should not interfere with TV reception has very little meaning. As this paper will demonstrate, the interference concerns of the broadcast industry are well founded and need to be adequately addressed to prevent interference to millions of viewers.

MSTV

Association For Maximum Service Television

Harming the DTV Transition

WHY UNLICENSED USE OF VACANT TV SPECTRUM WILL CAUSE INTERFERENCE TO DTV VIEWERS

By Victor Tawil and Bruce Franca*

This paper responds to New America Foundation's (NAF's) July 2006 Issue Brief, entitled, *Why Unlicensed Use of Vacant TV Spectrum Will Not Cause Interference to DTV Viewers*.[1] NAF asserts that its new brief addresses technical arguments raised by opponents of pending legislation in the Senate to include a provision directing the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to adopt rules permitting unlicensed use of "unused" TV spectrum. As made evident in this paper, the NAF paper is devoid of any new technical studies and analysis.

The "burden of proof" that the so-called vacant TV spectrum can be used without causing interference to TV viewers should be on those that want to make use of that spectrum. This approach has been a long-standing cornerstone of spectrum policy. However, to date, the proponents of unlicensed operations have provided little or no technical studies and conducted no laboratory testing. No field studies have been carried out of any unlicensed device designs to show that this technology will protect TV viewers. Moreover, proponents of an unlicensed regime have not demonstrated any effective mechanism for preventing or policing interference. Advocates, such as NAF, merely cite to potential theoretical solutions, with no hard evidence that any of these solutions will work in the real world.

In fact, the latest NAF paper does not dispute or disagree with the interference concerns and issues raised by MSTV and others concerned about interference to their licensed operations.[2] Instead, like its predecessor, this new paper merely infers that there *may* be possible technical solutions to these interference problems and issues raised by MSTV and others that oppose unlicensed use on interference grounds. Whether these solutions are practical or proven does not appear to matter to NAF. More importantly, NAF completely ignores the fact that the proponents of unlicensed use, such as Intel, Dell and Microsoft, have strongly objected in the FCC proceeding to the adoption of the very solutions and safeguards that NAF suggests are necessary to avoid interference.

In this paper, MSTV shows that interference to consumers' TV reception from unlicensed devices is a serious concern. Specifically, the paper addresses three types of interference, out-of-band, adjacent and co-channel, from unlicensed devices.

In Section I, the paper shows that the proposed requirements for out-of-band emissions are inadequate and that unlicensed devices complying with these requirements would cause interference to DTV sets at distances up to 78 feet. Section II provides a technical analysis demonstrating that unlicensed devices operating on adjacent channels could cause harmful interference at distances up to 2500 feet in weak signal reception conditions and that interference areas of 300 to 600 feet around an unlicensed device are very likely. The analysis concludes that adjacent channel use by unlicensed devices within the TV service area must be avoided. Section III provides an analysis of co-channel interference from unlicensed devices and shows that this type of interference can adversely impact TV viewers over an area of more than 75 square miles. The use of spectrum sensing

* Victor Tawil is Senior Vice President of the Association for Maximum Service Television (MSTV). He is a recognized expert in digital television, propagation and spectrum management. Before joining MSTV in 1988, he was with the Federal Communications Commission for fourteen years, specializing in the fields of spectrum management, tropospheric propagation and system engineering. He is a member of the International Union of Radio Scientists (URSI), Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) and the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers (SMPTE). Bruce A. Franca was Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering Technology (OET) before joining MSTV as Vice President for Policy and Technology in February of this year. He is a 34-year veteran of the FCC and has led many of the Commission's new technology efforts, such as the creation of the Personal Communications Service, Direct Broadcast Satellite Service and Digital Television. He also has significant experience with Part 15 operations and led OET's rule making effort to amend the Part 15 spread spectrum rules to permit digital transmissions that enabled the development of popular Wi-Fi systems. Mr. Franca was awarded the Chairman's Special Achievement Award in 1996 for his work on DTV and the FCC Gold Medal for Meritorious Service in 2005.

technology is also addressed. The paper shows that the ability of unlicensed devices to detect 5 GHz radar systems does not translate into the ability of unlicensed devices to protect DTV reception and viewers. The paper points out several fundamental flaws made by the unlicensed proponents concerning the use of spectrum sensing or detection as a co-channel protection mechanism for use in the TV bands.

In Section IV of the paper, MSTV sets forth the significant progress that has been made in IEEE 802.22 to develop a standard for fixed access wireless broadband operations that can provide important broadband services to rural areas and will appropriately protect TV viewers. In Section V, the paper explains, contrary to NAF's assertions, that the FCC's Equipment Authorization Program does not provide sufficient interference and enforcement protections for TV viewers.

Over the next few years, consumers will spend billions of dollars in new digital equipment. Broadcasters also will have spent billions of dollars converting their operations from analog to more efficient digital operations. The benefits of a successful transition to digital television should not be jeopardized over speculative and unproven unlicensed operation and devices.

I. Out-of-Band Interference

Out-of-band interference is interference from energy that is generated by an unlicensed device on channels or frequencies outside the channel actually being used for communications purposes.[3] This energy can appear as interference or additional noise in a TV receiver on the TV channel being received by the viewer.

Out-of-band interference can occur on any channel. Even when the unlicensed device is correctly operating on a so-called unused channel, this out-of-band energy can interfere with other channels that are being used by TV viewers. This interference can go through walls and can have an adverse impact on TV reception to surrounding neighbors.

MSTV has conducted laboratory testing and field studies showing that unlicensed operation at the FCC's proposed *out-of-band* limits will cause interference to TV viewers. These studies show that the proposed requirements for out-of-band emissions are inadequate and that unlicensed devices complying with these requirements would cause interference to DTV sets at distances up to 78 feet.

MSTV also created a video, entitled "Your Neighbor's Static," to show the impact of this type of interference on TV viewers. NAF's latest paper attempts to impugn this video. As shown below, NAF's criticisms are unfounded and are without technical merit.

a. MSTV has fully documented its testing and experiments

NAF claims that MSTV has not provided enough information so that an independent observer could verify its results. This criticism is totally unfounded. A total of three reports on this matter have been publicly made available by MSTV, including "step-by-step" instructions on the MSTV video.[4] These reports fully describe all of the elements necessary to independently reproduce the results of MSTV's video demonstration or laboratory studies.

The Communications Research Center of Canada ("CRC"), one of the most respected laboratories in North America, conducted MSTV's laboratory tests. The CRC tests showed that unlicensed devices, complying with the FCC's proposed out-of-band emission limits, could cause interference to DTV sets at distances up to 78 feet and interference to analog TV sets up to 452 feet. This first CRC report, filed as part of MSTV's initial comments in the FCC's White Space proceeding in November 2004, fully describes the rationale, methodology and the make and model of the hardware used to conduct these interference tests.

A second study and subsequent report by CRC was completed in February 2005. This study confirms MSTV's and CRC's original findings that the proposed FCC limits for out-of-band emissions are not adequate and harmful interference would be caused to TV reception.[5]

The third report was prepared in February 2006 by the consulting firm of Meintel, Sgrignolli & Wallace to further detail the methodology and the hardware used in the MSTV video, and to furnish "step-by-step" instruction of how the video was produced.

Good science is supported by experimentation and data, not unsubstantiated claims. NAF's criticism

of the MSTV video and experimental work ignores the fact that neither NAF nor its "experts" have done any testing or experimental work to support any of their claims.

NAF posits that a "series of tests that would determine the impact of various bandwidths would provide more relevant engineering information to determine appropriate regulations to prevent harmful interference." As shown below, MSTV conducted tests using two different bandwidths and both tests produced similar results that are consistent with the MSTV video. While NAF has criticized MSTV's efforts, NAF has not funded or conducted any tests to provide the information it states is needed for the development of appropriate rules and regulations to prevent harmful interference. Nor have any such tests been conducted by any of the unlicensed proponents.

b. MSTV's video accurately shows out-of-band interference to TV viewers

The MSTV video was created in August 2005 to demonstrate and verify in the field, the previously conducted laboratory tests of harmful interference to TV reception. NAF claims that the MSTV video exaggerates the desensitization problem. The NAF authors, however, do not offer any technical or scientific evidence to substantiate this claim. In fact, NAF acknowledges that desensitization interference is a well-known phenomenon and that consumer-grade TV receivers are more susceptible to this interference than other types of receivers because they are designed to receive signals over a large tuning range and operate with weak signals.

The only laboratory testing to quantify the impact of out-of-band interference and receiver desensitization has been done by CRC. The results of this testing have been confirmed in subsequent laboratory testing and verified in the "real world" demonstration of this interference shown in the MSTV video. Moreover, others have also confirmed that desensitization interference to TV receivers by unlicensed devices is a real problem that needs to be addressed.[6]

c. Signals used in MSTV's tests are appropriate for simulating out-of-band emissions

The NAF authors question the signals used in MSTV's test. They assert that the FCC has not specified a maximum bandwidth for unlicensed devices emitting in the TV band. Also, they claim in all but the most remote areas it is not possible to find contiguous blocks of free spectrum. Accordingly, they argue that the broadband transmission used by CRC is unlikely. Such a claim suggests a lack of understanding of the fundamental mechanism under investigation, i.e., the interference caused to TV reception from out-of-band emissions generated from an unlicensed device.

