

Tamara Preiss  
Vice President  
Federal Regulatory Affairs



June 1, 2011

1300 I Street, NW, Suite 400 West  
Washington, DC 20005

Phone 202 515-2540  
Fax 202 336-7922  
tamara.preiss@verizon.com

**Ex Parte**

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission's Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules, ET Docket No. 10-236; 2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations – Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology (OET), ET Docket No. 06-105**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Yesterday, Richard Harvey of Verizon, Michael Samssock of Verizon Wireless, Sean Haynberg of VComm, and the undersigned met with Geraldine Matise, James Burtle, Rodney Small, and James Miller of the Office of Engineering & Technology to discuss the November 30, 2010 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the above-captioned proceedings. We explained that CMRS spectrum is ill-suited for the research program experimental licenses proposed in the NPRM and that experimental applicants must coordinate with and seek consent from CMRS licensees in order to protect commercial wireless services from harmful interference. The attached presentation was distributed at the meeting.

This letter is being filed electronically pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's Rules. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tamara Preiss".

Attachment

cc: (via e-mail)  
Geraldine Matise  
James Burtle  
Rodney Small  
James Miller



# Research Program Experimental Radio Licenses and CMRS Spectrum

Sean Haynberg – Director RF Technologies

May 31, 2011

# Overview

- Proposed Program Experimental Licenses
- Research Program Experimental Licenses are Ill-Suited for CMRS Spectrum
- Coordination and Consent are Critical
- Power Flux Density Limits Will Not Protect CMRS
- Suitable Bands for Radio Experimentation
- Market Trials of Experimental Equipment
- Summary

# Proposed Program Experimental Licenses

- NPRM proposes new types of experimental radio licenses
  - Research Program Experimental Radio Licenses – for Universities and Medical Facilities
  - Innovative Zone Program Experimental Radio Licenses – for unused spectrum bands
- Herein, we address the Research Program Experimental Radio Licenses and applicability in CMRS bands
  - We do not address the Innovative Zone Program Experimental License, or the conventional experimental license authorizations

# Research Program Experimental Licenses are Ill-Suited for CMRS Spectrum

- CMRS spectrum is intensely used, has high mobility users, continuous changing network technologies and very sensitive to external interference – *not suitable for conducting unproven radio experiments by third parties* – would result in harmful interference to existing and future CMRS services.
  - CMRS spectrum use is intense, pervasive, and growing year after year – CTIA Wireless year-end survey for December 2010:
    - 300 Million Users (96% Penetration), 2 Trillion Minutes, 2 Trillion Messages
    - 200 Billion MBytes, Data Traffic Growth Doubling Year after Year
      - Projected Data Traffic Growth ~ factor of 35 times (2009 to 2014)
    - 253,000 Cell Sites, Capital Investment \$25 Billion per year
    - Picocells, Distributed Antenna Systems (DAS), Signal Booster Systems
- CMRS provides critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services that must be protected from harmful interference.
  - Public Safety uses CMRS voice and broadband data communications
  - Priority Access Services (PAS) for federal, state & local agencies (Part 64.402)
  - E911 location system is very sensitive to interference – require reception of multiple CMRS signals at very low levels to locate emergency E911 callers

# Research Program Experimental Licenses are Ill-Suited for CMRS Spectrum

- Universities and Health Care facilities located in urban areas – potential to impact a significant number of CMRS users
  - College dormitory residences rely upon CMRS as only source of voice service, and broadband data service – standard landline telephones rarely used by college students
  - Health Care facilities rely upon CMRS services for patient care – including doctors, nurses, staff, visitors and patients for emergencies
  - E911 and other public safety uses
- Such environments are not suitable for third party experimentation – intensely used critical licensed bands with mobile users
  - Would result in harmful interference to critical CMRS & E911 services
  - Third party program experimental licenses not appropriate, particularly 5 year terms

