555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Tel: +1.202.637.2200 Fax: +1.202.637.2201
www.lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

FIRM / AFFILIATE OFFICES
Abu Dhabi, Barcelona, Beijing, Boston, Brussels, Chicago, Doha, Dubai, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Hong Kong, Houston, London, Los Angeles, Madrid, Milan, Moscow, Munich, New Jersey, New York, Orange County, Paris, Riyadh, Rome, San Diego, San Francisco, Shanghai, Silicon Valley, Singapore, Tokyo, Washington, D.C.

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

March 16, 2012

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation
FCC File No. SAT-MOD-20101118-00239; IB Docket No. 11-109

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On March 14, 2012, Geoff Stearn, Vice President – Spectrum Development of LightSquared LLC, Javad Ashjaee, President and CEO of JAVAD GNSS and John P. Janka of Latham & Watkins met with the Commission staff listed below.

The following attached materials formed the basis for the conversation.

(1) Four graphs showing examples of the variation of C/N_0 over time, measured with a fixed GPS receiver. Given both the short and long term variations inherent in the received C/N_0, this information demonstrably rebuts the suggestion that a mere 1 dB downward movement in the entire C/N_0 curve (the result of a 1 dB degradation of C/N_0) could be perceptible by a user of a GPS receiver. The C/N_0 variation in a mobile context would be even greater, making a 1 dB C/N_0 degradation even less perceptible.

(2) Javad Ashjaee, *A Technical Story of a Bad Filter and a Good Filter Which Turned Political.*

(3) Presentation by Javad Ashjaee to the PNT Board dated November 9, 2011, *LightSquared Can Complement GPS.*

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

(4) Presentation by Javad Ashjaee during the GPS World Webinar, dated December 8, 2011, *LightSquared Can Complement GPS*.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John P. Janka
John P. Janka

Enclosures (4)

cc: Michael Ha
Chris Helzer
Walter Johnston
Steven Jones
Julius Knapp
Ronald Repasi
Mark Settle
Robert Weller


Energy
Sat: Gps 5
C/A
P1
CL2
Energy,dB*Hz
54
48.75
43.5
38.25
33
27.75
22.5
17.25
12
6.75
1.5
24143.7
26025.2
27906.7
29788.3
31669.8
33551.3
35432.9
37314.4
39196
41077.5
42959
Time, epochs
Start - Stop (GPS)
23:27:27.00 - 04:41:04.00
21.02.2012 - 22.02.2012
FILE INFORMATION
tred.jps
Date: 24.02.2012
Receiver: TRE_G3TH
ID:"03UT1IM0LZ4F01BWQD7
Hardware: "TRE_G3TH_8"
Firmware:
"3.4.1b3 Feb,21,2012"


Energy
Sat: Gps 12
C/A
P1
CL2
Energy,dB*Hz
58
52.35
46.7
41.05
35.4
29.75
24.1
18.45
12.8
7.15
1.5
9574.21
12096.8
14619.4
17142
19664.6
22187.2
24709.8
27232.4
29755
32277.6
34800.2
Time, epochs
Start - Stop (GPS)
19:20:18.00 - 02:25:05.00
21.02.2012 - 22.02.2012
FILE INFORMATION
tred.jps
Date: 24.02.2012
Receiver: TRE_G3TH
ID:"03UT1IM0LZ4F01BWQD7
Hardware: "TRE_G3TH_8"
Firmware:
"3.4.1b3 Feb,21,2012"


Energy
Sat: Gps 17
C/A
P1
CL2
Energy,dB*Hz
57
52.1
47.2
42.3
37.4
32.5
27.6
22.7
17.8
12.9
8
4079.44
6060.89
8042.33
10023.8
12005.2
13986.7
15968.1
17949.6
19931
21912.4
23893.9
Time, epochs
Start - Stop (GPS)
17:06:44.00 - 23:23:18.00
21.02.2012 - 21.02.2012
FILE INFORMATION
tred.jps
Date: 24.02.2012
Receiver: TRE_G3TH
ID:"03UT1IM0LZ4F01BWQD7
Hardware: "TRE_G3TH_8"
Firmware:
"3.4.1b3 Feb,21,2012"


Energy
Sat: Gps 22
C/A
P1
Energy,dB*Hz
58
52.45
46.9
41.35
35.8
30.25
24.7
19.15
13.6
8.05
2.5
38130.3
40611.3
43092.3
45573.2
48054.2
50535.2
53016.1
55497.1
57978.1
60459
62940
Time, epochs
Start - Stop (GPS)
03:20:34.00 - 00:00:15.00
22.02.2012 - --.--.----
FILE INFORMATION
tred.jps
Date: 24.02.2012
Receiver: TRE_G3TH
ID:"03UT1IM0LZ4F01BWQD7
Hardware: "TRE_G3TH_8"
Firmware:
"3.4.1b3 Feb,21,2012"


JAVAD
A technical story...
of a bad filter...
and a good filter...
P, dBm
Rejection, dB
GPS
GLN
-133 dBm
FREQ, MHz
which turned political!
And the Earth moves...
Galileo Galilei

The Real Interference Issue: Political Noise

I have been reflecting on events related to the GPS interference issue and LightSquared. What I discovered revealed the root of this problem, and as I will describe in this paper, it is entirely caused by poor design of GPS receivers The problem can be solved easily and with existing technology. In fact, it already has been solved.