The availability of contiguous channels has no relevance or significance to the interference mechanism being investigated. An unlicensed device is allowed under the FCC's proposal to generate out-of-band emissions on any frequency or frequencies outside its operating channel at a level of 200 uV/m at 3 meters as measured in any 120 kHz wide band.[7] Therefore, out-of-band emissions can be appropriately simulated as a wide bandwidth or broadband signal that spreads across one or more television channels. In fact, the FCC rules require that such emissions be measured up to the tenth harmonic of the highest frequency of the device or 40 GHz, whichever is higher.[8]

In its first study, CRC simulated out-of-band emissions by use of a 6 MHz OFDM signal. In its second study, out-of-band emissions were simulated using a White Gaussian noise generator with a bandwidth of 30 MHz. The second study reaffirmed the results of the first study and both tests show that signals at the "out-of-band" limit proposed by the FCC will cause interference to TV receivers.

The NAF claims "by assuming unlicensed devices will transmit at maximum allowed power levels over an unrealistically wide range of continuous channels, the interference demonstrated in the video exploited a longstanding loophole in the FCC rules that has never caused a problem using real emitters in the field." What NAF authors fail to mention is that these unlicensed devices have yet to be built and their assertions on how these devices will operate is mere conjecture. The MSTV study was based on and evaluated the "concrete proposal" made by the FCC with regard to out-of-band emission limits. Many of the proposed uses of these devices include broadband operations that include the use of wide bandwidth (6 MHz or more) transmissions. To reduce the out-of-band emissions of such devices requires expensive filtering and additional cost that unlicensed device manufacturers may not want to incur. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that such devices

will operate at out-of-band levels that comply with the FCC rules rather than limit the out-of-band emissions to levels far below what is permitted. While NAF suggests that out-of-band emissions have never been a problem in the past, recently this same situation did occur with regard to licensed services and resulted in interference to public safety users from commercial land mobile operations. Motorola's IDEN system has out-of-band emissions at or close to the FCC limit over a wide range of frequencies -- the very situation that NAF claims does not occur in the field.

d. MSTV's tests clearly show that proposed out-of-band limits need to be revised

NAF attempts to further confuse the out-of-band issue by inferring that the findings in the two CRC reports are inconsistent and confusing to a non-technical audience thus rendering the analysis/or demonstration meaningless.

Contrary to NAF's assertions, the two CRC studies come to exactly the same conclusion. The proposed FCC out-of-band emission limits are inadequate to protect TV receivers from interference. There is nothing confusing or inconsistent with this finding. MSTV and others have shown that the proposed FCC out-of-band emission limits are inadequate and that unlicensed devices operating at this level would cause unacceptable and harmful interference to TV receivers. Moreover, the out-of-band emission problem highlighted by MSTV was independently studied by a working group of the 802 IEEE Wireless Society, (IEEE-802.22). This working group tentatively determined that the FCC out-of-band limits are insufficient to protect DTV receivers by some 33 dB.[9] NAF and its experts have done no testing that contradicts these conclusions and nothing in NAF's new updated paper refutes these facts.

II. Adjacent Channel Interference

Adjacent channel interference is interference that occurs when the unlicensed device is operating on a channel next to or adjacent to a channel that is being used for TV reception and the unlicensed device is in proximity to the TV receiver. For example, a viewer watching TV channel 20 could receive adjacent channel interference from an unlicensed device operating on either TV channel 19 or 21.

In its paper, NAF states that MSTV has recently raised the issue of adjacent channel protection and calculated that a "100 mW unlicensed device can cause interference to adjacent channel DTVs up to 950 meters away**."** NAF does not dispute MSTV's analysis or calculations.[10] In fact, NAF states that "*we agree that interference from devices operating in adjacent channel can exist"* and that the *"FCC needs to establish some rules for adjacent channel protection as it has in many other radio services."*[11]

NAF does not offer or provide any technical solutions other than to argue that this adjacent channel problem is not new and can be remedied with appropriate rules and technology. NAF notes that TV-land mobile sharing has resulted in codified protection criteria (47 CFR 90.307) and states that these criteria can be used to "compute the extra protection which is needed to decrease unlicensed power in channels adjacent to TV channels."

MSTV is pleased that NAF now agrees with MSTV that the FCC needs to establish adequate adjacent channel protection criteria.[12] These protection criteria, however, need to apply to even low power unlicensed devices. As MSTV's analysis shows, unlicensed personal/portable devices operating even at 100 milliwatts can cause interference to DTV viewers hundreds of meters away.

a. First adjacent channels cannot be used by unlicensed devices

MSTV's adjacent channel interference analysis is straightforward. The FCC has established certain DTV co- and adjacent channel protections in its rules.[13] The required adjacent channel protection for DTV operations is specified in Section 73.623 of the FCC rules and has been proposed by the FCC for fixed/access unlicensed devices.[14]

The MSTV analysis uses the same adjacent channel protection proposed by the FCC and looks at the impact of personal/portable devices operating at 100 mW and at 400 mW. Four hundred milliwatts is the proposed maximum output power including antenna gain for personal/portable unlicensed devices. Three signal levels (from moderately strong to weak signal conditions) were considered for DTV reception. A

free space propagation model is assumed for the interfering unlicensed device consistent with the FCC's recommendation to use free space for distances of less than 1 kilometer (km). The results of this analysis are shown below:

Unlicensed Device Power	DTV Signal Strength	Interference to DTV Reception
100 mW	41 dBu	780 meters
	59 dBu	100 meters
	69 dBu	30 meters
400 mW	41 dBu	> 1 km
	59 dBu	200 meters
	69 dBu	60 meters

The analysis clearly shows that the operation of personal/portable devices on the first adjacent channel of a television station must be avoided. Since received signal strength will vary throughout the TV station's service area and will depend on the type of antenna a viewer is using for reception, there is no practical way to predict or avoid this type of interference. Other experts and studies have independently confirmed MSTV's analysis and conclusion that first adjacent channel operations must be avoided.[15]

While NAF did not contradict MSTV's adjacent channel analysis, NAF did seem to imply that MSTV's assumptions that the unlicensed device is transmitting a noise- or DTV-like signal or that the signal would be filling the whole adjacent channel are suspect. NAF is wrong. The entire FCC unlicensed proposal is based on the fact that the unlicensed device will be transmitting a noise-like digital signal similar to a DTV signal so that the DTV signal protections apply. The FCC clearly stated "*(g)iven the expected noise-like character of signals from unlicensed devices, we are proposing to use the same protection criteria that are currently specified in the rules for digital television*" and "*the signals from unlicensed devices can be expected to appear 'noise-like.'*"[16]

MSTV's calculations assume that the DTV-like signal would fill the adjacent channel because that is what is permitted under the FCC's proposed unlicensed rules. In fact, the proposed rules would allow larger than 6 MHz bandwidths to be used. Moreover, the unlicensed proponents have also suggested "filling" the entire 6 MHz channel. For example, Microsoft, in its comments, provides an entire table of data rates that can be supported by an unlicensed device using a 6 MHz channel bandwidth.[17]

The assertions by NAF and others pointing to the fact that land mobile stations now operate at higher power and therefore there will be no interference from lower power unlicensed devices are misleading and technically wrong. There are fundamental technical differences between *licensed* land mobile operations that are licensed and assigned to a specific frequency within a given geographic area, and an *unlicensed* regime that has no control over where or how the unlicensed device operates.

While raising the specter of TV and land mobile sharing, NAF also conveniently does not mention the fact that the FCC rules do not permit any land mobile operation on adjacent channels within the protected contour of a TV station. Section 90.307 of the FCC rules clearly states that a land mobile base station may not be located closer than 90 miles or 145 kilometers from an adjacent channel TV station.[18] This ensures that all land mobile operations are well outside the protected contour of the TV station. Similarly, operation of unlicensed devices on adjacent channels would have to be restricted to areas beyond the protected contour of the TV station in order to avoid interference, as shown in MSTV's analysis above.

b. NAF's previous spectrum availability studies are wrong

As discussed above, NAF now acknowledges that adjacent channel protections are needed.[19] However, the NAF and Freepress spectrum availability assessment, entitled, *Measuring the TV "White Space" Available for Unlicensed Wireless Broadband*, dated November 15, 2005, was premised on full use of the 6 MHz in the adjacent channels.[20] NAF's "experts" now concede that this adjacent channel assumption was wrong. In fact, they even concede that "if the FCC supports MSTV's position that access to channels immediately adjacent to a licensed TV channel in an area will not be permitted", that any use of adjacent channel operation would not be possible.