# Coordination and Consent are Critical

- Coordination and licensee consent are necessary to protect CMRS from harmful interference
  - Commenting parties agree: CTIA, Qualcomm, Motorola, AT&T, Verizon, SIA, APCO, TIA, and WCIA
  - The experimental applicant and CMRS licensees must work together to ensure incumbent services are protected
    - Experimental applicant has to provide detail coordination information for licensee evaluation
    - Experimental applicant cannot determine extent of harmful interference that would occur, does not have sufficient information
    - Incumbent licensees do not have information on experiment plans & equipment
- Coordination and consent must be ongoing
  - CMRS makes frequent changes in technologies, system configurations, new cells, devices & services, migration over time
    - CDMA, EVDO, GSM, EDGE, UMTS, HSPA, LTE have different radio characteristics, bandwidths, frequencies, and sensitivities to interference
  - Experiments also changing over testing periods
  - Entire environment is dynamic, many changes over time, many unknowns, need to be cautious
- CMRS services in adjacent bands and markets also require protection
  - Experimental applicant must provide coordination information
  - Interference due to out-of-band emissions & receiver overload impacts adjacent band CMRS devices and base stations (i.e. near-far interference)
  - Interference beyond the experimental test areas impacts adjacent CMRS markets

# Coordination and Consent are Critical

- Notification process needs to be open ended
  - Many unknowns – experiments use new & unproven air-interfaces, not well defined, not FCC type certified, not always compliant to standards – nature of experiment may be classified, proprietary, not entirely shared
  - Time to consult with system suppliers, allocate resources, analyze
  - May need to revise experiments to avoid interference
  - 30 days is the *minimum* requirement, other cases longer
  - Licensee consent is required in all cases
- Only practical way to avoid interference would require
  - Perform experiments in off-hour periods with lowest usage on network
  - Remove specific channels from service
  - Actively monitor system & services for signs of interference
  - Cease experiments immediately if interference occurs
  - Revise experiments to avoid interference, reassess ongoing
- Experiments in CMRS bands require significant ongoing coordination, evaluation, and consent – *represents a significant burden and distraction for incumbent licensees* – their engineering resources are required to operate, maintain and optimize their networks, and advance new technologies like LTE
  - Experiments should be limited in scope, area and time to minimize distractions to licensees and prevent interference to CMRS services

# Power Flux Density Limits Will Not Protect CMRS

- Power flux density (PFD) limits will not protect existing & future services, will increase noise & interference levels in CMRS bands
  - Any increase in interference will disrupt CMRS and E911 services
  - CMRS operates at very low signal & noise levels
    - Advanced power control (1/1000 sec), signal processing techniques, MIMO antenna systems, low noise receivers – operate at low levels to optimize spectrum utilization
  - E911 location signals operate at very low levels – require reception of multiple signals at very low levels for the system to locate emergency E911 callers
    - CMRS E911 location systems use network based and handset based systems that receive and triangulate multiple weak signals from distant users for location
- Part 15 limits are not sufficient to protect CMRS and public safety services from harmful interference
  - Used for worst case, incidental, non-intentional radiation – actual levels normally much lower – not appropriate for intended signals to operate
  - Part 15 limits permit -79 dBm/MHz (Cell 800MHz) and -89 dBm/MHz (PCS 1950MHz) for Class B (residential) limits. Class A (commercial) limits permit even higher levels.
  - CMRS signals operate well *below* these Part 15 levels and would be overpowered (i.e. CDMA signals received at -100 dBm/MHz)
- PFD limits will not protect CMRS from harmful interference – must rely on licensee consent for experiments in CMRS bands

# Suitable Bands for Radio Experimentation

- Radio experimentation is more suitable in unlicensed, shared licensed, or unused spectrum bands
  - These bands are unused or have some expectation of interference potential. Will not interfere with existing licensed services.
  - Radio experimentation involves new & unproven concepts, should occur in bands with non-critical services.

