

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review – Review of The Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	MB Docket No. 14-50
	)	
2010 Quadrennial Regulatory Review – Review of The Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	MB Docket No. 09-182
	)	
Promoting Diversification of Ownership In the Broadcasting Services	)	MB Docket No. 07-294
	)	
To: The Commission	)	

**COMMENTS OF LIN MEDIA**

In these comments, LIN Television Corporation d/b/a LIN Media (“LIN”) supplements the comments it has previously filed to address the “elephant in the room” regarding the Federal Communications Commission’s broadcast television ownership rules.<sup>1</sup> That is, the Commission must treat similarly-situated parties in a similar way. This is particularly the case with respect to regulations rationalized on the premise that spectrum is scarce. If spectrum scarcity persists as a legal basis for pervasive regulation of the structure of the broadcast industries and the activities of Title III broadcast licensees, then the Commission’s regulation of broadcasting, when undertaken by other Title III licensees, must reflect the same concerns about spectrum scarcity.

---

<sup>1</sup> LIN submits these comments in response to the FCC’s Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. *See In the Matter of 2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review – Review of the Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, 29 FCC Rcd 4371, FCC 14-28 (released April 16, 2014) (“Further Notice”). *See also In the Matter of 2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review – Review of the Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Order, DA 14-525 (released June 27, 2014) (extending the comment deadline to August 6, 2014).

Alternatively, the Commission’s pervasive regulation of broadcasting, to the extent that regulation is based on spectrum scarcity, must be revisited and conformed to reflect the profound changes in the way the airwaves are used by licensees to deliver electronic media and by citizens to consume electronic media. All regulations that are based on spectrum scarcity must be reconsidered and modified appropriately in light of the expansive amount of spectrum licensed for “flexible use”, the policy of the FCC to re-allocate as much scarce spectrum as possible from broadcasting to flexible use, and the emergence of Title III flexible use licensees as competitors to Title III broadcast licensees. This aspect of competition is particularly relevant to the Commission’s review of ownership rules under Section 202(h) of the Communications Act.

## **BACKGROUND**

The record already before the Commission in MB Docket No. 09-182 favors the substantial relaxation of the local television multiple ownership rule.<sup>2</sup> In previous comments and *ex parte* filings, LIN has a) provided the Commission with examples of how ownership of more than one station in a market benefits localism, diversity, and competition and has shown how over-regulation impedes those goals,<sup>3</sup> b) explained the direct competition local television broadcasters face from a variety of vastly larger non-broadcast competitors that are relatively unregulated,<sup>4</sup> c) discussed the constitutional and other impediments to the FCC’s regulation of programming as requested by multi-channel video programming distributor (“MVPD”) commenters,<sup>5</sup> and d) taken the Commission’s invitation to provide a clear,

---

<sup>2</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 73.3555(b).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Comments of LIN Television Corporation, MB Docket No. 09-182, at 1 (filed July 12, 2010) (revising the local ownership rule would provide “small and midsize market television broadcasters the necessary scale, infrastructure, and flexibility to best serve their communities”); Comments of LIN Television Corporation, MB Docket Nos. 09-182 & 07-294, at 15-19 (filed March 5, 2012) (describing news production costs, inability to create market niches, viewer satisfaction and cross-promotion of local programming).

<sup>4</sup> See e.g., Comments of LIN Television Corporation d/b/a LIN Media, MB Docket No. 10-71, at 7 (filed June 26, 2014) (describing the differences in regulation between local broadcasters and non-broadcast programmers); LIN Television Corporation d/b/a LIN Media Notice of Ex Parte Communication, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, 10-81 (filed February 26, 2014) (describing local broadcasters and the benefits enjoyed by larger non-broadcast entities).

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Comments of LIN Television Corporation, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, at 20-21 (filed March 5, 2012) (“March 5 Comments”) (discussing First Amendment concerns with the FCC regulating programming). LIN appreciates that the Commission agrees that multicast programming should not create separate attributable “stations” under the Commission’s ownership rules. See *Further Notice*, at ¶ 39 (released April 15, 2014) (finding

pragmatic waiver standard for the local television ownership rule in smaller markets.<sup>6</sup> On the current record alone, the Commission has ample evidence of the need for and the benefits of reform of its outdated local broadcast television ownership rules.<sup>7</sup>

These facts, examples, arguments, and proposals stand as strong today as they did when LIN submitted them to the Commission. In the intervening months and years, however, a new and overarching marketplace and regulatory change ushered in by the Commission itself requires an even harder look at the Commission's local broadcast ownership rules: competition with other Title III over-the-air services.