This means that NAF's previous assertions with regard to spectrum availability are significantly in error and substantially overestimate the amount of spectrum that would be available for unlicensed use. Rather than correct and rectify this egregious mistake in their new paper, NAF and its experts instead continue to mislead the public by citing to this study and by repeating their previous and now admitted erroneous spectrum availability findings. NAF further compounds this error by again citing

to this misleading and incorrect spectrum availability information in another subsequent August 2006 working paper by Pierre de Vries.[21]

III. Co-channel Interference

Co-channel interference is interference that occurs when unlicensed devices transmit either inadvertently or deliberately on the same channels that are being used for TV reception. This type of unlicensed operation can cause interference to TV viewers over an area of more than 75 square miles.

NAF and others assert that listen-before-talk (LBT) or spectrum sensing technology that is used for protection of 5 GHz radar systems can be used to avoid co-channel interference. This paper shows that this technology is not sufficient to prevent co-channel interference to consumers' TV receivers. The paper explains that the ability of unlicensed devices to detect 5 GHz radar systems does not translate into the ability of unlicensed devices to protect DTV reception.

a. Spectrum sensing for 5 GHz radar does not translate to protection of TV viewers

NAF asserts that detecting television signals is much easier technically than detecting a radar signal. It points to the fact that radar signals transmit in bursts and rotate while DTV signals transmit continuously in a well-defined format and on known frequencies.[22] NAF has performed the classic misdirection on the public and policy makers. The issue is not detection of either the radar signal or the TV signal. The issue is **protection** of receivers used by licensed services from interference by unlicensed devices.

The ability to detect radar at 5 GHz does not translate to protection of DTV reception. MSTV has not disputed that radar signals at 5 GHz are hard to detect. MSTV's position is that detection of a radar signal and the protection of TV reception are technically different problems. In this section, we will first address NAF's criticisms of MSTV's statements. We will then explain, from a technical perspective, why using sensing technology for protection of 5 GHz military radar is different (and easier) and why this approach will not adequately protect DTV reception.

b. MSTV's statements with regard to 5 GHz detection are valid

MSTV's statement that 5 GHz unlicensed devices are "only required to detect a strong radar signal" is valid**.** NAF provides no technical information to dispute MSTV's statement. The only statement NAF makes is to claim that "compared to a military radar, TV is a bullhorn on a stick" and therefore easy to detect and avoid. MSTV has not found any measurement information relating to "bullhorns on sticks" in any scientific literature. We rely on the more common engineering practice of analyzing received power and signal strength. Both of which strongly support MSTV's statement that the levels required for 5 GHz detection correspond to strong radar signal levels.

The FCC measurement procedures for 5 GHz unlicensed devices stipulate a signal detection threshold of -62 to -64 dBm, depending on the output power of the unlicensed device.[23] This signal detection threshold is equivalent to receiving a very strong signal level, especially when compared to the detection level required for protection of DTV reception.[24] In fact, NAF alludes to a detection threshold of -129 dBm for DTV reception.[25] The difference in detection threshold for 5 GHz radar and DTV is 66 dB![26] This means that the radar signal detection level is ***four million times stronger*** than the TV signal detection level! MSTV believes that this simple technical fact supports our statement that 5 GHz unlicensed devices are "only required to detect a strong radar signal" and why NAF provides no technical information to dispute this fact.

MSTV's statement that 5 GHz unlicensed devices are only required to detect the radar signal 80% of the time is also valid. NAF admits that the 5 GHz unlicensed measurement procedures require only 80% of the radar test signals to be detected but suggests because these devices are tested over a few seconds this translates to "near certain detection."[27] NAF provides no measurements or technical analysis to validate this statement. On the contrary, we see nothing in the extensive analysis and testing that was undertaken by NTIA, DoD and the FCC with regard to sharing at 5 GHz to indicate that the final adopted measurement procedures were not intended to fully and accurately measure the actual performance of the unlicensed device. There is no evidence presented to suggest that an unlicensed device that is tested and found to successfully detect a certain signal 80% of the time will suddenly perform at a much

higher level when presented with those same signal conditions in the field.

Conversely, MSTV does not dispute that 80% detection is adequate to *fully protect* 5 GHz radar systems. MSTV notes that military radar systems employ robust and sophisticated technology to reject interference and active jamming by the enemy. Unlike military radar, however, TV receivers are not made to reject interference. Detection by unlicensed devices operating in the TV band must be accurate 100% of the time to avoid interference and protect TV viewers.

MSTV's statement that no studies have been conducted showing that sensing technology can protect DTV reception is also true. In response to MSTV's comment that "(a)fter over two years, no 'sensing' technology studies or proof have been submitted to the FCC showing that 'feature detector' or other technology can reliably detect TV signals even at these levels," NAF's only cite is a single reply comment from the Shared Spectrum Company ("Shared Spectrum"), a developer of "sensing technology."[28] Further, NAF fails to note that even in this document Shared Spectrum stated that measurements in "high RF noise locations" ,such as a typical office environment, presented problems. Shared Spectrum stated that to operate in this environment further testing needed to be done.[29]

c. Protection of 5 GHz radar and DTV reception are very different technical problems

To begin, it is important to remember that interference is caused to the receiver, either the radar receiver or a consumer's DTV set, and it is the receiver for which protection is required. In this section, we will show that protection of 5 GHz radar is a technically easier problem than protecting DTV reception; that harmful interference to radar operation from unlicensed devices is unlikely; and, that very small sensitive receiving antennas are practical at 5 GHz but not across the TV band.

1) Radar Transmitter and Receiver are Co-located and the Path Losses between Radar Receiver/Transmitter and Unlicensed Device are Reciprocal

Let's examine the 5 GHz radar situation. The 5 GHz radar system operates at very much higher power levels than the potentially interfering unlicensed device and, even more importantly, **the radar receiver is co-located with the radar transmitter.** This means that the propagation path between radar and the unlicensed device and the radar receiver is the same as the propagation path between the unlicensed device and the radar receiver. See Figure 1:



Figure 1. 5 GHz Unobstructed Path

This also means that any obstructions between the unlicensed device and the radar system will effect both the radar transmitter and the unlicensed device equally. So, if the unlicensed device cannot "hear" the radar because there is a hill or terrain blockage or even a person's body in the way, then the radar receiver cannot receive interference from the unlicensed device, because the unlicensed device's signal will also be blocked by the same obstruction. Figure 2 illustrates this point.



Figure 2. 5 GHz Obstructed Path

In other words, the losses from the radar transmitter to the unlicensed device and from the unlicensed device to the radar receiver are the same. Any obstruction that effects one side of the path will effect the other path to the same extent.

NAF's assertions to the contrary, this is a much easier interference problem to solve than the non-equivalent and unknown path situation involved in protection of DTV reception.

2) *For TV Reception Case, Paths are Non-reciprocal and Unknown - A Different and Harder Protection Problem*

In the case of TV reception, the TV transmitter and TV receivers are not co-located. There is no signal available to "sense" the location of the TV receiver. TV sets and unlicensed devices can be located anywhere in the service area. There is also no way of knowing what is the actual signal level being received at any TV receiver.

For example, in Figure 3, TV viewer 1 may be 30 miles away from the transmitter and using an outdoor antenna, while TV viewer 2 may also be 30 miles away but using an indoor antenna so that the signal level received by TV viewer 2 is less than received by TV viewer 1 even though they are at the same distance. Moreover, there are different propagation paths between the TV transmitter and each of the TV receivers, as well as between the unlicensed transmitter and the same TV receivers.



Figure 3. Unobstructed TV and Unlicensed Device Paths

Taking into account path obstructions further complicates protection of TV reception and viewers. Figure 4 provides a simple illustration, where the signal path from the TV transmitter to the unlicensed device and TV viewer 2 is obstructed and all other paths are unaffected. In this case, the signal level received by the unlicensed device and TV viewer 2 is reduced due to signal losses from buildings or other obstructions. The unlicensed device therefore "senses" it is much further away from the TV transmitter and, therefore, the channel is vacant or available and it can transmit. However, because the unlicensed device is actually within or close to the TV service area, the unlicensed device will cause interference to TV reception. In addition, the obstruction also reduces the strength of the TV signal received by TV viewer 2 making the TV signal much more vulnerable to harmful interference.



Figure 4. TV Signal Obstructed Paths

This simple case illustrates why protecting TV reception is much more difficult than the 5 GHz radar situation. In the 5 GHz radar case, the radar receiver and transmitter are co-located. "Sensing" the radar transmitter signal identifies the location of the radar receiver. In addition, there is a single path between the radar and the unlicensed device that is the same in either direction.[30] In the case of DTV protection, there is no signal to "sense" the location of the TV receiver. In addition, there are multiple paths from the TV transmitter to TV receivers; there are multiple and different paths from the unlicensed device to the TV receivers; and path obstructions can affect any path differently.