## Suitable Bands for Radio Experimentation

- Unlicensed 2.4 GHz, 5.8 GHz & 900 MHz bands – used by Universities for research & experiments
- Shared licensed 3.6 GHz band
- Point-to-point fixed services in unlicensed & unused licensed bands
- TV white-space spectrum available in VHF & UHF bands
- Unused bands above 38 GHz – high frequency reduces interference range
- Unused and non-auctioned bands (i.e. designated for Innovation Zones)

# Market Trials of Experimental Equipment

- Marketing Trials represent significant expansion of radio experimentation
  - Enforcement and control of potentially thousands of experimental devices
  - Should not be authorized to third parties without an agreement with licensee
  - Licensees need to manage use of spectrum and trial devices – to prevent harmful interference to existing services
- Marketing Trials require the following to avoid interference to CMRS:
  - Coordination & notification to adjacent bands & market CMRS licensees – minimum of 30 day prior notification
  - Limited in operation, scope, area, and duration to manage experimental devices
  - Maintain positive control of all experimental devices – ability to remotely shut down transmitters
  - Maintain central point of contact – immediately cease transmissions causing harmful interference
  - Tamper resistant radio devices – cannot be modified or hacked in ways causing interference to existing licensed services
  - Equipment type certification is not required, but should meet all FCC operational limits including power, emission, field strength
  - CMRS services in adjacent bands and markets also require protection
  - Upon completion of trial, enforcement and removal of all radio devices is required to clear the spectrum

# Summary

- CMRS spectrum is intensely used, has high mobility users, not suitable for unproven radio experiments, which would result in harmful interference to existing CMRS services. CMRS bands provide critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services that must be protected from harmful interference.
- Therefore, the Commission should not authorize Research Program Experimental Licenses or Market Trials to third parties in licensed CMRS spectrum.
- Coordination and consent from incumbent licensees is critical to ensure existing services are protected from interference. Also, coordination with adjacent band and market CMRS licensees is required.
- PFD limits will not protect CMRS services from harmful interference – experiments will increase noise and interference levels in CMRS bands
- The Commission should consider other bands more suitable for researching, testing, and developing new and unproven technologies, which will not interfere with existing licensed services.



V-COMM is a leading provider of quality engineering and engineering consulting services to the worldwide wireless telecommunications industry with offices in Cranbury, NJ and Blue Bell, PA. V-COMM's engineering staff is experienced in Cellular, Personal Communications Services (PCS), Wireless Broadband Data, Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio (ESMR), Paging, 2-Way radio, Microwave, and Broadcast Mobile TV networks. We have provided our expertise to wireless operators in engineering, system design, implementation, performance, optimization, and evaluation of new wireless technologies.

We have extensive experience in analyzing interference in various spectrum bands including Cellular, SMR, PCS, AWS, Air-to-ground, Public Safety, and 700 MHz spectrum. We have engineering experience in all commercial wireless technologies, including LTE, HSPA, UMTS, EVDO, CDMA, GSM, WiMAX, DVB-H, and Public Safety wireless technologies including analog and digital Project 25, EDACS, Opensky, and other trunking and conventional radio networks. Further, V-COMM was selected by the FCC & Department of Justice to provide expert analysis and testimony in the Nextwave and Pocket Communications Bankruptcy cases.

For additional information, visit V-COMM's web site at [www.vcomm-eng.com](http://www.vcomm-eng.com).