Unfortunately, the GPS interference issue is a perfect example of how Washington is allowing politics to influence a technical debate. Opponents of LightSquared are trying to deal with the GPS interference issue by employing armies of lawyers and lobbyists who either don't understand the scientific facts or are lying about them. Instead, it would be much better for those who are making much of the noise about LightSquared, to spend money on research and development to help solve the problem.

This political approach to a technical issue demonstrates why the United States is currently ranked seventh in the world for the most scientific and engineering researchers per capita, following Finland, Sweden, Japan, Singapore and Norway. Why would high-caliber talent want to go into technology-related jobs when our system appears to be placing low value on scientific facts and high value on political influence?

How I Came to Understand the Real Issue

Around December 2010, when I received initial reports and letters regarding LightSquared interference with GPS, I joined the Coalition to Save GPS and signed a letter to the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission thinking I was doing my part to protect GPS. I wrote similar commentary on my website, www.javad.com.

Then I was invited to participate in the 2011 ESRI[1] conference in San Diego and join a panel to discuss the LightSquared-GPS issues. In order to defend the GPS system and provide technical data, I started my own investigation of the problem. I soon realized that my own company had a fundamental problem in the first stage of our antenna system. It was allowing other radio energies into the receiver in addition to the Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) signals. I recognized that the flaw in our filter system would degrade the performance of our GNSS receivers whether LightSquared's system is deployed or not.

As an engineer, I always strive to innovate my products and took it upon myself to see if we could develop a device that filters out as much noise as possible from the adjacent band without affecting the integrity of the GNSS signals. Unfortunately, this was never a priority in our industry – we always used filters that offered little protection against interference.

I soon drew the conclusion that the standard operating procedure resulted in degraded performance. **Figure 1**, below, shows the theoretical spectrum of the United States' GPS satellite system and Russia's similar system, GLONASS, the so-called L1 bands. This figure shows GPS and GLONASS spectrum allocations and assumes that all of the adjacent spectrum is completely clean and free of any radio signals. At least that's the theory. In practice this is not the case.

[1] *ESRI is a company based in Redlands, CA that creates Geographic Information Systems software and provides digital maps and other GIS data. They sponsor numerous conferences each year.*



Figure 1: The Theoretical GPS Spectrum

Figure 2, below, shows what the actual spectrum may look like. It has lots of “white noise” and harmonics of other existing transmitters. In the real world, the GPS system lives in a very noisy neighbourhood. The shape of interfering signals can change drastically as you drive around. To extract the best of GNSS signals, we should only allow these signals in and do not invite other outside noise.



Figure 2: The Real World GPS Spectrum

Figure 3, shows a perfect theoretical filter. It allows 100% of GNSS signals to pass from the antenna to the receiver, and it blocks 100% of all radio signals outside the spectrum allotted to GNSS. Such a filter would give us the best possible theoretical signal-to-noise ratio in a receiver and the best possible theoretical receiver performance. This theoretical filter would let in all signals in the GNSS spectrum pass, and completely blocks everything else.



Figure 3: The Perfect Theoretical Filter

Unfortunately, it is not technically possible to build such a perfect filter. Our challenge is to build the best filter that keeps the GNSS signals intact and blocks unwanted signals as much as possible. In other words, make the side slopes, or skirts, of a filter as steep as possible. How difficult it is to build such a filter? How much would it cost?

First let us look at the filter that we were using in my own company's GPS receiver products (see **Figure 4**). Those long, gently sloping skirts are not good. Filters with this shape allow a lot of white noise and strong signal spikes into the receiver that a GNSS device doesn't need, and doesn't want (the overall grey area). I knew we could do better, and this is why I set out to find a solution that filters out as much as possible.

Figure 4: A Typical GPS Filter with Little Protection



As an innovator, I always want to improve our filter designs and enhance overall performance. **Figure 5** shows the performance curve and shape of a filter that we built and tested that met these criteria. And as you see below, the skirts on this filter are nearly vertical, indicating that we were able to block out almost all the noise. In technical terms, the slope of the filter on each side is about 10dB per MHz. In the future we may be able to do even better, but today, I think this the state-of-the-art design. To my delight, there is considerable benefit to this new filter because it is simpler, it performs better and it costs less than our old filter design.

Figure 5: New Javad GNSS Filters, Enhanced Performance



The performance difference between the old filter of **Figure 4** and new filter of **Figure 5** is enormous. The red section in **Figure 6**, below, illustrates the extra noise and undesirable signals that our old filter was allowing to pass from the antenna into the receiver. All of that extra noise degrades the performance of GNSS receivers.



Figure 6: Unwanted Noise in the Receiver

To think in laymen's terms about such performance degradation, consider having a conversation with a friend in a quiet room. Now consider trying to have the same conversation in a crowded restaurant with waiters shouting to each other (noise spikes) and all the restaurant customers talking loudly to overcome all the background noise. All that extra noise makes it a lot harder to understand what your friend is trying to say to you. The same is true for radio receivers: the more background noise they hear, the harder it is for them to detect and understand the signal that they are supposed to be listening to.