### **THE COMMISSION MUST TREAT SIMILARLY SITUATED PARTIES SIMILARLY**

There is more than a bit of irony apparent in the FCC's implementation of its statutory mandates with respect to television broadcasting. On April 15 of this year the Commission released the *Further Notice* concluding, after five years of record building and analysis, that it simply could not complete the quadrennial review of its media ownership rules required by Section 202(h). Yet exactly one month later, on May 15, the Commission adopted an order of nearly 500 pages outlining its process for conducting the broadcast "incentive auction"<sup>8</sup> as required by the Spectrum Act of 2012.<sup>9</sup> Although Congress gave the

---

that "the ability to multicast is not a substitute for common ownership of multiple stations and, therefore, would not justify tightening the existing numerical limits.").

<sup>6</sup> See March 5 Comments, at 21-23 (proposing a waiver standard in smaller markets).

<sup>7</sup> LIN hereby incorporates its prior filings that were referenced into the record for the 2014 Quadrennial Ownership Review. See *Further Notice*, at ¶ 1 (noting that the existing 2010 record will be incorporated into the record of the 2014 Quadrennial Review proceeding). LIN also reiterates its previous arguments related to sharing agreements and asks that the Commission consider them as part of the review of the local television ownership rule, as it promised to do in paragraph 349 of the *Further Notice*. See *id.*, at ¶ 349 ("As discussed below, the asserted public interest benefits of common ownership, operation, or control of stations in the same local market, and the issue of whether competition from other video alternatives warrants relaxation of our ownership rules, are appropriately raised and considered in the context of setting the terms of the local television ownership rule"). See also LIN Media Notices of Ex Parte Communication, MB Docket No. 09-182 (filed on January 16, 2013 in reference to 3 separate meetings); LIN Media Notice of Ex Parte Communication, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, 10-71 (filed February 28, 2014); LIN Media Notice of Ex Parte Communication, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, 10-71 (filed March 12, 2014); LIN Media Notice of Ex Parte Communication, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, 10-71 (filed March 21, 2014); LIN Media Notice of Ex Parte Communication, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, 10-71 (filed December 21, 2012).

<sup>8</sup> *In the Matter of Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions*, Report and Order, GN Docket No. 12-268, FCC 14-50 (released June 2, 2014) ("*Incentive Auction Report and Order*").

<sup>9</sup> Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. 112-96, H.R. 3630, 126 Stat. 156 (enacted Feb. 22, 2012) ("Spectrum Act").

FCC until 2022 to conduct the incentive auction, the Commission intends to devote all resources necessary to conduct the auction in 2015, seven years ahead of the statutory deadline. The irony is compounded by the fact that the growth in demand for wireless capacity is driven almost entirely by growth in video traffic. In 2013, Ericsson predicted that “[a]s consumers demand access to their media content on all of their devices, TV and video traffic is set to dominate networks and grow from 40 percent to 90 percent of mobile traffic within the next 3-4 years.”<sup>10</sup> According to recent data from Sandvine, “real time entertainment” such as YouTube, Netflix and Pandora accounted for more than a third of peak period mobile traffic data in the first half of 2014, and Sandvine predicts that “this number will continue to increase as longer form video becomes more commonplace on mobile networks in North America.”<sup>11</sup>

The net effect of this process is a shift in the allocation and licensing of the 600 MHz band from one class of licensee to another, but continued use of the band for delivery of services that, in a constitutional sense (and likely eventually, in every sense) are functionally indistinguishable from television. Although most “wireless broadband video” today is delivered essentially “on demand” by the end user via a one-to-one link, nothing precludes wireless broadband licensees from providing a broadcast service using flexible use spectrum, and the wireless industry is planning to do exactly that. The LTE standard includes a specification for a broadcast video service, and both vendors and carriers are working to exploit it.<sup>12</sup> Verizon Wireless has already publicly tested, and has announced plans to launch as early as the third quarter of this year, a broadcast video service using its mobile data spectrum.<sup>13</sup> According to the *New York Times*, Verizon’s “LTE Multicast” product “pushes broadcasts that can be received by multiple devices at once . . . [and] is not creating multiple copies of the content.”<sup>14</sup> Verizon Wireless has already tested the service with a controlled broadcast of the 2014 Super Bowl. According to the same

---

<sup>10</sup> See Ericsson Press Release, *World’s First Complete Solution for Broadcast Video Over LTE Networks*, (February 25, 2013). A copy of this press release is attached as Attachment A.