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission’s Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules	)	ET Docket No. 10-236
	)	
2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations – Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology (OET)	)	ET Docket No. 06-105
	)	

**COMMENTS OF V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Sean Haynberg  
Director of RF Technologies

David Hunt  
Senior Staff RF Engineer

David Stern  
Vice President

Dominic Villecco  
President

V-COMM, L.L.C.  
2540 US Highway 130, Suite 101  
Cranbury, NJ 08512  
(609) 655-1200

March 10, 2011

## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY, RESEARCH &amp; HEALTH CARE EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES..</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>SPECTRUM BANDS SUITABLE FOR RADIO EXPERIMENTATION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>INNOVATION ZONE EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>MARKET TRIALS OF EXPERIMENTAL EQUIPMENT.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>THIRD PARTY EXPERIMENTS IN CMRS SPECTRUM WILL DIMINISH CMRS QUALITY OF SERVICE AND INNOVATIONS OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>ANECHOIC CHAMBERS, FARADAY CAGES, AND OPEN AREA TEST SITES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A – COMPANY INFORMATION &amp; BIOGRAPHIES.....</b>	<b>22</b>

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission’s Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules	)	ET Docket No. 10-236
	)	
2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations – Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology (OET)	)	ET Docket No. 06-105
	)	

**COMMENTS OF V-COMM, L.L.C**

V-COMM, L.L.C. (V-COMM)<sup>1</sup> submits comments in response to the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in the above-captioned proceeding.<sup>2</sup>

**I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

The NPRM seeks comments on enhancing the development of innovative and new technologies by expanding the scope of its radio spectrum experimental licensing program pursuant to Part 5 of its rules. V-COMM herein comments on the use of Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) spectrum bands (i.e. Cellular, PCS, AWS, SMR, 700MHz bands, etc.)

---

<sup>1</sup> V-COMM, L.L.C. is a wireless telecommunications consulting company with principal members having over 29 years experience in the wireless industry. We have provided our expertise to wireless operators in RF engineering, system design, implementation, performance, optimization, and evaluation of new wireless technologies. We have extensive industry experience in all CMRS technologies. V-COMM’s company information and experiences are highlighted in this report’s Appendix A, along with biographies of senior members of its engineering team. Verizon Wireless retained V-COMM to evaluate the proposals in the NPRM and their potential impact on wireless networks.

<sup>2</sup> *Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission’s Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, ET Docket No. 10-236 (released November 30, 2010) (“NPRM”).

for radio experimentation and market trials pursuant the proposals outlined in the NPRM. V-COMM also provided comments in the FCC's Dynamic Spectrum Use Technologies Notice of Inquiry (NOI) proceeding,<sup>3</sup> as an attachment to comments submitted by Verizon Wireless on February 28, 2011. Therein, we provided reasons that opportunistic underlay spectrum sharing technologies are not compatible with and will cause harmful interference to existing licensed CMRS services.

V-COMM is an independent engineering firm with extensive experience in CMRS technologies and systems. We have significant experience in CMRS and Public Safety network design and deployments, engineering networks for high performance, optimizing spectrum efficiency, and evaluating new wireless technologies. V-COMM has conducted extensive interference and compatibility studies within CMRS networks,<sup>4</sup> performed noise and interference studies in CMRS spectrum bands,<sup>5</sup> and participated in numerous FCC proceedings with comprehensive engineering reports.<sup>6</sup>

For reasons provided herein, expanded opportunities as proposed in the NPRM for radio experimentation and market trials in licensed CMRS spectrum should not be authorized to third

---

<sup>3</sup> *Promoting More Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Dynamic Spectrum Use Technologies*, Notice of Inquiry, ET Docket No. 10-237 (released November 30, 2010) ("*NOI*").

<sup>4</sup> V-COMM has conducted extensive compatibility and interference studies within AT&T Wireless' and Verizon Wireless' networks including interference testing of spectrum-sharing technologies and trials within CMRS spectrum.

<sup>5</sup> V-COMM has conducted spectrum noise and interference measurements within Verizon Wireless and AT&T Wireless' CMRS networks. V-COMM submitted the "AMPS Noise Floor Study" within the FCC's AirCell spectrum-sharing proceeding (ET 02-86) on April 10, 2003, and the "PCS Noise Floor Study" within the FCC's Spectrum Policy Task Force Report proceeding (ET 02-135) on Sept. 16, 2003. These spectrum noise studies were also provided as Attachment B and Attachment C to Comments filed by V-COMM in the FCC's Interference Temperature (ET 03-237) comment proceeding on April 5, 2004.