Finally, in the event that the unlicensed device initially "fails to detect" the radar signal and moves closer to the radar system becoming more of an interference threat, the radar signal level received by the unlicensed device will become stronger thereby increasing the probability of detection and the likelihood for the unlicensed device to automatically shut off. In contrast, this safeguard is not present in the protection of DTV reception. Because the DTV receiver is not co-located with the TV transmitter, moving the unlicensed device closer to the DTV receiver does not increase the probability of detection but rather makes it merely more likely that interference will occur!

3) *Harmful Interference to 5 GHz Radar Operations is Unlikely*

In contrast to TV receivers, radar systems are designed to reject interfering and unwanted signals. Radar systems must deal with unwanted reflections of radar transmissions from non-targets. Military systems must also deal with active jamming by the enemy. The impact on 5 GHz military radar systems by a few unlicensed transmitters operating unintentionally is negligible. In fact, Wi-Fi systems are already operating and co-existing on a portion of the spectrum used by 5 GHz military radar systems.[31] The new FCC requirements also permit these devices to continue to operate indefinitely and allow manufacturers to continue to market previously approved devices without spectrum sensing or DFS capability until July of 2007.

The FCC measurement procedures specify a detection threshold value of either -64 or -62 dBm depending on the device's transmitter power. If one views the detection threshold as defining the radar "service area," then one can conversely use this value to determine how far away the unlicensed device should be from the edge of this service area. Let's assume a 5 GHz unlicensed device operating at 200 milliwatts or 23 dBm, and determine the maximum received power at a distance of 100 meters. To determine the received power, one needs to compute the free space path loss value at a distance of 100 meters and subtract that value from the transmitted power of 23 dBm. The equation for free space path loss is:

$$L_{dB} = 32.44 + 20 \log D + 20 \log f,$$

where

D is in kilometers and f is in megahertz.

For a distance D of 100 meters and a frequency of 5.5 GHz, the resulting path loss is 87 dB. Therefore, the signal strength received at 100 meters would be 23 dBm minus 87 dB or -64 dBm -- the same threshold level required for "sensitive" radar detection.[32] This means that the unlicensed device must be located at least 100 meters beyond the radar's "service area" to avoid interference. If the 5 GHz unlicensed device inadvertently operates at or slightly inside the service area, the radar interference area is at most a 100 meter radius around the unlicensed device.

On the other hand, the impact on TV reception of an unlicensed device inadvertently operating on an occupied TV channel is significant. Intel in its comments to the FCC suggests that the interference range of a 100 mW unlicensed device is approximately 8 kilometers or 5 miles and therefore the device must be at least this distance outside the TV contour.[33] While the potential interference would actually be greater, using Intel's interference calculation shows that the interference area to TV viewers from a single unlicensed device would be over 75 square miles.[34]

4) *Operation at 5 GHz Allows for Physically Small, Efficient and Uniform Sensing Antennas*

Sensing or LBT begins with receiving the signal at the antenna. In simplest terms, the ability or effectiveness of an antenna to receive a transmitted signal is related to its physical size, which in turn is related to the wavelength of the signal to be received.[35] At 5 GHz, the wavelength of the signal is less than about 2.5 inches. Therefore, a very effective sensing antenna can be made in a small physical space. For example, some computer manufacturers place multiple antennas in the screen area of a laptop computer. In addition, since the 5 GHz unlicensed band extends from 5150 to 5825 MHz, the frequency range is only about ±6% of the median frequency. This means that the antenna effectiveness can be made fairly uniform across the entire frequency band.

In contrast, the TV broadcast allocation is actually on three separate frequency bands (54-72 MHz, 174-216 MHz and 470-806 MHz) that extend across both the VHF and UHF region of the spectrum.[36] The wavelength at 54 MHz is over 18 feet and the wavelength at 806 MHz is about 14 inches. In addition, the total frequency range is over ±87% from the median frequency. Even if one limits unlicensed operation to only the UHF band, the wavelength varies from almost 25 to 14 inches and the deviation from the median frequency is ±25%. This makes building an antenna with uniform performance across the band difficult and complex. In addition, the physical size of even a poorly performing antenna for an unlicensed device in the TV band must be significantly larger than an antenna at 5 GHz.[37] Furthermore, physical size of the antenna is an important consideration for portable/mobile unlicensed devices. Unfortunately, a "small" TV band antenna in an unlicensed device is not likely to be effective in sensing the very low signal levels needed for detection.

d. Use of signal detection will not protect DTV viewers

The NAF paper correctly identifies the hidden node problem as one of the major concerns that needs to be addressed to avoid harmful interference. NAF states that *"studies have shown that in both urban and rural areas, where buildings and terrain serve as obstacles to TV signal penetration, there may exist many 'shadow' spots in which TV signals may be weakened or totally diminished."* In other words, where sensing or LBT will likely fail!

NAF posits that the use of very sensitive receivers could solve the hidden node problem. It states that the *"FCC could simply set a sensitivity value for detectors that would give a high confidence that usable TV signals would not be missed"* and then verify through its Equipment Authorization Program that each unlicensed device meets this specified sensitivity level.

NAF's hypothesis that a predetermined threshold level can solve the hidden node problem is incorrect. Even if the premise that a very sensitive threshold detector can be built is accepted, the ability of that detector to accurately predict its location relative to a television receiver or a television service area is nil. Signal detection alone cannot accurately predict location. Further, if the detection level is set low enough to actually provide protection to DTV viewers, the detection level will be so far below the ambient "noise floor" that all spectrum will appear occupied and the detector will never find unused or unoccupied spectrum.

Let's examine what sensitivity level is needed to address the hidden node problem and protect DTV reception. In fact, let's look at the detection level Intel suggests is needed for low power unlicensed devices.[38]

Tables 1 & 2 show the DTV receiver and unlicensed device parameters used by Intel in its analysis.

Table 1: DTV Receiver Parameters

Receiver	Parameters
Minimum usable signal at DTV receiver	-83 dBm
The required signal to co-channel interference ratio of the TV signal to be protected	23 dB
DTV Receiver co-channel interference threshold protection	-106 dBm
The gain of the DTV receiver antenna with respect to the antenna of the unlicensed device	+10 dB
Receive frequency (MHz)	600

Table 2: Unlicensed Device Parameters

Unlicensed Device	Parameters
Maximum transmit EIRP when receiving signal at detection threshold (100 mW)	+20 dBm
Detection receiver bandwidth	1 kHz
Antenna Gain (dBi)	0 dB

Listed below is the step-by-step analysis used by Intel to develop link budgets to determine what it believes is "safe threshold values for detecting unused channels for use by low power unlicensed devices."[39]

Step 1: Determine the separation distance needed between a 100 mW unlicensed device and a potential victim DTV receiver as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Link Budget for Computing the Required Separation Distance between an Unlicensed Device and a Victim DTV Receiver

Link Budget	Values
Unlicensed device transmit power (100 mW)	20 dBm
Receiver interference protection threshold	-106 dBm
Loss needed between unlicensed device and each victim receiver (20dBm - (-106 dBm))	126 dB
Average building losses	6 dB
Off axis DTV antenna gain	-14 dB
Loss needed to be attributed to path loss at 600 MHz (126 dB - 6 dB - 14 dB)	106 dB[40]
Free space interference range outside of the Grade B service contour	8 km

Step 2: Determine the detection threshold to protect potential victim DTV receiver from a 100 mW unlicensed device as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Detection Threshold Link Budget for Protecting a DTV Victim Receiver

Link Budget	Values
DTV signal at Grade B service contour	-83 dBm
Excess path loss at 8 km beyond DTV service contour[41]	2 dB
Antenna gain differential	-10 dB
Building loss due to walls, antenna height, and multipath	-23 dB
Power level of feature detector relative to DTV signal	-11 dB
Required pilot tone detection threshold to protect DTV Receiver	-129 dBm

Let us now discuss some of the fundamental flaws in Intel's analysis.

e. Signal detection alone cannot accurately predict location

Intel's analysis is fundamentally flawed. The basic assumption that signal detection and sensing is sufficient to prevent unlicensed devices from operating inside a television station service area is incorrect. The analysis takes for granted that a predetermined detection threshold level will guarantee that the unlicensed device will be located 8 kilometers or 5 miles beyond the TV station's service area and therefore the unlicensed device will not cause interference.[42] This assumption is erroneous and the premise that a "detection threshold" level can guarantee that an unlicensed device is at a location some distance from the television's service area is wrong. Signal detection and sensing alone cannot accurately predict location

The -129 dBm detection value, suggested by Intel, is based on a received DTV level of -85 dBm (includes 2 dB of additional path loss to account for the 8 km distance beyond DTV service contour of -83 dBm). The -129 dBm value takes into account the physical and technical differences between the TV receive system and the unlicensed device, such as the antenna gain and the power level of the detector.[43] Intel also includes 23 dB for other factors that degrade the signal detected by the unlicensed device such as building losses, multipath and antenna height.[44] If one assumes that building losses and mulitpath can occur at the same levels both within the TV service area as well as 5 miles outside the service area and that the unlicensed device can be at the same antenna height both outside and within the TV service area, then these factors can be ignored. The real issue then becomes whether a -85 dBm or lower DTV signal can occur at a location closer than 5 miles from the edge of the television service area contour or even within the service contour.