<sup>11</sup> See Sandvine, *Global Internet Phenomenon Report 1H2014*, May 15, 2014, available at <http://www.sandvine.com/downloads/general/global-internet-phenomena/2014/1h-2014-global-internet-phenomena-report.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Kevin Fitchard, *Nokia tinkers with the idea of turning LTE into a TV broadcast network*, GIGAOM, July 29, 2014 (reporting on a trial of LTE broadcast by Nokia and a German broadcaster).

<sup>13</sup> Brian X. Chen, *Verizon Wireless Prepares Network for TV Broadcasting*, NY TIMES, January 31, 2014, <http://mobile.nytimes.com/blogs/bits/2014/01/31/verizon-lte-multicast/> (last visited July 21, 2014).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

article, “Verizon says it already has a relationship with the National Football League, so live sports will probably be among the first offerings from the new service.”<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Verizon Wireless smartphones come with NFL Mobile (which provides “Live NFL Games”)<sup>16</sup> and several other electronic media applications pre-installed and incapable of being uninstalled.<sup>17</sup> The selection and presentation of these electronic media apps and the content they deliver to millions of consumers via the scarce radiofrequency spectrum are *sui generis* editorial.

When wireless carriers use repurposed broadcast spectrum to provide broadcast services consisting of, among other things, quintessentially broadcast content such as live professional sports, curated and scheduled by the licensee, there is no obvious basis for the government to apply vastly different scarcity-based regulations to two similarly situated speakers. If spectrum is scarce, it is scarce for all licensees. And if that spectrum is used for speech, then the same concerns about scarcity apply equally to all speakers. Essentially all of the pervasive regulation of television broadcasting, including the ownership rules at issue in this proceeding, has been undertaken by the FCC in the exercise of its “public interest” mandate under Title III. But all radio transmissions, including traditional radio and television broadcasting as well as mobile telephony and broadband services, fall under the “public interest” ambit of Title III.<sup>18</sup> The Commission has found that its “broad authority to manage spectrum... in the public interest” gives it authority to regulate the provision of mobile data services,<sup>19</sup> and the courts have upheld that authority.<sup>20</sup> And these decisions make perfect sense. Both digital broadcasting and

---

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

<sup>16</sup> See *Inside the NFL*, VERIZON, <http://www.verizonwireless.com/insiders-guide/inside/nfl/>.

<sup>17</sup> Other media apps pre-installed on Verizon Wireless smartphones include YouTube, Audible, Flipboard, Kindle and Amazon Music.

<sup>18</sup> See 47 U.S.C. §§ 301 *et seq.* It is, of course, possible for a licensee of radiofrequency spectrum that operates as a common carrier to be subject to both Title II and Title III. See, e.g., *Cellco P’ship v. FCC*, 700 F.3d 534, 538 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

<sup>19</sup> See *In the Matter of Reexamination of Roaming Obligations of Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers and Other Providers of Mobile Data Services*, Second Report and Order, 26 FCC Rcd 5411, 5440 (2011) (“*Data Roaming Order*”).

<sup>20</sup> See *Cellco P’ship*, 700 F.3d at 541-42.

wireless data are the same at the most fundamental technical level; both transmit digital data through a series of zeroes and ones.<sup>21</sup>

Reallocation of broadcast spectrum for mobile data services compels the Commission to think outside of the traditional regulatory silos and conform its policies and regulations to what is actually being done with the radio spectrum it regulates. Even if the public interest in a diversity of voices was once so important as to justify limiting each broadcaster's First Amendment rights to speak on one, or at most two, 6 MHz channels in each market, the Commission is compelled to re-assess that judgment when it has determined that the public interest in providing more capacity for wireless data is greater than the public interest in a diversity of voices.<sup>22</sup> This is the case even more so when many flexible use licensees already hold dozens of times more spectrum in every market than any broadcaster is permitted to hold in any market.