<sup>6</sup> V-COMM has participated in numerous FCC proceedings with comprehensive engineering reports including experimental AirCell, Cellular Airborne, Spectrum Policy Task Force, Ultra-wide band, Interference Temperature, Cognitive Radio, PCS H-Block, AWS-III Block, and Low Power Auxiliary Stations, Wireless Microphones in 698-806 MHz band proceedings.

parties. Licensed CMRS spectrum is not suitable and not compatible with third party experimental uses. Further, universities, research organizations, and health care facilities should not utilize licensed CMRS spectrum to conduct unproven radio experiments or market trials. CMRS spectrum bands are intensely utilized, have highly mobile users, and are not suitable for radio experimentation and market trials which would result in harmful interference to existing CMRS services. In addition, CMRS bands provide critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services that must be fully protected from harmful interference.

Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses should only be authorized in non-auctioned and unlicensed spectrum that will not cause harmful interference to existing licensed services.<sup>7</sup> Coordination with adjacent market and adjacent band CMRS licensees should be required prior to authorizations. Harmful interference to CMRS services must be assessed and avoided in adjacent markets and adjacent bands.

CMRS licensees have limited engineering staff that are not capable of investigating and addressing third party experiments in their licensed bands. Such a distraction will diminish the quality of service of CMRS networks and slow the rate of innovation of new CMRS technologies including LTE.<sup>8</sup> The Commission should consider other bands more suitable for researching, testing, and developing new and unproven technologies, which will not interfere with existing licensed services.

Experiments performed inside anechoic chambers and faraday cages should not require experimental licenses, however open area test sites should continue to require them. FCC rules

---

<sup>7</sup> Non-auctioned spectrum is spectrum that has not been auctioned to a licensed entity. Unlicensed spectrum is defined pursuant to FCC Part 15 rules.

<sup>8</sup> LTE (Long Term Evolution) is a 4th generation wireless technology that is being deployed by wireless operators and under continued development with new releases and enhanced functionality.

should require sufficient shielding and isolation to prevent signals leaking outside these facilities and causing harmful interference to existing services in licensed spectrum bands.

## **II. UNIVERSITY, RESEARCH & HEALTH CARE EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES**

University, research and health care experimental licenses should be grouped together within FCC rules, and have the same regulations apply to each of them, as they represent the same issues that can impact incumbent spectrum licensees and users. Accordingly, we address them collectively as a group in this section.

Universities, research organizations, and health care facilities should not utilize licensed CMRS spectrum to conduct unproven radio experiments, which can result in harmful interference to incumbent CMRS services. CMRS spectrum is intensely utilized, has highly mobile users, ubiquitous coverage, and is very sensitive to external system interference. Thus, licensed CMRS spectrum bands are not suitable for conducting radio experiments. Rather, other bands that are more suitable should be considered for such radio experimentation as noted in Section III below.

Universities and health care facilities use and rely on CMRS services, which can receive interference from radio experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum. College dormitory residents use CMRS service as their only source of voice communications, and CMRS broadband data service as well, while standard landline telephones are rarely used by college dormitory residents. Health care providers rely on CMRS services for patient care -- including doctors, nurses, staff, visitors, and patients for emergencies. All of these users could be interfered with by radio experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum. Further, many universities and health care facilities are in urban areas and/or adjacent to major highways where there is additional concern

over harmful interference to CMRS users operating just outside these facilities. Therefore, licensed CMRS spectrum bands should not be used for radio experimentation that can result in harmful interference to these incumbent CMRS users.