The correct answer is, of course, there may be locations within the service area where the signal level may be below this value. While apparently unknown to NAF and its authors, the fact that locations within a TV stations service area may not receive an adequate television signal or are "unserved" is well known.[45] Under Intel's approach, each "unserved" location would translate into a *carte blanche* approval for an unlicensed device to transmit even though it is located well inside the service area of a television station and will cause interference to surrounding TV viewers.

Let's look at a real consumer reception situation. MSTV was asked to provide assistance to a television viewer in the Seattle area who could not receive the Seattle DTV stations although he was located less than 25 miles from the stations.[46] MSTV ran terrain profiles from the viewer's home to the TV station. The following is a terrain profile from one of the Seattle television stations to the viewer's residence.



The terrain profile shows that the viewer's location is blocked by terrain from although locations beyond the viewer are not blocked and have clear line of sight to the television station. This location clearly receives a signal much weaker than -85 dBm. An unlicensed device at this location would therefore "sense" that it is located at least 5 miles beyond the service contour when it is in fact well within the service area. In addition, because the unlicensed device is located within the service

area, Intel's assumption of a 6 dB building loss "over the 5 miles beyond the Grade B and a 14 dB loss due to the unlicensed signals being transmitted into the "back" of the TV antenna would not apply.[47] In this instance, the interference distance would be much larger than the 5 miles assumed by Intel from an unlicensed device operating beyond the television contour.

f. Intel's suggested detection level is inadequate to protect TV viewers

Next, let's examine the "margin" in Intel's detection threshold. In its analysis, Intel assumes a value of 23 dB for "(b)uilding loss due to walls, antenna height, and multipath."

Antenna Height. Intel does not specifically address the loss attributed to differences in antenna height between the unlicensed device and an outdoor TV antenna. This factor is merely included in its 23 dB of loss "margin." However, as part of its analysis for transmit power control, Intel does calculates the "slant range" and path loss between the unlicensed device and an outdoor antenna. This calculation assumes that the outdoor antenna is at a "height of 8 meters above the unlicensed device antenna."[48] This is consistent with an outdoor TV antenna of 30 feet and an unlicensed device antenna height of 6 feet or a difference of 7 dB.[49] While this is certainly not a "worst case" situation, for the purposes of this paper, we will use this 7 dB value.[50]

Therefore, the margin for the remaining factors of building loss and multipath is 23 dB minus 7 dB or 16 dB. Intel's analysis also includes a 2 dB propagation loss since it assumes that the unlicensed device is 5 miles beyond the TV station's Grade B contour. Although we have shown previously that this may not be the case, for simplicity, let's include and add this additional 2 dB to the margin for a total "margin" of 18 dB for building loss and multipath.

This 18 dB of margin is used to account for <u>all</u> degradation that might occur to the DTV signal received or "detected" by the unlicensed device. The principal question is whether the 18 dB margin is sufficient to protect TV receivers? The answer is NO, even considering Intel's own analysis and data.

Building Loss and Multipath. In an *ex parte* presentation to the FCC, Intel stated that building losses average 5.7 dB with a standard deviation of 8.6 dB.[51] If one assumes that building losses follow a normal distribution, this means that about two-thirds of the values for building losses will fall between the average or mean value and one standard deviation. Therefore to provide enough protection for building losses for two-thirds of the situations where building losses occur the needed margin would be 14.3 dB; to protect for 95% of cases, the building loss margin would have to be 22.9 dB (the average and two standard deviations); and, to account for almost all or about 99% of the situations, the building loss margin value would have to be 31.5 dB (the average and three standard deviations).

In addition to building losses, Intel notes that the signal can experience multipath degradation on the order of 4 to 19 dB.[52] In its comments, Intel argues that this degradation can be reduced to 6 dB through the use of diversity antennas, although there is no proposal by the FCC to require diversity antennas nor does Intel in its comments argue for such a requirement. Intel also fails to explain how such diversity performance could be maintained or how antenna performance would be affected if the antennas were rotated or moved, such as in the case of a game controller or toy.

Nevertheless, assuming *arguendo* that all unlicensed devices are required to use diversity antennas that always reduce multipath to 6 dB, the 18 dB margin used by Intel in its analysis would only provide protection to TV viewers for less than 2/3 of all building loss or attenuation situations.[53] The following chart computes the "margin" required to take into account losses due to building blockage and correct for multipath degradation:

Percentage of Building Attenuation Situations Covered	Margin Required with Diversity Antennas	Margin Required with No Diversity Antenna
68% (1 sigma)	20.3 dB	33.3 dB
95% (2 sigma)	28.9 dB	41.9 dB
99% (3 sigma)	37.5 dB	50.5 dB

Accordingly, NAF's and Intel's suggested 18 dB of "margin" for its unlicensed device detection threshold is woefully inadequate and would result in significant harmful interference to DTV viewers.

g. Intel's analysis fails to adequately take propagation variability into account

NAF and Intel also fail to recognize the fact that radio propagation is probabilistic and that its assumed DTV signal level of -85 dBm is a "predicted" value. The predicted TV service contour is based on the signal level that occurs at 50% of the locations and 90% of the time. In practice, the actual signal levels will vary significantly over both time and location.[54] The detection level suggested by Intel does not take into account this signal variability and therefore will not prevent interference to DTV reception. In order to improve the reliability of detection, DTV signal level variation needs to be taken into account and a more appropriate predictive model that takes into account a higher percentage of location variability needs to be used. For example, at UHF frequencies, the difference in location variability between the 50th percentile and the 90th percentile for UHF is on the order of 15 dB.[55] Reducing the detection level by such a factor would help to ensure, but not necessarily guarantee, that unlicensed devices would not cause harmful interference to TV reception as required by the FCC rules.

In summary, the use of a signal detection threshold alone can not guarantee that a device is located a specific distance beyond the television station's service area. This error is particularly problematic since Intel's interference analysis is predicated on the assumption that a –85 dBm signal level will always be at least 8 kilometers beyond the Grade B contour and therefore one can reduce the interfering signal of the unlicensed device by a factor of 20 dB or 100 times.[56] When in fact, as shown above, DTV signals at levels at or below –85 dBm can and do occur within the DTV service area where this reduction is not appropriate and the unlicensed device would cause additional significant interference to DTV viewers.

Further, not withstanding this fatal flaw, assuming *arguendo* signal detection is used, to reduce the likelihood of harmful interference to DTV reception, the detection threshold proposed by Intel and NAF would have to be reduced substantially to properly account for building attenuation and multipath losses, and to account for location variability. The authors of this paper would argue that, at the very least, sensing at these reduced levels is significantly more complicated than the sensing used for protection of 5 GHz radar systems and is well beyond the current state of the art for practical circuit designs and software for low-cost unlicensed devices.

IV. Significant Progress Has Been Made on the IEEE 802.22 Standard

NAF and its authors attempt to discredit the IEEE 802 standards organization and its processes. NAF states that the IEEE 802 rules make it very unlikely that this group will reach consensus because it has members who are proponents of unlicensed use as well as broadcast interests that NAF assert are firmly opposed to it. NAF also states that because membership and voting is based on individuals and membership is open-ended, it therefore possible to "stack" the committee to achieve a particular outcome.[57] NAF's clear intent is to insinuate that broadcast interests have "stacked" this group to prevent an unlicensed standard from being developed.

Nothing could be further from the truth. All of NAF's claims show a complete lack of understanding of the IEEE organization and its processes. In its desperate attempt at discrediting the world's leading wireless standards setting organization, NAF ignores the fact that the eligibility requirement for voting on an IEEE standard in a Working Group such as the 802.22 Group is not a trivial process.[58] NAF"s position is curious given the high level of participation in other IEEE working groups by the major proponents of unlicensed devices.

Far from being opposed, as suggested by NAF and its authors, MSTV and other broadcast industry participants have strongly supported the work of IEEE 802.22, which is committed to the development of a wireless standard that is based on sound scientific study needed to protect TV reception rather than mere political rhetoric. Further, broadcast participation is far lower than would be required to influence and *"stack"* the committee as suggested by NAF. Only 5 individuals from the broadcast community have participated in 802.22 while voting membership within the Working Group has ranged from 50 to 95 individuals.[59] NAF's suggestion that consensus is hard to achieve is also contradicted by the facts. If a standard is based on sound engineering, a 75% minimum voting requirement of the Working

Group is not difficult to achieve. This is evident by the fact that all the standards adopted in IEEE 802 have always exceeded the minimum requirement by having an approval rating greater than 90%.