As **Figure 6** shows, we had a lot of extra noise coming into our GNSS receivers. Note again that we are not discussing LightSquared here. Our focus is to improve the performance of GNSS receivers by eliminating as much noise as possible from the red zone – whether coming from a LightSquared transmitter or any other source.

If you are out in the countryside in an electronically quiet environment, you may see only small amount of improvement with our new filter, but in cities, where there are lots of other transmitters, the improvement will be significant. With the new filter, you probably will be able to get a Real Time Kinematic[2] (RTK) solution faster and with greater accuracy. With the old, broad-skirted filter, you will need to stay longer in one position to get a position fix, and your solution may not be as accurate. Indeed, your receiver might stop functioning completely if there's too much radio noise. All practicing surveyors will say that there have been times when their receivers were not functioning properly. They usually blame it on foliage, rain, and other physical environmental conditions, when the real problem often is a noisy radio spectrum environment that does not allow enough margin for operation under foliage and where GNSS signal reception is weaker.

In scientific terms, the filter of **Figure 4** can allow enough noise to get into the receiver to create the equivalent of several dB of additional "noise figure"[3]. To put this in perspective, a good receiver has a noise figure of less than 2 dB. Most engineers would agree that an effective noise figure of more than 3 dB means poor receiver performance. Allowing extra noise into the receiver can make the effective noise figure much more than 3 dB.

It's important to distinguish between "noise figure" and "signal-to-noise" ratios that are determined at the end of the signal processing. Even 1 dB of additional "noise figure" will degrade performance, but several dB change in signal to noise ratio might not be noticeable at all in a GNSS receiver. Please note that the discussion so far has nothing to do with LightSquared. Everything I've outlined thus is meant to improve receiver design overall.

---

[2]RTK devices are high-precision receivers that use information from terrestrial transmitters to provide additional information, allowing more precise positional solutions.

[3]Noise figure is defined as the difference (in decibels) between a theoretically perfect receiver that does not generate any noise internally, and a real-world receiver.

Better Filters Provide Multiple Benefits

I think this discussion shows that other GNSS manufacturers are not showing a desire to innovate and improve their designs. Either they don't want to block out noise, or they don't have the technical competency to do so. The filter in **Figure 5** is much better than the one in **Figure 4** because it provides superior performance for GNSS receivers, with or without LightSquared. If they thought they couldn't build such filters without negative side effects, they were wrong – we have demonstrated that it can be done.

If we build better filters and better GNSS receivers, both general purpose users and high-precision users of GNSS will get improved results. In addition, the **Figure 5** filter will protect the receiver from hearing LightSquared signals. This is shown in **Figure 7**, below. The GPS and GLONASS signals are shown in green. Our new steep-skirt filter is shown in grey, and the LightSquared signals are pink. Note that this new filter completely blocks out the LightSquared signals without reducing the signal strength of GNSS signals.

Figure 7: Improved Filter Solves Interference Problem with LightSquared



This improved filter design should make it clear that LightSquared can coexist with GNSS. Once we understand that, we can also understand that high-precision GNSS receivers can benefit from LightSquared. We can use LightSquared for RTK communication (the land-based signals that augment signals from GPS satellites and provide more precise positional data). We desperately need better RTK communication, and LightSquared's network can provide it.

My desire to innovate filter design was evident in my presentation at the 2011 ESRI conference, where a representative from LightSquared spoke with me on a panel. He was intrigued by the challenge I wanted to tackle offered to support my efforts to build a new and improved filter.

The GPS Community's Response (or Non-Response) to Scientific Facts

Since the ESRI conference, the community's response has been a mix of good, bad, and even ugly. The good part is that our cooperation with LightSquared led to effective and cost-effective solutions to the technical problem. The bad part was that most of the GNSS receiver community stuck fingers in their ears and said, in effect: "I'm not listening! I can't hear you!" The ugly part came in the form of numerous hostile responses I received when I presented my solution at the 2011 PNT[4] meeting, published my findings, and partici

[4] *The National Executive Committee for Space-Based Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT) is a U.S. Government organization established by Presidential directive to advise and coordinate federal departments and agencies on matters concerning the Global Positioning System (GPS) and related systems.*

pated in the GPS World webinar.

Proving that it was possible to design and build a filter that would improve GNSS receiver performance, and do away with the possibility of interference from LightSquared, made me a villain to the status quo. But I ignored their hostility because my objective is to build better receivers, not please the establishment.

I soon took the designs out of the theoretical realm and successfully built a number of prototypes to test in the laboratory and in the field. The results were successful, and within just a few months from the point when I decided to tackle this problem, we were in full production – not only were my new devices more accurate because they filtered out unnecessary noise, they were cheaper to produce and they were compatible with LightSquared.

The PNT Advisory Board's letter to the FCC Chairman on August 3, 2011 blamed LightSquared for the interference and asserted that the only solution was to shut down the company. Rather than innovate and develop a technical solution to the interference problem, those on the PNT Advisory Board, several of whom represent the major GPS companies with a financial interest in the outcome of this debate, chose to use their political might.