In addition, such third party radio experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum can interfere with critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services provided within CMRS spectrum. Federal, state and local public safety agencies are able to use Priority Access Services (PAS) in CMRS spectrum pursuant to Part 64.402 rules to assist first responders during national emergencies. Public safety agencies use CMRS voice services to supplement their voice communications needs, critical broadband data communications for in-vehicle mobile data terminals, and CMRS smartphones to enhance efficiency and productivity for our nation's first responders.<sup>9</sup> The NPRM requests comments whether there can be alternate means to accomplish E911 and other emergency services during radio experiments in CMRS spectrum. V-COMM does not believe that there any alternate methods to accomplish and replace E911 and other emergency services in CMRS spectrum.

Further, CMRS networks and technologies are not compatible with third party uses operating in and sharing licensed CMRS spectrum, which will result in harmful interference and lower quality CMRS services. CMRS networks and technologies will be affected by third party radio experiments conducted within its licensed spectrum bands. CMRS networks can experience losses in system capacity, reduced data throughputs, disruptions, and poor quality of service when third party experiments increase noise and interference levels within licensed CMRS spectrum. For example, LTE networks dynamically manage use of resource blocks within spectrum, GSM networks use interference detection on call assignment and handoff, and

---

<sup>9</sup> Source: Public Safety IT, Jan/Feb 2011, Page 1.

CDMA networks use forward and reverse-link noise level thresholds for call assignment and loading balancing. This results in CMRS networks avoiding the use of these channels and resource blocks of spectrum for periods of time when the radio experiments are affecting the licensed CMRS spectrum bands.

For reasons provided above, third party radio experiments should not be authorized in licensed CMRS spectrum, which can result in harmful interference to incumbent licensed users. Such radio experiments should be conducted in either: i.) other spectrum bands that are more suitable for radio experimentation (i.e. unlicensed or lightly used fixed services bands); ii.) within established Innovation Zone Experimental License areas with non-auctioned or unlicensed spectrum; or iii.) inside anechoic chambers or shielded rooms (Faraday Cages). The use of these spectrum bands and locations can prevent harmful interference to existing CMRS services.

Further, experimental licenses should not be authorized in licensed CMRS spectrum bands because they would not be able to measure or monitor any interference caused to actual CMRS users within the testing area. For testing of opportunistic dynamic spectrum use technologies, all experiments should utilize simulated base stations and simulated users on other spectrum bands. In addition to preventing interference to actual licensed users, testing with simulated test users has the benefit of making tests more scientific and providing more information because the simulated users can be directly monitored during tests. This will provide valuable information and understanding of the experimental testing without impacting incumbent spectrum users.

Coordination and notification to CMRS licensees operating on adjacent bands and adjacent markets should be required for all radio experiments and testing activities by

universities, research organizations, and health care facilities. This is to address the potential interference from out-of-band emissions and propagation of interference beyond the experimental test facilities. Interference must be assessed and avoided to licensed CMRS services operating in adjacent markets and adjacent bands. These experimental licenses should be required to perform the following coordination and notification to adjacent band and adjacent market CMRS licensees.

- 1.) Coordination Requirements – Experimental licenses must coordinate with CMRS licensees operating on adjacent bands and adjacent markets for all testing experiments. Sufficient information must be provided to adjacent band and market licensees so they may understand the nature of the tests, radio equipment involved, requested timelines, detailed locations of transmitting antennas, indoor and outdoor operations, transmitting ERP levels, carrier frequencies & bandwidths, and how disruptions to the CMRS network will be avoided. Proofs of non-interference to adjacent markets and adjacent bands should be provided prior to and upon completion of testing experiments. The Experimental license must maintain a central point of contact (POC) to coordinate all test activities with the CMRS licensees, and be able to cease all transmissions in cases of interference to CMRS users.
- 2.) Notification Requirements – Experiments conducted on adjacent bands and adjacent markets should provide advance notice to CMRS licensees of a minimum of 30 days. Longer notification periods may be required depending on the nature of the planned testing activities, to understand the testing activities and assess the impact to the CMRS network, to resolve any test activities that can cause interference to CMRS services, and in cases that require the CMRS equipment manufacturer to be consulted

for questions and compatibility issues. In some cases, non-disclosure agreements may be required to protect sensitive information and/or proprietary technology. The notification and coordination process must be open ended to allow the CMRS licensee time to address any issue they may have. Notifications should also be made in a FCC web-based reporting system, which supports electronic notification to CMRS licensees operating on adjacent bands and adjacent markets with respect to the testing experiments.