The Commission's *Incentive Auction Report and Order* explicitly states that some post-repacking television stations will be on the same spectrum as some 600 MHz flexible use licensees, just with different geographic areas.<sup>23</sup> Within the foreseeable future, then, Title III over-the-air services will soon be operating in the same spectrum bands, transmitting data that is curated by the licensee and rendered as video, but with two completely different sets of ownership or "spectrum" caps.<sup>24</sup> A Title III wireless data licensee will be permitted to hold, and use for television broadcasting, vastly more "scarce" spectrum than a broadcast licensee is permitted to hold.

Whether under constitutional or administrative law, government agencies simply cannot treat similarly situated parties differently.<sup>25</sup> Nor, in this case, does the public interest support it.<sup>26</sup> If the

---

<sup>21</sup> See generally Ericsson White Paper, *LTE Broadcast: A Revenue Enabler in the Mobile Media Era* (February 2013) (available at <http://www.ericsson.com/res/docs/whitepapers/wp-lte-broadcast.pdf>).

<sup>22</sup> See *Incentive Auction Report and Order*, at ¶ 122 (concluding that the statutory requirement that the FCC use "all reasonable efforts" to preserve broadcast coverage and population served during repacking should be tempered by the FCC's overarching goal to make spectrum available for flexible use licensing).

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*, at ¶¶ 82-83.

<sup>24</sup> The Commission's recent prohibition of many sharing agreements that it has previously approved and potential chilling effects of the Commission's proposal to require public filing of any broadcaster sharing agreement will mean that broadcasters will more often than not be limited to 6 MHz.

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g., *United States Railroad Retirement Bd. v. Fritz*, 449 U.S. 166, 180 (1980) (Stevens, J., concurring in judgment) ("when Congress imposes a burden on one group, but leaves unaffected another that is similarly,

Commission wishes to support localism, competition, and diversity, it must put local television broadcasters on the same level ownership regulation playing field as their MVPD and wireless company competitors.<sup>27</sup>

### **THE COMMISSION MAY NOT MAKE OWNERSHIP RULES CONTINGENT ON A BROADCASTER'S CHOICE OF SPEECH**

LIN supports the Commission's finding that it cannot base its ownership decisions on licensee programming choices.<sup>28</sup> Television broadcasters must be permitted to choose the programming they wish to air without government interference, whether it be on the primary or secondary stream. LIN also believes that the Commission should extend the same reasoning to its discussion of "affiliation swaps".<sup>29</sup> The Commission simply should not be in the process of managing broadcast licensee programming choices, just as it is not in the business of managing the programming choices of other Title III services.<sup>30</sup>

In any event, the Commission should view skeptically comments from those who compete with broadcasters contending that the FCC should restrict broadcasters' ability to choose programming. For

---

though not identically, situated, "the Constitution requires something more than merely a "conceivable" or "plausible" explanation for the unequal treatment."); *Melody Music, Inc. v. FCC*, 345 F.2d 730 (D.C. Cir. 1965) (requiring the FCC to explain its reasoning for disparate treatment); *McElroy Elecs. Corp. v. FCC*, 990 F.2d 1351, 1365 (D.C. Cir. 1993) ("We remind the Commission of the importance of treating similarly situated parties alike or providing an adequate justification for disparate treatment"); *In the Matter of Morris Communications, Inc. Request for Waiver of Installment Payment Rules and Reinstatement of 900 MHz SMR Licenses*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 23 FCC Rcd 317944, at ¶ 15 (released February 21, 2008) ("administrative agencies such as the Commission are required to follow their own precedents and . . . once an agency allows exceptions to a rule, it must provide a rational explanation if it later refuses to allow exceptions in cases that appear to be similar"); *In the Matter of Furnishing of Customer Premises Equipment by the Bell Operating Telephone Companies and the Independent Telephone Companies*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 86-79, 1986 FCC LEXIS 3759, at ¶ 2 (released March 28, 1986) ("We believe a fundamental precept of regulation is that similarly situated entities should be treated [similarly]").