The Sound of Silence

I chose to let the science inform my opinion. We developed a theoretical solution, created an experiment to test it, and proved that the theory was correct. The last step in the scientific process is that experimental results must be replicable. To assist others in replicating my findings, I took 40 units of the new system to the November PNT Advisory Board Meeting and offered our new filter design to those who wished to test them. Some people took up my offer, but nobody has come out in public and announced the results of their own tests. Did anyone conduct any tests? If so, what were the results?

All I heard was silence! I have to assume that any tests that were actually conducted in fact replicated our results. If the new filters didn't work, opponents of LightSquared would have been shouting their test results from the rooftops.

The reaction from many of my industry peers to my scientific analysis was decidedly unscientific. My pure technical findings were tagged as hostile, harsh, disrespectful, political, self-serving and betraying. I ask my critics: How in the world could I possibly want to cause harm to GNSS systems that I have worked so hard in the past 30 years to improve? If GNSS system receives any harm, my company and I are among the first to feel the damage!

I'm not a stranger to controversy, so I chose to ignore them. I received similar personal attacks for ten years when I was working on GLONASS. Déjà vu!

Despite my findings that proved the August 3rd letter technically wrong, the PNT did not correct the record, nor did they offer an apology to the FCC chairman for making false claims. In the scientific community, an organization that puts out such blatantly wrong information loses its credibility and goes silent for a while.

So recently, others inside the government created a new smoke screen: low precision (C/A code only) receivers. The government tests reported that 75% of low-precision re

ceivers “failed” a compatibility test with LightSquared, but what they neglect to explain is that their definition of “failure” is 1-dB loss in signal-to-noise!

There are two points to note: First, most receivers have up to 20-dB of margin on signal-to-noise and users most likely will not even notice a 1-dB loss. Second, if you take any one of the so called “failed” receivers near many existing transmitting systems (like AM and FM radio and TV towers) you will see that they will lose some dB’s of signal-to-noise or they may completely stop functioning. Should we force all such transmitters off the air? Or better yet, should we demand that GPS receivers that are being used in critical applications have protection against existing systems? I wrote a letter regarding this issue to the FCC Chairman recently outlining my point-of-view on this false rationale.

Next came the issue that LightSquared interferes with avionic systems that warn pilots about approaching terrain and mountains. This was tested in a laboratory. In addition to all I mentioned earlier, the test also ignored that LightSquared towers are aimed six degrees below the horizon and transmit 20-dB (100 times) less power in directions above the horizon. Those conducting the testing and analysis of the data clearly chose to ignore some facts.

It Would Be Funny If It Weren’t So Tragic

The story does not end here. According to the official test results, 300 million inexpensive GPS receivers built into cellular telephones are not affected by LightSquared. However, the very expensive encrypted military GPS receivers that are supposed to be battle hardened are affected!

Why is no one asking the Pentagon why they procured equipment that’s vulnerable to wireless signals of all things?

One may argue that the reason military receivers did worse than cell phones is that military receivers use wide band P-code. This is exactly my point; the military receivers which use wide band un-encrypted P-code for the main purpose of getting better protection against interferences, end up performing worse than even a cell phone in the presence of interference. This also applies to the FAA. Everyone in Washington ignores these facts!

This technical matter has a lot of lawyers, lobbyists and spin doctors involved, but it’s the engineers who have the ability to solve this problem.

No matter what happens to LightSquared, I am determined to build a better filter system for our GNSS receivers and offer better products to surveyors worldwide, and if we can accomplish this while facilitating a better RTK network, all the more reason.

I would like to invite engineers who want to roll up their sleeves and find solutions and discuss technical details to join me and several of my peers on Tuesday, January 17, 2012 in my San Jose facility. Please RSVP to javad@javad.com.



LightSquared Can Complement GPS

Javad Ashjaee
JAVAD GNSS

Presentation to PNT Board
November 9, 2011
Crowne Plaza Hotel, Alexandria, VA

1

Topics

- Root of the problem
- Technical details of our solution
- Filters group and carrier delays
- Interference analysis features
- Retrofit and upgrade plans

2

Positioning
Navigation
Timing

3

Communication

4



5

JAVAD

LightSquared

6

Technical Problem

7

Cast of Characters



8

LSQ Power:
1/10 mw -10 dBm

GPS Military & C/A Power:
1/20,000,000,000,000 mw -133 dBm

GPS encrypted P-Code Power:
1/200,000,000,000,000 mw - 143 dBm

9

DB Chart

10db	10	
20db	100	
30db	1,000	
40db	10,000	
50db	100,000	
60db	1,000,000	1M
70db	10,000,000	
80db	100,000,000	
90db	1,000,000,000	1B
100db	10,000,000,000	
110db	100,000,000,000	
120db	1,000,000,000,000	1T
130db	10,000,000,000,000	
140db	100,000,000,000,000	

LSQ Is 20 Trillion Times Stronger (133 dB)



GPS Receivers with No Protection



Even small interference can hurt Defenseless GPS Receivers

Frequency Response old LNA.



Group Delay old LNA.