As stated above, adjacent channel, adjacent band, and out-of-band emissions can cause harmful interference to existing CMRS services in other CMRS bands. Some CMRS bands are adjacent to and/or intermixed with Public Safety spectrum bands, which can receive interference from radio experiments operating in adjacent bands and adjacent markets. In conjunction with adjacent band assessments, the near-far interference issue should be analyzed to ensure receiver overload and desensitization will not occur to existing services. This is required to protect CMRS device and base station receivers from experiments transmitting on adjacent bands that can overload and desensitize nearby CMRS receivers.

Proof of non-interference to adjacent bands and adjacent markets should be provided prior to and upon completion of testing experiments. Particular attention should be made regarding the uplink and downlink spectrum uses and FDD vs. TDD operations within intended and adjacent bands to confirm that harmful interference will not be caused to licensed CMRS services operating in these bands.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> FDD and TDD terms are defined as Frequency Division Duplexing and Time Division Duplexing. FDD operation is where the transmitter and receiver operate at different carrier frequencies for uplink and downlink communications, and TDD operation is where the transmitter and receiver are operating on the same carrier frequency for uplink and downlink communications.

Minimum frequency offsets (i.e. guard bands) to avoid adjacent channel, adjacent band, and out-of-band emission interference should be studied on a case by case basis before authorizing experimental licenses.<sup>11</sup> Compliance to FCC limits for power, field strength and emissions will not be sufficient to fully protect incumbent CMRS services. CMRS licensees achieve protection through coordination with adjacent band operators and complying with industry standards to fully protect existing and future services from adjacent band and out-of-band emissions interference.

Although they are not subject to equipment type certification, all experimental radio equipment should comply with applicable FCC rules for the intended bands of operation. This includes power limits, emission limits, power flux density limits, field strength limits, and RF safety limits. Any non-compliant radio equipment should be required to obtain specific waivers for experimental operation. Proof of compliance documentation should be provided to potentially affected licensees upon request.

A central point of contact (POC) should be required for experimental licenses to coordinate and document all testing activities planned and completed, and to maintain positive control of all test transmitters used in experiments. Upon notification or identification of harmful interference to existing CMRS users, experiments must cease all transmissions immediately and not resume testing until such interference is resolved.

Experimental licenses should be required to submit reports prior to and upon completion of tests and experiments, in addition to annual progress and findings reports. Reports should be submitted in a FCC web-based reporting system, which supports electronic notification to CMRS licensees in adjacent bands and adjacent markets to the experimental licenses. Reports should

---

<sup>11</sup> The FCC requested comments on the minimum frequency offsets to prevent adjacent channel

contain sufficient detail to understand the nature and objectives of the experiment, the frequency bands utilized, radio equipment setup, operating characteristics, transmitted power levels, antenna information, detailed location of transmitters, indoor and outdoor operations, dates, times and duration of testing experiments planned and conducted. Proofs of non-interference to licensed CMRS services should be included in the report documentation.

In response to the NPRM's request for comments on setting power flux densities (PFD) to facilitate radio experiments,<sup>12</sup> V-COMM does not believe there is a threshold for additional noise and interference levels from third party experiments in CMRS spectrum that will not interfere with CMRS spectrum uses and services. Any increases in the noise and interference level will result in disruptions to CMRS services and E911 services. CMRS systems operate at very low signal and noise levels to optimize CMRS spectrum utilization and efficiency. CMRS features such as advanced dynamic power control algorithms adjusting links to the minimum power necessary a thousand times a second, advanced signal combining and processing techniques, advanced MIMO antenna systems using multiple signal path inputs and outputs, lower power base stations, and low noise receivers all contribute to very low operating signal and noise levels within CMRS spectrum. Given this, CMRS technologies are very sensitive to external system noise and interference and there are no additional noise and interference levels that are acceptable.