Since its inception in early 2005, the IEEE 802.22 Working Group has made tremendous progress toward the development of a standard for a broadband Wireless Regional Area Networks (WRAN) in the TV bands. The Working Group has received and studied 16 different technical proposals and is currently working on a **single merged proposal** for standardization. Final evaluation and testing is on-going and is expected to be completed by the end of his year.[60]

V. FCC Equipment Authorization Program Does Not Provide Effective Interference Protection

The new NAF paper includes an insert on the FCC's Equipment Authorization Program asserting that it can be used to assure that equipment authorized under this program does not cause interference to TV broadcast reception. The insert is intended to respond to MSTV's very valid concerns that "well-intentioned rules … with respect to compliance of new unlicensed equipment" may not be sufficient to prevent interference and the fact that it is generally "impossible to recall equipment" once it is in the field and being used by consumers.

While not completely clear from NAF's language, NAF appears to recommend that only the FCC, rather than privately operated testing bodies, would be able to approve unlicensed devices that operate in the TV bands. NAF also appears to recommend that "(s)ince the radios under question here are expected to be used, in most cases, in conjunction with Internet access, it would not be a significant burden for them to connect to the equipment manufacturer or distributor periodically to update their software" and that if this were not done the devices could be shut down though expiration date features, such as Macrovision's Flex*net* technology used by the computer software industry. NAF also suggests that other "very low-power devices that are not connected to the Internet" such as those used to "track herds of cattle, or to monitor industrial machinery" would not be subject to this requirement. NAF does not, however, define the terms "periodically" or "very low-power."

MSTV commends NAF for its recognition that MSTV's concerns with interference from unlicensed operations are valid. MSTV supports a requirement that unlicensed devices be connected to the Internet to ensure that the unlicensed device can be reprogrammed or modified in case of interference. The periodic solution proposed by NAF, however, is inadequate. NAF would require that any interference by an unlicensed device be remedied only periodically. Further, NAF does not define what it means by "periodically" but uses the example of software "expiration," which is usually an annual process. Even if this process were made quarterly, it would be an unacceptable solution. **The basic premise of Part 15 operation is that an unlicensed device cannot cause interference**.[61] NAF's proposed solution of "periodically" attaching to the Internet would have TV viewers wait 90 days or 6 months or even a year to correct interference from unlicensed devices. As NAF suggests, there is little burden to requiring ALL unlicensed devices from being connected to the Internet and including the capability of being remotely accessed and immediately shut-off and/or modified to correct any interference. This is the same requirement that the FCC adopted for all broadband over powerline (BPL) devices and should be the minimum requirement for any unlicensed device operating in the TV band.

The contention that the Equipment Authorization Program would offer protection from, and enforcement of, interference is premised on the following theory: that only devices that fully comply with the Commission' rules are produced; that the Commission has sufficient resources to ensure that non-compliant devices are not introduced into the market; and, in the rare instance that this might occur, to immediately track down and remove those devices from operation and to prosecute those manufacturers that are responsible for those illegal devices. This theory does not reflect reality.

A recent NAB study of Part 15 devices operating in the FM broadcast band shows wide spread non-compliance of these Part 15 devices with the FCC rules.[62] Less than 25% of the devices tested were compliant with the FCC's field strength limits. In February, 2006, the FCC issued a *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture and Order*, proposing a $1 million forfeiture against Behringer USA, Inc., for apparent violation of the FCC's equipment authorization rules.[63] Behringer apparently violated the FCC rules by marketing at

least 50 models of unauthorized digital audio devices. These devices were marketed for more than five years including for more than one year after Behringer was put on Notice of its violations. MSTV is also aware of the illegal marketing of Part 74 two-way radios to the nuclear power industry and others.

These few cases confirm the inability of the Equipment Authorization program to act as an effective deterrent and enforcement mechanism, particularly in the use of unlicensed devices in the TV band. Unlike the typical Part 15 device that operates in bands that are used by microwave ovens, industrial machinery and marine and military radar systems where the probability of interference is negligible or low, unlicensed devices are now being proposed to be operated in the TV bands that are also used by hundreds of millions of consumer devices, i.e., TV sets, that can be easily interfered with. NAF and Intel do not refute this fact. Intel computes that an interference zone of 5 miles for a 100 milliwatt device located beyond the Grade B contour and higher powers have been proposed to be permitted for such devices. Even using Intel's interference radius, this means that an unlicensed device can cause interference over an area of 75 square miles! Clearly, the Equipment Authorization program is not set up to handle the interference that could be caused by both legal and illegal unlicensed devices that would operate in the TV broadcast band. Finally, there is no indication that the FCC has ever been able to recall, or even has the authority to recall, a Part 15 device from consumer use.[64]

VI. Broadcasters Interference Concerns are Valid and Well Founded

NAF asserts in the title of section IV of its paper "broadcasters interference concerns are unfounded and readily avoidable." But a careful reading of the NAF paper suggests otherwise and that broadcasters interference concerns are clearly not unfounded or easily avoided. For example, NAF's latest document acknowledges the following:

1) NAF recognizes MSTV concerns with out-of-band interference. NAF states that out-of-band and desensitization interference "could easily be solved by establishing a new limit on total power in addition to the limit that was proposed on power/120 kHz that was proposed in the NPRM, and that the "FCC could eliminate desensitization concerns by setting a protection distance goal for unlicensed devices and setting a maximum total TV band power limit that the unlicensed device can transfer to a TV receiver at that distance." *NAF fails to acknowledge that there is no such proposed requirement before the FCC nor does it suggest what power limit should be used for such a requirement.*

2) NAF "agrees that interference from devices operating in adjacent channels to TV bands can exist." NAF states that the "FCC needs to establish some rules for adjacent channel protection as it has in many other radio services." *NAF fails to acknowledge that there is no such proposed requirement before the FCC nor does it suggest what specific limit should be used for such a requirement.*

3) NAF suggests requiring that all devices be tested and certified only by the FCC laboratory and that since most devices are expected to be used in conjunction with Internet access "it would not be a significant burden for them to connect the equipment manufacturer or distributor periodically to update their software… ." *NAF fails to acknowledge that there are no such proposed requirements before the FCC.*

4) NAF also fails to address the problem of sensing "The FCC could simply set a sensitivity value for detectors that would give a high confidence that usable TV signals would not be missed." *NAF fails to acknowledge that there is no such proposed requirement before the FCC nor does NAF define what level should be used or what it believes to be a "high confidence" level.*

While NAF's latest document acknowledges the validity of a number of MSTV's interference concerns, NAF continues to cling to the argument that these concerns can be solve by FCC rules and then chastises the Commission for taking the time for appropriate technical solutions to be developed. NAF disparagingly states that the "FCC's proposed rulemaking is pending but currently inactive." This is clearly not the case. The FCC has recently announced a projected schedule to complete the proceeding on unlicensed operation in the TV broadcast bands that includes important and necessary field and laboratory testing.[65]

Good spectrum management like good medical care is premised on "first, do no harm." Developing technical solutions to unlicensed devices using the TV spectrum without causing interference is a complex problem that needs to be addressed by solid technical analysis backed by field tests, studies and data. NAF and the unlicensed device proponents have supplied none. The important benefits of a successful transition to digital television should not be jeopardized over speculative and unproven unlicensed devices.

MSTV and the broadcast industry have pledged to work with Congressional and government leaders to fashion an approach that would identify and set aside unused broadcast spectrum for the deployment of broadband services in rural areas. The proposed legislation, however, goes far beyond rural broadband and would permit any type of unlicensed device to operate in the TV band including toys, video game controllers and other devices that are unlikely to incorporate the safeguards required to prevent interference to TV viewers.

VII. End Notes

[1] See New America Issue Brief #19, "Why Unlicensed Use of Vacant TV Spectrum Will Not Interfere with Television Reception, dated July 2006, by Michael J. Marcus, Paul Kolodzy and Andrew Lippman. This paper updated an earlier paper, dated October 2005 by the same authors.

[2] For example, NAF does not disagree that "desensitization interference" can occur and states that "(C)onsumer-grade TV receivers are more susceptible to this problem than other types of receivers because they are designed both to receive signals over a large tuning range and receive weak signals." See NAF paper at p. 2. NAF also states "we agree that interference from devices operating in adjacent channels can exist." NAF paper at p. 4.

[3] For the purpose of this paper, out-of-band interference includes both out-of-band and spurious emissions from an unlicensed device that results from the modulation process; harmonic and parasitic emissions; and, intermodulation and frequency conversion products.

[4] All three reports were included as part of the Statement of Robert W. Hubbard, President & CEO, Hubbard Television before the U.S Senate Commerce Committee, Sciences and Transportation, March 14, 2006.