<sup>26</sup> As LIN has previously shown, co-ownership of local television broadcast stations better the public interest. See, e.g., Comments of LIN Television Corporation, MB Docket No. 09-182, at 2-3 (filed July 13, 2010) ("co-owned television broadcast combinations . . . can focus financial and other resources on doing what local television stations do best – serving their local communities with local news, information, and entertainment.").

<sup>27</sup> Indeed, the participation of MVPDs in a broadcast ownership proceeding shows how broadcasters compete with MVPDs. MVPDs attempts to keep broadcasters artificially constrained in size or further constrain broadcasters must be seen for what they are: self-serving attempts to handcuff competitors.

<sup>28</sup> *Further Notice*, at ¶¶ 63-64 (agreeing with broadcasters that "the ability to multicast does not justify tightening (or failing to loosen) the local television ownership rule").

<sup>29</sup> In other words, LIN disagrees with the FCC's tentative subjecting of affiliation swaps to the top-four prohibition. *Id.* at ¶ 45.

<sup>30</sup> LIN recognizes that the Commission's other statutorily required or public interest rules may have some incidental effects on broadcast licensee speech, but none come close to the damage on freedom of speech that would be inflicted by the Commission specifically telling broadcast stations that they cannot affiliate with a different broadcast network without the Commission's consent.

example, MVPDs compete with broadcasters for both local advertising dollars (either on their own or through MVPD Joint Sales Agreements a/k/a “interconnects”)<sup>31</sup> and for portions of subscriber fees. Naturally, their commercial interests are best served if broadcasters, which provide a free option to MVPDs, are limited to broadcasting less popular programming. The FCC should not be complicit in the ongoing efforts of MVPDs to degrade the quality and variety of programming that is available to consumers for free, over-the-air, without any subscription payment. Further limitations on broadcasters will simply cause more marquee programming to migrate from free over-the-air television to behind the paywalls of MVPDs and wireless providers. Simply put, the chilling effects of requiring Commission consent to change affiliation or a potential limit on adding new programming to a multicast stream would benefit MVPDs at the expense of the American public. There is a substantial public interest in the continuation of a robust, competitive, free OTA broadcast service.<sup>32</sup>

#### **THE COMMISSION SHOULD START NOW**

While LIN believes that the broadcast ownership rules must be reformed, LIN notes that the current Quadrennial Review is not anticipated to be presented to the Commissioners for a vote until 2016.<sup>33</sup> As it has done before,<sup>34</sup> LIN therefore suggests to the Commission that there may be ways to ameliorate the constraints of the local broadcast television ownership rules while furthering other goals of

---

<sup>31</sup> *Further Notice*, at 220 n.17 (dissenting statement of Commissioner Pai).

<sup>32</sup> *See* Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Pub. L. No. 102-385, at §§ 2(a)(10)-(12), 106 Stat. 1460, 1461 (1992) (“A primary objective and benefit of our Nation’s system of regulation of television broadcasting is the local origination of programming . . . Broadcast television stations continue to be an important source of local news and public affairs programming and other local broadcast services critical to an informed electorate . . . Broadcast television programming is supported by revenues generated from advertising broadcast over stations. Such programming is otherwise free to those who own television sets . . . [t]here is a substantial government interest in promoting the continued availability of such free television programming, especially for viewers who are unable to afford other means of receiving programming”). *See also* Comments of LIN Television Corporation, MB Docket Nos. 09-182 & 07-294, at 20 (filed March 5, 2012) (“any attempt by the FCC to regulate a station’s programming decisions directly – including its choice of network and syndicated programming – would be plainly in conflict with the First Amendment.”).

<sup>33</sup> *Further Notice*, at 220 (dissenting statement of Commissioner Pai).