Old Filter System







Solution





Tests

1. Component analysis and simulation
2. In-circuit signal measurements
3. Anechoic chamber (more than NTIA)
4. The ultimate test

1. Component analysis and simulation









2. In-Circuit Signal Measurements


Active
Microwave Probe
RF Input
(Sine Wave)


Tested for Closest Edges of 10L and 10R to GPS
Light Squared and Inmarsat
GPS
GLONASS
MHz
1531
1550.2
1591
1610
1631.5
LightSquared Signal Power
10L
10H
JAVAD LightSquared Filtering
GPS Filter for Older High Precision Receiver
GNSS Filter for Modern High Precision Receiver
GNSS Filter for Modern High Precision Receiver
GNSS Filter for Modern High Precision Receiver
Normal MPS Signal Power (Starfire/ Omnistar)
GPS Filter for Low Precision Receiver
GPS Signal Power
GLONASS Signal Power
0
-10
-20
-30
-40
-50
-60
-70
-80
1526-1536
1545-1555
1563-42
1637-42
1590-1614
1626-1636


New Filter System
In
$30
L1
$0.24
$0.24
$0.24
$0.24
LNA
LNA
LNA
LNA
< GPS
< 10 L
< 10 R
Out
New LNA
Patent Pending
L2
LNA
Saved $10 too


Six SAW Filters


L1
In
LNA
Ceramic Filter
SAW
GPS > Pinp 1575 = -100 dBm
10 L > Pinp 1536 = -10 dBm +10 dBm P1dB
10 R > Pinp 1626.5 = -10 dBm +8 dBm P1dB


LNA
SAW
SAW
SAW
For GPS L1
Gp=+33dB
P1dB inp = -40 dBm
P1dB outp = -8 dBm


Out
GPS > Poutp 1575 = -67 dBm
10 L > Poutp 1536 = -68 dBm
10 R > Poutp 1626.5 = -70 dBm


The RF Chain
GPS
10 L
10 R


GPS > 1575 P= -67 dBm
10 L > 1536 P= -68 dBm
10 R > 1626 5 P= -70 dBm
ANT_INT
ANT_EXT
Input LC Diplexer
Ceramic Filter





Overall Results

Relative to GPS+Noise					
FRQ	L1	10L	10R	L1-10L	L1-10R
Ant LNA input	-100	-10	-10	-90	-90
Ant LNA output	-67	-68	-70	1	3
Ceramic Filter	-68	-70	-73	2	5
LNA	-60	-54	-57	4	7
splitter	-53	-57	-60	4	7
Attenuator	-56	-60	-63	4	7
SAW filter	-57	-102	-105	45	48
Mixer	-49	-105	-122	56	73
SAW Filter	-58	-162	-168	104	110
Overall Gain:				194	200

Relative to C/A and Military P-codes					
FRQ	L1	10L	10R	L1-10L	L1-10R
Ant LNA input	-133	-10	-10	-123	-123
Ant LNA output	-100	-68	-70	-32	-30
Ceramic Filter	-101	-70	-73	-31	-28
LNA	-83	-54	-57	-29	-26
splitter	-86	-57	-60	-29	-26
Attenuator	-89	-60	-63	-29	-26
SAW filter	-90	-102	-105	12	15
Mixer	-82	-105	-122	23	40
SAW Filter	-91	-162	-168	71	77

PNT Letter:

High precision GPS applications contribute over 90 billion dollars to the economy each year. They rely on the full band GPS receivers that have been developed over the last 15 years.

PNT Policy:

GPS transmits two signals: a secure encrypted signal exclusively for military users and a non-secure civilian signal.

Relative to Encrypted P-codes					
FRQ	P	10L	10R	P-10L	P-10R
Ant LNA input	-143	-10	-10	-133	-133
Ant LNA output	-110	-68	-70	-42	-40
Ceramic Filter	-111	-70	-73	-41	-38
LNA	-93	-54	-57	-39	-36
splitter	-96	-57	-60	-39	-36
Attenuator	-99	-60	-63	-39	-36
SAW filter	-100	-102	-105	2	5
Mixer	-92	-105	-122	13	30
SAW Filter	-101	-162	-168	61	67

3. Anechoic Chamber System Test

Anechoic Chamber Test Setup



















TRIUMPH-VS Interference Analyzer Features (6 Bands)

- Interference frequency
- Interference power
- Control voltage shape
- C/N0 loss
- Statistical data

Anechoic Chamber Test Result of 10L

10L Power	AGC Change	C/N0 Loss
-10 dBm	None	None
-4 dBm	-0.6 dB	None
-1 dBm	-4.3 dB	1 dB
+1 dBm	-9.4 dB	2 dB
+3 dBm	-16.6 dB	4 dB
+4.5 dBm	-16.6 dB	6 dB

Anechoic Chamber Test Result of 10R

10R had no effect on GPS for the maximum power of 10R that we could generate (+4.5 dBm)

4. The Ultimate Test: Special Zero Baseline





Zero Baseline Results (Carrier Phase), cm		
Calibrator	Off	On
GPS L1	0.02	0.02
GPS L2	0.01	0.01
GLN L1	0.39	0.14
GLN L2	0.01	0.01

Zero Baseline Results (Code Phase), cm		
Calibrator	Off	On
GPS P1	4.22	4.86
GPS P2	5.73	4.08
GLN P1	60.36	7.38
GLN P2	2.03	1.36