[5] It is worth noting that one reason for conducting additional tests and issuing a second report was to address issues raised by various parties, including NAF, with regard to the first report. Specifically, NAF was critical of the choice of antenna used in the first experiment and stated that the type of "silver sensor" antenna used could exaggerate the interference results. The second set of tests used a reference standard dipole antenna rather than a "silver senor' antenna to eliminate the antenna variable from the tests. Another criticism was the type of signal and choice of bandwidth used to emulate the out-of-band energy. Some parties argued that the use of a modulated signal and the narrow bandwidth of the signal selected may affect the results. The second set of tests attempted to address these criticisms by using a Gaussian White Noise generator rather than an OFDM signal generator to spread the out-of-band energy across five television channels. The results in the second CRC report reaffirm the original findings.

[6] See CEA and Motorola filings in Docket 04-186. and *ex parte* filing by IEEE 802.22. 18 http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6518164462

[7] See, for example, Sections 15.239(c), 15.240(c), 15.241(c), and 15.242(c) of the FCC rules.

[8] See Section 15.33 of the FCC rules.

[9] IEEE 802.22 is responsible for developing standards for operating Wireless RANs within the TV bands. In September 2005, it submitted an *ex parte* filing with the FCC to report on its activities and findings to date. The report concluded that unlicensed systems should not operate within a co- and first adjacent channel contour of a DTV station and that the FCC's proposed out-of-band emission requirements are insufficient to protect DTV receivers by some 33 dB for 1 dB desensitization of DTV receivers.

[10] While NAF does not dispute MSTV calculations, the authors apparently try to discredit this work by innuendo by suggesting it comes from an unattributed, undated Powerpoint presentation, although they note it was created by Bruce Franca of MSTV on March 29, 2006. What they fail to disclose is that this draft document was sent to and shared with Mr. Kolodzy by Bruce Franca in response to an April 5th e-mail from Mr. Kolodzy requesting technical discussion on the relevant interference issues. In the spirit of an "open technical dialog," MSTV shared its "draft" technical work that fully described its technical concerns and its analysis on interference. Mr. Franca and Mr. Kolodzy exchanged several telephone calls and e-mails regarding this work. Mr. Kolodzy was fully aware that this presentation was a preliminary draft and who had created it. Further, rather than being "unattributted and undated" as suggested by NAF, this information is contained in the clearly identified MSTV presentation, Unlicensed Devices in the Television Band, dated April 12, 2006, made available to the Senate Committee staff on that same date.

[11] See NAF paper at p. 4.

[12] The FCC proposed that fixed/access unlicensed devices must meet DTV protections on both co- and adjacent channels but that personal/portable devices need only comply with co-channel protections. The adjacent channel analysis contained in this paper shows that this preliminary conclusion by the FCC that the "potential for harmful interference to adjacent channel television operations is sufficiently low that we do not need to impose adjacent channel restrictions on these devices" is incorrect..

[13] See 47 CFR 73.623 and FCC NPRM pp.15 and 28.

[14] Under these criteria, in order that interference is not caused to DTV reception, the interfering signal on an adjacent channel cannot be more than 26 dB greater than the received DTV signal.

[15] For example, Charles W. Rhodes, an independent consultant, presented a paper entitled, *Unlicensed Transmitters Operating on "White Channels within the Broadcast Bands*, dated May 20, 2006, at the annual conference of the National Translator Association. In this paper, Mr. Rhodes states that "(f)irst adjacent

channels to broadcast channels should NOT be considered "white" in the same community due to interference such usage would cause within the station's coverage area." The paper presents detailed analysis of various interference mechanisms that can occur. Mr. Rhodes' July 26, 2006 article, *White Spaces Are There for a Reason*, for TV Technology also explains why adjacent channel operation by unlicensed devices is not possible. He suggests "the most efficient use of the spectrum by white channels would be in a band of their own with a suitable guard band separating it from broadcast spectrum." In addition, experts in IEEE 802.22 have also concluded that adjacent channel operation within a TV service area would create interference to TV viewers and is not feasible.

[16] See, for example, FCC NPRM at para. 30.

[17] See comments of Microsoft Corporation, dated November 30, 2004 at p. 6.

[18] The 90 mile separation distance assumes that the TV station has a service area of 55 miles and the land mobile base station will serve mobiles within 30 miles so that all mobile operations will be at least 5 miles outside the protected contour of the TV stations. While it may be possible to reduce this separation distance of 5 miles to take into account the differences in power between land mobile stations and unlicensed devices, operation of unlicensed devices would still have to be restricted to beyond the protected contour of the TV station in order to avoid interference. For example, as shown in MSTV analysis, a personal/portable unlicensed device would have to be more than 1 kilometer outside the TV station's service area.

[19] NAF points to the current TV-land mobile sharing of TV channels 14-20 in 13 major markets and the FCC requirements that govern such sharing and that prohibit use of the first adjacent channels.

[20] NAF spectrum assessment is based on a Study from Freepress that was attached to the NAF October 2005 Issue Brief.

[21] See NAF working paper #14, "Populating the Vacant Channels," dated August 2006.

[22] MSTV recognizes that radar signals are not continuous and that radars rotate so that the signal may be in a different direction. This fact, however, does not mean that a radar signal is more difficult to detect than a very weak TV signal

[23] The 5 GHz unlicensed device measurement procedures provide an additional 1 dB for the radar detection signal level. This means that the threshold detection is actually -63 dBm (-64 dBm + 1 dB) for unlicensed devices with output power levels of 200 mW or more. The -129 dBm level suggested by Intel and alluded to by NAF is 66 dB less than this -63 dBm level.

[24] In fact, as shown below, this is a level within the range that unlicensed devices produce and use for communications between local devices.

[25] See NAF's cite to Shared Spectrum's reply comments at p. 5 and footnote 31 of NAF's paper. MSTV does not suggest that this threshold value of -129 dBm would be appropriate or would actually protect DTV viewers. As shown below, Intel's detection level analysis is flawed and fails to adequately account for location of the device, building losses, multipath degradation and a number of other factors. MSTV's position is that further analysis and field testing would be required to develop an appropriate detection threshold and to show that this threshold would actually protect TV reception. None of which has been done to date.

[26] This value assumes that both the 5 GHz and TV band unlicensed devices operate with approximately the same bandwidth. Even taking into account the 11 dB difference in power level of the feature detector assumed in the Intel analysis, the difference in detection threshold is still 55 dB or the radar detection is at a power level over 300,000 times the level for operation in the TV band.

[27] NAF 'sassertion that the unlicensed device is tested only over a few seconds is not true. The transmission period for the long pulse radar test signal is 12 seconds and a minimum of thirty trials must be conducted. This is a minimum test period of 6 minutes, considerably longer than the few seconds suggested by NAF.

[28] See Reply Comments of Shared Spectrum Company, FCC Docket No. 04-186, February 1, 2005. This paper also shows that the detection level proposed by Intel and referred to by Shared Spectrum is inadequate to prevent interference to DTV reception.

[29] While MSTV would perhaps take issue that a typical office environment is a high RF noise location, MSTV staff has in fact met with personnel from Shared Spectrum and pointed out challenges that would need to be addressed to make this technology viable. For example, in neighborhoods close to TV transmitters where high RF fields may be present, such signals may mask or "de-sense" the detector making it difficult to detect low level television signals MSTV, for example, has invited Shared Spectrum to test at its facility, which is co-located with WUSA TV Channel 9 in Washington D.C., where this phenomena occurs.

[30] In the radar case, each path between an unlicensed device and a radar system can be considered separately. The fact that there can be multiple unlicensed devices or even multiple radars does not matter. Each unlicensed device is required to protect a radar receiver co-located with a radar transmitter. That protection can be broken down into a single path analysis and each path will be

same in both directions simplifying protection requirements and analysis.

[31] The new DFS regulations also apply to unlicensed devices operations in the 5.25-5.35 GHz band. Applications filed after July 20, 2006 for new unlicensed devices in this band must comply with these requirements. All devices manufactured after July 20, 2007 must also comply. There are no requirements however that prohibit earlier manufactured without this capability from continuing to operate.

[32] One hundred meters or about 330 feet is clearly within the intended communication range of these unlicensed devices. This suggests that the same antenna and receiver functions can be used for both communications between unlicensed devices and detection of the radar signal.

[33] See Intel Comments at Appendix A. This calculation also assumes that there is a 14 dB antenna discrimination factor and a 6 dB attenuation of the interfering signal over this distance.

[34] This is based on an 8 km or 5 mile radius. In this case, since TV receivers can be located in front of the unlicensed device the 14 dB antenna discrimination would not apply and the actual calculated interference area would be much larger.

[35] Because the difference in velocity of an electric wave in free space and the wave on the antenna, the physical length of the antenna does not correspond exactly to the electrical length of the antenna and the physical length can be made somewhat shorter depending on the size of the wire and other factors. For the purposes of this discussion, this small difference between electrical length and physical length was disregarded. See, for example, *Practical Antenna Handbook* by Joseph J. Carr, McGraw-Hill, 2001.

[36] The UHF band after the transition would extend only up to 698 MHz (TV channel 51).