<sup>34</sup> *See supra* note 7 (citing LIN’s previously filed Notices of Ex Parte Communication).

the Commission, such as the Commission's incentive spectrum auction goals.<sup>35</sup> As noted above, spectrum and ownership are intrinsically intertwined.<sup>36</sup>

### CONCLUSION

LIN hopes that these comments have addressed the “elephant in the room”. The Commission must treat similarly situated entities similarly and must not continue to impede the speech of broadcasters based on rationales such as spectrum scarcity when it does not apply those rationales to other Title III licensees that also engage in speech. The FCC has the ability to address these matters now, and should not wait another four years.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
John K. Hane  
Carly A. Deckelboim  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW  
PITTMAN LLP  
2300 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
*Counsel to LIN Television Corporation*

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Rebecca Duke, V.P. Distribution  
Joshua Pila, Senior Counsel  
LIN TELEVISION CORPORATION  
One West Exchange Street, Suite 5A  
Providence, RI 02903-1058

August 6, 2014

---

<sup>35</sup> LIN has previously suggested that auction participation can be incentivized by ownership relief. *See* LIN Media Notice of Ex Parte Communication, GN Docket No. 12-268, MB Docket Nos. 09-182, 07-294, & 10-71 (filed January 16, 2014) (“ownership relief could be an incentive to channel sharing”).

<sup>36</sup> *See Further Notice*, at ¶ 3, n.4 (“The incentive auction is likely to affect the broadcast television industry in a number of respects”).

Attachment A

---

## WORLD'S FIRST COMPLETE SOLUTION FOR BROADCAST VIDEO OVER LTE NETWORKS

- New end-to-end LTE broadcast solution will revolutionize video delivery in mobile networks and address growing consumer demand for TV Anywhere services
- Enables operators to efficiently launch media services over LTE with Ericsson's unique combination of three new standards: eMBMS, HEVC and MPEG DASH.
- Verizon Wireless to introduce LTE Broadcast for entertainment and sporting events beginning in 2014
- Leading mobile network operator Telstra to commence trials on its live network in 2013

As consumers demand access to their media content on all of their devices, TV and video traffic is set to dominate networks and grow from 40 percent to 90 percent of mobile traffic within the next 3-4 years. The result is increasing pressure on operators to enable their customers to enjoy the TV Anywhere experience, while at the same time managing network costs and efficiency.

Leading network operators are already seeing the potential that LTE brings. With its high speed and capacity, an LTE network can enable the delivery of high-quality video content to anyone, anywhere, anytime, without buffering. To respond to the growing need for video over LTE, Ericsson (NASDAQ: ERIC) is launching an exclusive end-to-end solution.

Ericsson's new LTE broadcast solution lifts the video experience to a new level, offering the highest-quality video content for popular events with guaranteed delivery. It enables operators and their media partners to provide premium services with guaranteed quality and cost-efficient delivery over LTE, bringing with it new sources of revenue.

Parissa Pandkhou, Director – Advanced Solutions, Verizon says “Verizon plans to introduce Ericsson LTE Broadcast to give sports fans a whole new experience while watching a game. We see new opportunities in this technology for sports, concerts and even distance learning and college classes.”

Australian operator Telstra's Executive Director for Networks and Access Technology, Mike Wright confirmed that Telstra will partner with Ericsson on a live network trial of LTE Broadcast technology in the second half of 2013.

“The trial will show how we can improve the delivery of video to customers who want to enjoy the video content on the move. The key for this solution is the greater network efficiency it will provide, ensuring we will be able to meet a critical business imperative of giving our

---

technology savvy customers the services they want. Working closely with a world leading technology company like Ericsson means we can really make a difference.”

Peggy Johnson, Executive Vice President, Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. and President, Global Market Development, says: “We see a clear demand for the efficient delivery of video over mobile networks. To meet these needs, we are excited to be working with Ericsson to offer a cutting-edge solution for high-quality live and non-real-time media services over LTE broadcast-enabled networks.”

Ulf Ewaldsson, Senior Vice President and Chief Technology Officer, Ericsson says: “Ericsson is in a unique position to deliver LTE Broadcast. We are the only vendor that can blend insight on consumer habits, deep mobile networks expertise and twenty years of video compression technology leadership to help operators maximize the revenue opportunity represented by this rapid evolution in media consumption.”

The LTE Broadcast solution consists of three new technology standards:

HEVC (High Efficiency Video Coding) – the new video compression standard promises to half the bandwidth required to transport video content compare to today’s leading implementation of MPEG-4 AVC.

