

WILLIAM K. KEANE
DIRECT DIAL: +202.776.5243
PERSONAL FAX: +202.478.2160
E-MAIL: kkeane@duanemorris.com

www.duanemorris.com

April 3, 2012

Ms. Marlene S. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street S.W.
Room 2-B450
Washington DC 20554

NEW YORK
LONDON
SINGAPORE
LOS ANGELES
CHICAGO
HOUSTON
HANOI
PHILADELPHIA
SAN DIEGO
SAN FRANCISCO
BALTIMORE
BOSTON
WASHINGTON, DC
LAS VEGAS
ATLANTA
MIAMI
PITTSBURGH
NEWARK
BOCA RATON
WILMINGTON
CHERRY HILL
LAKE TAHOE
HO CHI MINH CITY

Re: **WT Docket No. 07-293; ID Docket No. 95-91;**
GEN Docket No. 90-357; RM-8610 Ex Parte Notice

Dear Ms. Dortch:

This is to advise that on Friday, March 30, the undersigned together with Dan Hankins, Chairman, Aerospace and Flight Test Radio Coordinating Council (“AFTRCC”); Chip Yorkgitis, Kelly Drye & Warren LLP, representing Raytheon Company; and Daniel G. Jablonski, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Lab, met with Commission staff regarding the above referenced proceedings. Staff members in attendance included Julius P. Knapp, Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology; Ron Repasi, Deputy Chief; Patrick Forster, OET; and Linda Chang, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

The AFTRCC representatives addressed issues raised regarding the proposal made by GoGo, Inc. In particular, it was noted that the details provided thus far did not afford a sufficient basis for determining the extent of the interference potential that GoGo’s proposal entailed for aeronautical mobile telemetry (“AMT”). The AFTRCC representatives advised that AFTRCC would be prepared to discuss with GoGo a coordination agreement when and if the proposal were further defined, but that the Commission should make clear in its order on reconsideration that GoGo would be subject to WCS rules as spelled out in Part 27 including, but not limited to, the prior coordination rule, Section 27.73.

The AFTRCC representatives also underscored the importance of clarification by the Commission regarding prior coordination for WCS fixed stations. In that regard, it was noted that certain of the WCS deployment scenarios brought to AFTRCC’s attention contemplated the use of omni-directional antennas in point-to-multipoint configurations. Such arrangements,

Ms. Marlene S. Dortch
April 3, 2012
Page 2

along with point-to-point scenarios, presented significant interference concerns. AFTRCC also observed that for a number of years it had prior coordinated point-to-point WCS fixed installations, and that such coordination had been routinely required by OET. AFTRCC further observed that it remained ready, willing, and able to negotiate coordination agreements with WCS licensees as contemplated by the Report and Order,¹ but that until both sides were ready, it would not be possible to reach closure on the issues affecting such agreements.

Finally, AFTRCC stressed the importance of maintaining Rule 27.73(a)'s reference to coordination being conducted "consistent with Recommendation ITU-R M. 1459." If the Commission were nonetheless of the view that an adjustment is needed to address a perceived tension between the text and the Rule, AFTRCC urged that its earlier proposal for addition of the phrase "and good engineering practices," would certainly harmonize the two. This would also be consistent with the flexibility AFTRCC has utilized in coordinating initial WCS proposals.

A copy of this ex parte filing is being submitted for the docket.

Respectfully submitted,



William K. Keane
Counsel for AFTRCC

Cc: Julius P. Knapp
Ron Repasi
Patrick Forster
Linda Chang

¹ 25 FCC Rcd 11710 (2010).