[37] For example, everyone is familiar with the size of classic TV "rabbit ears" and loop or "bow-tie" antennas

[38] It is inferred that NAF and its authors agree with Intel's analysis since they have referenced this value and have not provided any other analysis nor have they suggested that this value is inappropriate. They also cite to a reply comment by Shared Spectrum that references this value.

[39] See Comments of Intel Corporation, in ET-Docket Nos. 04-186 and 02-380, dated November 30, 2004.

[40] Intel states that "(t)his value (*i.e.,* 106) is adjusted to correct for average building losses and backdoor antenna gain. MSTV notes that this "20 dB adjustment" is incorrect and results in a significant reduction in the protection needed to avoid interference to DTV reception. For example, this assumes that the antenna is always pointed at the TV station and away from the unlicensed device. This is not always the case. For example, TV stations in a market may not always be co-located or consumers may desire to receive TV signals from two locations, such as Washington and Baltimore. If this "adjustment" is not included the "free space interference range" or distance the device must be from the protected contour of the TV station goes from 8 km to 40 km.

[41] Intel cites that this value is derived from ITU P.1546-1. As noted above, MSTV takes issue with the 8 km value although Intel's analysis has more fundamental flaws that are addressed in this paper.

[42] See Chart associated with Step 2: Determine the detection threshold to protect potential victim receiver from a 100 mW unlicensed device.

[43] According to Intel, the signal received by the unlicensed device compared to the DTV receiver is less due to a 10 dB difference in antenna gain and an 11 dB difference due to the power in the detection bandwidth versus across the entire 6 MHz DTV signal.

[44] The 23 dB is allotted to account for building loss, multipath and antenna height. Therefore, the -29 dBm - (-10dB (difference in antenna gain) -11dB (difference in power due to detection bandwidth) -23dB) = - 85 dBm.

[45] In the Spring of 2000, thirty broadcast organizations established the VSB/COFDM Project, a testing and research project on the state-of-the-art implementations of VSB and COFDM technologies. Extensive DTV measurements were made at about 200 outdoor and 45 indoor sites. These measurements showed many sites with signal levels of less that -85 dBm. In addition, MSTV completed a year-long extensive RF field measurement program in 1998. This testing encompassed a combination of radials, arcs, grid and cluster measurements of both WHD-TV and WETA-HD. These measurement data show a number of locations where the DTV signal is less than -85 dBm. For example, forty-four of the over three hundred measurements taken for the model DTV station, WHD-TV, showed levels of less than -85 dBm *within* the noise-limited contour of the station. A number of these measurements were less than 30 miles from the transmitting antenna (or more than 20 miles from the edge of the TV service area). In addition, fifty-two of the two hundred and ninety-two measurements of WETA-HD were less than -85 dBm, including one location only 12 miles from the transmitter. These "real world" measured data show that the -85 dBm level does not only occur more than 5 miles from the TV station and refutes completely the basic premise of Intel's analysis and approach. See, *8VSB/COFDM Comparison Report*, VSB/COFDM Project, December, 2000 and *Model HDTV Station Field Test Program, An*

Interim Report for the Model HDTV Station Project, Inc., prepared by the Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc., September 1998.

[46] This request was forwarded to MSTV by Congressman Jay Inslee's staff on behalf of one of his constituents.

[47] In Intel's analysis, the detection threshold is predicated on the fact that the unlicensed device is outside of the DTV service by at least 8 kilometers. In such a case, the unlicensed device will be transmitting into what Intel calls the "backdoor" of the TV antenna and therefore the interfering signal from the unlicensed device can be reduced by 14 dB. Intel also assumes that since the unlicensed device is 8 kilometers beyond the protected contour there will be a 6 dB propagation loss over those 8 kilometers due to buildings and ground clutter. Neither of these would occur if the unlicensed device were at or within the contour. Therefore, there would be a 20 dB shortfall in the detection threshold and in the protection needed to ensure no interference if the unlicensed device was located at the contour rather than 8 kilometers beyond the contour.

[48] See Intel's comments dated November 30, 2004, Appendix A at p.3.

[49] DTV planning factors assume TV reception is based on an outdoor antenna at 30 feet above the ground.

[50] For example, the height of the TV antenna might be greater due to terrain or in the situation of an antenna mounted on a taller building such as an apartment building.

[51] See Intel *ex parte* Power Point Presentation to the Federal Communications Commission, dated November 1, 2004.

[52] Intel notes that fading depth has been quantified by Bullington to be less than 19 dB for 99 percent occurrence over 50 to 70 kilometer paths. See Intel's comments Appendix A at p. 2.

[53] To protect for 2/3rds of all in-building use, the allowance for building attenuation should be a minimum of 14.3 dB.

[54] For example, most individuals have experienced the variability that can occur with radio propagation, such as when using a mobile phone or listening to the radio their vehicle where slight changes in position will make significant changes in signal level or service will vary by time of day or date.

[55] See, for example, *A Computer Program for Calculating Effective Interference to TV Service*, OST Technical Memorandum, FCC/OST TM 82-2, July 1982, prepared by Harry K. Wong.

[56] Intel assumes that the unlicensed device is outside of the DTV service by at least 8 kilometers. In such a case, the unlicensed device will be transmitting into what Intel calls the "backdoor" of the TV antenna and therefore the interfering signal from the unlicensed device can be reduced by 14 dB and that there will be a 6 dB propagation loss over those 8 kilometers due to buildings and ground clutter. Neither of these would occur if the unlicensed device were at or within the contour. Therefore, there would be a 20 dB shortfall in the detection threshold and in the protection needed to ensure no interference if the unlicensed device was located at the contour rather than 8 kilometers beyond the contour.

[57] See Footnote 27 of the NAF paper.

[58] IEEE requires a consensus of 75% of individuals in the committee for passage. To be eligible to vote, an individual must attend at least two week-long Plenary sessions out of the past four and have a recorded participation of in least 75% of all of the Working Group's meetings during those long-week sessions. Moreover, if the individual fails to meet the attendance/participation requirement, they lose their voting rights until eligibility is re-established. Such stringent requirements require a commitment to the standard setting process.

[59] The requirement for allowing individuals rather than organizations to participate and vote is intended to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Rather than disparage the IEEE process, NAF's authors could make the same commitment to participate and have a voice in the process as MSTV has done.

[60] Approval of the WRAN Standard is expected in 2007.

[61] See, for example, Section 15.5, General conditions of operation, of Part 15 of the FCC rules. 47 CFR 15.5.

[62] See, *A Report to National Association of Broadcasters Regarding Study and Measurements of Part 15 Devices Operating in the FM Broadcast Band,* prepared by Dennis Wallace of Meintel, Sgrignoli, & Wallace, dated June 2, 2006.

[63] See, In the Matter of Behringer USA, Inc., *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture and Order (Notice),* File No. EB-04-SE-069, adopted February, 16, 2006.

[64] For example, in the Behringer *Notice*, none of the devices that Behringer marketed for the one year after being notified of its violations were recalled from consumers.

[65] See FCC Public Notice, *Office of Engineering and Technology Announces Projected Schedule for proceeding on Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands,* ET Docket No. 04-186, DA 06-1813, released September 11, 2006.

EXHIBIT B

Figure 3 In NAF's Technical Comments



	n-10	n-8	n-5	n-3	n-2	n-1	n=0	n+1	n+2	n+3	n+4	n+6	n+8	n+9	n+10	n+15
Receiver #1	-25	-27	-27	-28	-28	-44	-90	-37	-27	-25	-26	-27	-28	-28	-27	-26
Receiver #2	-22	-22	-24	-24	-26	-37	-78	-29	-25	-22	-22	-24	-24	-24	-24	-23
Receiver #3	-24	-26	-26	-29	-33	-38	-88	-39	-30	-25	-24	-28	-26	-28	-28	-27
ATSC A/74	-11	-11	-12	-20	-24	-35	-83.5	-35	-24	-20	-12	-11	-11	-11	-11	-18

This graph is Figure 3 from NAF's Technical Comments, which is chart A.10 from NAF's Kansas study with the addition of a dotted line at -28 dBm (the received power from an unlicensed device at 10 meters).

NAF's Figure A.11 From The Kansas Study



	n-10	n-8	n-5	n-3	n-2	n-1	n=0	n+1	n+2	n+3	n+4	n+6	n+8	n+9	n+10	n+15
Receiver #1	-37	-39	-41	-40	-39	-59	-101	-49	-42	-43	-41	-43	-40	-42	-42	-42
Receiver #2	-36	-38	-39	-41	-44	-50	-100	-46	-40	-40	-38	-39	-40	-41	-40	-38
Receiver #3	-34	-39	-39	-38	-41	-49	-97	-49	-39	-36	-35	-38	-37	-40	-39	-37

This is figure A. 11 from the Kansas report with a dotted line drawn onto the graph at -28 dBm (the received power from an unlicensed device at 10 meters).