Aggregate Effect of 44,000 LSQ Transmitters on LEO Satellites

LEO Satellites	
Each LSQ transmitter (EIRP)*	61.5 dBm
Side lobe	-20 dB
Aggregate of 44,000 transmitters	46 dB
Min path loss for lowest LEO (200 miles)	-146 dB
Effective power at LEO	-58.5 dBm

* Equivalent Isotropically Radiated Power

Measuring and Compensating for Group and Carrier Delays



We dynamically and continuously calibrate GLONASS inter-channel biases with accuracy of **0.2 millimeter**















Retrofitting/Updating Existing Receivers

LightSquared-Protected:
Protected by the above JAVAD LNA system. For all precision positioning applications. Multipath mitigation features preserved.
November 2011

LightSquared-Compensated:
Protected by the above JAVAD LNA system and dynamically compensated for group delay variations (better than 100 picosecond). For precision timing applications.
March 2012

LightSquared-Integrated:
Same as two above plus LightSquared communication module Inside.
June 2012



We offer to build filter sub-assembly for other manufacturers too, at least until they catch up.

JAVAD GNSS Retrofit Plan

- All we ship today are LSQ compatible or eligible for free retrofit.
- We can retrofit our earlier shipped units at a cost of $300 to $800, depending on the model.

JAVAD GNSS Upgrade Plan

- All existing receivers will be obsolete soon.
- We will give up to $10,000 credit for any old receivers we upgrade.*
- We will give up to 5 years of reduced-price RTK subscription ($10,000 value).*

* Depending on the age and model of the receiver.

JAVAD GNSS Retrofit Plan for Other Manufacturers

We are collecting data on other manufacturer's receivers to plan for their retrofit.

Mixing and Matching SAW Filters



Mixing and Matching SAW Filters



Mixture of Two Different SAW Filters





Mixture of Two Different SAW Filters. GPS Only



LightSquared Can Complement GPS

Javad Ashjaee
JAVAD GNSS

GPS World Webinar
December 8, 2011

1

Topics

- History of interferences with GPS
- My history with the LightSquared issue
- Technical solution (PNT presentation)
- Retrofit/upgrade of existing receivers

2

History of interference with GPS

3

Frequency bands (MHz)			
GPS L5	1164.45	1176.45	1188.45
GPS L2	1215.6	1227.6	1239.6
GLN L2	1234	1246	1258
LSQ 10L	1526	1531	1536
LSQ 10H	1545.2	1550.2	1555.2
GPS L1	1563.42	1575.42	1587.42
LSQ TX	1626.5	1631.5	1636.5
GLN L1	1590	1602	1614

4



5

Our Solutions

Did not form a coalition, but designed:

1. 64th-order adaptive filter for in-band interferences
2. Internal interference analyzer/warning system

6

7

8

My history with the LightSquared issue

- December 29, 2010 e-mail
- May 23, 2011; test e-mail
- June 9, 2011, ESRI Invitation

9



10



11



12

Our Motivations

1. Improve our receivers against all interferences
2. LightSquared is ideal for RTK corrections

13



14

JAVAD

LightSquared

15

Technical Topics

- Root of the technical problem
- Technical details of our solution
- Four ways to prove it works
- Interference analysis features
- Technology road map

16

Technical Problem

17

DB Chart		
10db	10	
20db	100	
30db	1,000	
40db	10,000	
50db	100,000	
60db	1,000,000	1M
70db	10,000,000	
80db	100,000,000	
90db	1,000,000,000	1B
100db	10,000,000,000	
110db	100,000,000,000	
120db	1,000,000,000,000	1T
130db	10,000,000,000,000	
140db	100,000,000,000,000	

18

DB Chart		
-10db	1/10	
-20db	1/100	
-30db	1/1,000	
-40db	1/10,000	
-50db	1/100,000	
-60db	1/1,000,000	1/1M
-70db	1/10,000,000	
-80db	1/100,000,000	
-90db	1/1,000,000,000	1/1B
-100db	1/10,000,000,000	
-110db	1/100,000,000,000	
-120db	1/1,000,000,000,000	1/1T
-130db	1/10,000,000,000,000	
-140db	1/100,000,000,000,000	

19



20

Tests

1. Component analysis and simulation
2. Sine wave in-circuit measurements
3. Anechoic chamber (more than NTIA)
4. The ultimate performance test

21

1.Component analysis and simulation

(Old Filter System)

22



23



24

2. Sine Wave In-Circuit Measurements

(Old Filter System)

25



26



27



Solution

29





1.Component analysis and simulation

(New Filter System)

32







2. Sine Wave In-Circuit Measurements

(New Filter System)

36


Active
Microwave Probe
RF Input
(Sine Wave)
37


LSQ 10L
LSQ 10H
LSQ 10R
GPS
GLN
1526
1536
1545.2
1555.2
1563.4
1563.4
1590
1614
1626.5
1636.5
38


New Filter System
In
$30
$0.24
$0.24
$0.24
$0.24
LNA
< GPS
< 10 L
< 10 R
Out
New LNA
Patent
Pending
Innovation saved $10 too
39