MPEG DASH (Dynamic Adaptive Streaming over HTTP (DASH)) – simplifies and standardizes the adaptive delivery of video to consumer devices, ensuring a better quality of service, greater efficiency and opening opportunities for monetization

eMBMS (Evolved Multimedia Broadcast Multicast Service) – a 3GPP standard that enables mobile networks to offer broadcast/multicast services dynamically to offload issues of popular content in dense consumption scenarios, reducing the cost of service delivery over the radio network and for backhaul.

Ericsson’s ConsumerLab research shows that 67 percent of consumers use mobile devices (tablet, laptop or smartphone) for consumption of TV services. Furthermore the research shows that over 50% of TV consumption on smartphone happens outside of the home (on mobile networks). The new video over LTE solution meets the needs for greater efficiency in the delivery of content to all devices and greater personalization of TV experiences.

Ericsson will showcase the complete solution at Mobile World Congress 2013 in collaboration with Verizon, Telstra and Qualcomm. Please visit us at Ericsson booth in Hall 2, Mobile World Congress 2013 in Barcelona, Feb 25 – 28, 2013. More information about Ericsson activities at the event can be found here: <http://www.ericsson.com/mwc2013/>



---

NOTES TO EDITORS

During Mobile World Congress 2013 in Barcelona, Ericsson showcases its combined technology and services leadership for the Information and Communications Technology industry. Our solutions deliver superior network performance in the field, enable complete customer experience management, simplify and automate operations workflows thereby leading to operational excellence. We show how the Networked Society comes to life - what it will mean for the industry and how it will enable our customers to capture growth opportunities.

Verizon Wireless: LTE Broadcast Means the Best Seats in the House

<http://news.verizonwireless.com/news/2013/01/ericsson-4G-LTE-broadcast.html>

Verizon Wireless: The Next Big Thing: LTE Broadcast

<http://news.verizonwireless.com/news/2013/01/verizon-wireless-4G-LTE-broadcast.html>

Ericsson demonstrates Broadcast Video/TV over LTE (Feb, 2012)

<http://www.ericsson.com/thecompany/press/releases/2012/02/1589080>

[Ericsson announces world's first HEVC encoder for live TV delivery to mobile devices \(August, 2012\)](#)

White Paper <http://www.ericsson.com/res/docs/whitepapers/wp-lte-broadcast.pdf>

Press Backgrounder

<http://www.ericsson.com/res/thecompany/docs/press/backgrounders/lte-broadcast-press-backgrounder.pdf>

Video [http://www.ericsson.com/news/130222-lte-broadcast-a-revenue-enabler-for-premium-media-content\\_244129229\\_c](http://www.ericsson.com/news/130222-lte-broadcast-a-revenue-enabler-for-premium-media-content_244129229_c)

Download high-resolution photos and broadcast-quality video at [www.ericsson.com/press](http://www.ericsson.com/press)

*Ericsson is the world's leading provider of communications technology and services. We are enabling the Networked Society with efficient real-time solutions that allow us all to study, work and live our lives more freely, in sustainable societies around the world.*

*Our offering comprises services, software and infrastructure within Information and Communications Technology for telecom operators and other industries. Today more than 40 percent of the world's mobile traffic goes through Ericsson networks and we support customers' networks servicing more than 2.5 billion subscribers.*

*We operate in 180 countries and employ more than 100,000 people. Founded in 1876, Ericsson is headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden. In 2011 the company's net sales were SEK 226.9 billion (USD 35.0 billion). Ericsson is listed on NASDAQ OMX, Stockholm and NASDAQ, New York stock exchanges.*

PRESS RELEASE  
FEBRUARY 25, 2013



---

[www.ericsson.com](http://www.ericsson.com)  
[www.twitter.com/ericssonpress](http://www.twitter.com/ericssonpress)  
[www.facebook.com/ericsson](http://www.facebook.com/ericsson)  
[www.youtube.com/ericssonpress](http://www.youtube.com/ericssonpress)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT

Ericsson Corporate Communication and PR  
Phone: +46 10 719 69 92  
E-mail: [media.relations@ericsson.com](mailto:media.relations@ericsson.com)

Ericsson Investor Relations  
Phone: +46 10 719 00 00  
E-mail: [investor.relations@ericsson.com](mailto:investor.relations@ericsson.com)