Six SAW Filters


L1
In
LNA
Ceramic Filter
SAW
GPS > Pinp 1575 = -100 dBm
10 L > Pinp 1636 = -10 dBm +10 dBm P1dB
10 R > Pinp 1626.5 = -10 dBm +8 dBm P1dB
41


LNA
SAW
SAW
SAW
For GPS L1
Gp=+33dB
P1dB inp = -40 dBm
P1dB outp = -8 dBm
42


Out
GPS > Poutp 1575 = -67 dBm
10 L > Poutp 1536 = -68 dBm
10 R > Poutp 1626.5 = -70 dBm
43


The RF Chain
GPS
10 L
10 R
44


GPS > 1575 P= -67 dBm
10 L > 1536 P= -68 dBm
10 R > 1626.5 P= -70 dBm
ANT_INT
ANT_EXT
Input LC
Diplexer
Ceramic
Filter
45





Overall Results

Relative to GPS+Noise					
FRQ	L1	10L	10R	L1-10L	L1-10R
Ant Filter Input	-100	-10	-10	-90	-90
Ant Filter output	-67	-68	-70	1	3
Ceramic Filter	-68	-70	-73	2	5
LNA	-50	-54	-57	4	7
splitter	-53	-57	-60	4	7
Attenuator	-56	-60	-63	4	7
SAW filter	-57	-102	-105	45	48
Mixer	-49	-105	-122	56	73
SAW Filter	-58	-162	-168	104	110
Overall Gain:				194	200

48

Relative to C/A and Military P-codes					
FRQ	L1	10L	10R	L1-10L	L1-10R
Ant Filter Input	-133	-10	-10	-123	-123
Ant Filter output	-100	-68	-70	-32	-30
Ceramic Filter	-101	-70	-73	-31	-28
LNA	-83	-54	-57	-29	-26
splitter	-86	-57	-60	-29	-26
Attenuator	-89	-60	-63	-29	-26
SAW filter	-90	-102	-105	12	15
Mixer	-82	-105	-122	23	40
SAW Filter	-91	-182	-168	71	77

49

Relative to Encrypted P-codes					
FRQ	P	10L	10R	P-10L	P-10R
Ant Filter Input	-143	-10	-10	-133	-133
Ant Filter output	-110	-68	-70	-42	-40
Ceramic Filter	-111	-70	-73	-41	-38
LNA	-93	-54	-57	-39	-36
splitter	-96	-57	-60	-39	-36
Attenuator	-99	-60	-63	-39	-36
SAW filter	-100	-102	-105	2	5
Mixer	-92	-105	-122	13	30
SAW Filter	-101	-162	-168	61	67

50

3. Anechoic Chamber System Test

(New Filter System)

51

Anechoic Chamber Test Setup



52

53



54



55



56



57



58



59



60

TRIUMPH-VS Interference Analyzer Features (6 Bands)

- Interference frequency
- Interference power
- Control voltage shape
- C/N0 loss
- Statistical data

61

Anechoic Chamber Test Result of 10L

10L Power	AGC Change	C/N0 Loss
-10 dBm	None	None
-4 dBm	-0.6 dB	None
-1 dBm	-4.3 dB	1 dB
+1 dBm	-9.4 dB	2 dB
+3 dBm	-16.6 dB	4 dB
+4.5 dBm	-16.6 dB	6 dB

62

Anechoic Chamber Test Result of 10R

10R had no effect on GPS for the maximum power of 10R that we could generate (+4.5 dBm)

63

4. The Ultimate Performance Test: Special Zero Baseline

(New Filter System)

64



65



67

Comparative Performance

Zero Baseline Results (Carrier Phase), cm		
Calibrator	Off	On
GPS L1	0.02	0.02
GPS L2	0.01	0.01
GLN L1	0.39	0.14
GLN L2	0.01	0.01

Zero Baseline Results (Code Phase), cm		
Calibrator	Off	On
GPS P1	4.22	4.86
GPS P2	5.73	4.08
GLN P1	60.36	7.38
GLN P2	2.03	1.36

68

Aggregate Effect of 44,000 LSQ Transmitters on LEO Satellites

69

LEO Satellites	
Each LSQ transmitter (EIRP) *	61.5 dBm
Side lobe	-20 dB
Aggregate of 44,000 transmitters	46 dB
Min path loss for lowest LEO (200 miles)	-146 dB
Effective power at LEO	-58.5 dBm

* Equivalent Isotropically Radiated Power

70

Measuring and Compensating for Group and Carrier Delays

71

Our GLONASS is as good as GPS

We dynamically and continuously calibrate GLONASS inter-channel biases with accuracy of 0.2 millimeter



72

We dynamically and continuously calibrate GLONASS inter-channel biases with accuracy of **0.2 millimeter**

73

Group and Carrier Delay Measurement Block Diagram



74



75



76



77



78



79



80

LEO Satellites & Doppler shifts

Dr. Larry Young of JPL

81

Technology Road Map

82

LightSquared-Protected:
Protected by the above JAVAD LNA system. For all precision positioning applications. Multipath mitigation features preserved.
November 2011

LightSquared-Compensated:
Protected by the above JAVAD LNA system and dynamically compensated for group delay variations (better than 100 picosecond). For precision timing applications.
March 2012

LightSquared-Integrated:
Same as two above plus LightSquared communication module inside.
June 2012

83



Made in San Jose, California

84

Made in the USA

You Can Conduct Your Own Tests

The technology is available, and I have 40 units here today.

86

87

- Military Receivers
- Low-End Receivers

88

Non-Technical Problem

89

Retrofitting/Updating Existing Receivers

90

JAVAD GNSS Retrofit Plan

- All we ship today are LSQ compatible or eligible for free retrofit.
- We can retrofit our earlier shipped units at a cost of $300 to $800, depending on the model.

91

JAVAD GNSS Upgrade Plan

- All existing receivers will be semi-obsolete soon.
- We will give up to $10,000 credit for any old receivers we upgrade.*
- We will give up to 5 years of reduced-price RTK subscription ($10,000 value).*

* Depending on the age and model of the receiver.

92

JAVAD GNSS Retrofit Plan for Other Manufacturers

We are collecting data on other manufacturer's receivers to plan for their retrofit.

93

Worst-Case				
		5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
Salary	75,000	375,000	525,000	750,000
Truck	10,000	50,000	70,000	100,000
Gas/travel/Misc.	10,000	50,000	70,000	100,000
		475,000	665,000	950,000
GPS receiver	15,000	3.2%	2.3%	1.6%
Days		1,800	2,520	3,600
Per day		$8.33	$5.95	$4.17

94

Middle-Case				
		5 Years	7 Years	10 Years
Salary	75,000	375,000	525,000	750,000
Truck	10,000	50,000	70,000	100,000
Gas/travel/Misc.	10,000	50,000	70,000	100,000
		475,000	665,000	950,000
GPS receiver	5,000	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%
		1,800	2,520	3,600
Per day		$2.78	$1.98	$1.39

95

Best-Case				
		5-Years	7-Years	10-Years
GPS Receiver	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
RTK saving	$2,000	10,000	14,000	20,000
Net Cash		$5,000	$9,000	$15,000

96

Retrofit Disaster!

Less than a Big Mac a day!

97

Why So Much Fuss!

- Misleading reports
- Special interests
- Political issues
- Milking LightSquared
- Some media

98

Misleading Reports

99

The PNT Letter


Hon. James R. Schlesinger
Chairman
National PNT Advisory Board

Dr. Bradford Parkinson
Vice-Chairman
National PNT Advisory Board

Cc: Hon. William J. Lynn III
Hon. John D. Porcari

To FCC Chairman, August 3, 2011

100

PNT Letter:

PNT is a panel of independent experts supported by two Administrations with over 250 years of cumulative experience with GPS applications.

101

PNT Letter:
The proposed power levels are as much as 5 billion times stronger than GPS. They cannot be "filtered" without gravely crippling GPS productivity gains.

We proved this is not true!

102

The truth is:

Not 5 Billion...
But 20 Trillion times stronger!
And it works and has lots of margin.

103

PNT Letter:
Any additional filter, if found, is expected to seriously compromise the accuracy and performance of the GPS devices.

We proved this is not true!

104

PNT Letter:
The suggestion that the lower LSQ band will not significantly harm GPS is false.

We proved this is not true!

105

PNT Letter:
The newer military signal (Lm) and the international signal (L1C) that will allow interoperability with the European GPS equivalent (Galileo) broadcast a wider bandwidth than the current GPS civil signal and must also use full band receivers. Thus, they will suffer the same impairments for both the proposed upper and lower bands.

We proved this is not true!

106

Truth is that:

The new systems will work even better because their codes are not encrypted (unlike the current P-codes).

107

GLONASS ??!!

Declared fully operational today.

108

PNT Letter:

Simple retrofits of the almost 1 million full-band GPS receivers are not possible. Such suggestions do not recognize the nature of GPS receivers that allow positioning to sub-centimeter level accuracy and must maintain timing to 1/10th of a billionth of a second.

?????

109

The PNT Letter


Hon. James R. Schlesinger
Chairman
National PNT Advisory Board

Cc: Hon. William J. Lynn III
Hon. John D. Porcari

Dr. Bradford Parkinson
Vice-Chairman
National PNT Advisory Board

The Misleading Letter

110

Questions For Media

111

The PNT Letter was drafted by who and based on what research?

112

Should we keep shipping faulty receivers to aggravate the retrofit problems even further?

113

How much was spent by companies on finding a solution, and how much on efforts to stop LSQ?

114

Did they try to find a solution and failed, or they did not try at all?

115

Is this not a national emergency if our military GPS receivers are jammed even by LSQ signals?

116

Are they using delay tactics so LSQ run out of time & money and investors get cold feet?

117

Evaluate damages to the nation and to the GPS community so far, because of such irresponsible acts.

118

150 GPS scientists assembled at Stanford University 3 weeks ago to discuss the LSQ issue. What was the outcome? Did they find any flaw in my presentation to the PNT board?

119

Do the people with special interest exaggerate the difficulty of retrofitting or upgrading existing receivers?

120

John Deere:

Farmers equipment cannot be interrupted for retrofit or upgrade. They always work.

121

Harvesting Corn at Night

122

Harvesting Snow in Winter!

To my good friend Ron Hatch of John Deere!

123