E911 signals also operate at very low signal levels, which require reception at multiple CMRS base stations for E911 caller location determination. GSM networks use TDOA network based triangulation methods receiving weak mobile signals from individual mobiles at multiple base stations to locate E911 callers. CDMA & UMTS networks use AGPS based handset and

---

interference in the NOI at ¶ 21.

hybrid E911 location systems that transmit signals within CMRS uplink and downlink bands to locate E911 callers.

Body-worn medical devices transmitting in licensed CMRS spectrum bands should be tested and confined within locations inside the medical facility receiving the experimental license, while limiting use outside the medical facility to prevent interference to existing CMRS services.

### **III. SPECTRUM BANDS SUITABLE FOR RADIO EXPERIMENTATION**

Spectrum bands that are suitable for radio experimentation, which will not result in harmful interference to existing licensed services, include the following bands. These bands are suitable for researching, testing, developing and market trials of new technologies, and they are particularly suitable for the development of new opportunistic dynamic spectrum use technologies.

- Unlicensed spectrum bands 2.4 GHz, 5.8 GHz and 900 MHz and the shared licensed 3.6 GHz band offer opportunities for radio spectrum experimentation. These unlicensed and shared licensed bands should provide good test beds for conducting radio experiments with new technologies.
- Certain locations with unlicensed or unused spectrum in microwave point-to-point bands that use fixed location stations.
- White space devices in certain markets using available channels in broadcast UHF TV spectrum on a low power basis with updated geolocation databases.

---

<sup>12</sup> NPRM at ¶ 22.

- Certain bands with very light usage above 38 GHz, which has the advantage of reduced interference ranges due to the higher frequency band operation.
- Potential experiments in spectrum bands that are used very infrequently, not used at certain times of the day, or not used in certain areas of the country. These can be considered for Innovation Zone experiments.

Licensed CMRS bands with high mobility, high spectrum utilization, and continuously changing network technologies are not suitable for radio experimentation or underlay spectrum sharing, which would result in harmful interference to existing and future CMRS services. In addition, CMRS bands are not suitable for unproven radio experimentation because they provide critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services.

#### **IV. INNOVATION ZONE EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES**

Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses should be designated for non-auctioned or unlicensed spectrum bands only, and must not cause harmful interference to existing licensed services in adjacent bands and adjacent markets. Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses should never be authorized to conduct radio experiments in active licensed CMRS spectrum bands, which can cause harmful interference to existing CMRS services including critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services. In addition to being restricted to non-auctioned and unlicensed spectrum, Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses should be located in remote areas and/or performed indoors to gain additional isolation and minimize the risk of interference to existing licensed services operating on adjacent bands and in adjacent markets.

The FCC's Office of Engineering and Technology (OET) should pre-establish and identify specific bands authorized for use within the Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses.

The FCC OET can confirm the availability of specific bands within the Innovation Zones including confirmation whether specific bands are either non-auctioned, licensed, operating pursuant to Special Temporary Authorities (STA) or other authorizations.

Existing Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses in spectrum bands that become auctioned to licensed entities should be subject to discontinuance. As licensees begin to utilize their spectrum for pre-market testing, customer trials, deployment of commercial service, or subleasing of spectrum for other uses, the Innovation Zone Experimental License must be immediately terminated (unless temporary authorization is provided by the licensee).

Coordination with the adjacent market and adjacent band CMRS licensees should be required prior to authorizations. Interference must be assessed and avoided to licensed CMRS services operating in adjacent markets and adjacent bands. Proofs of non-interference with adjacent market and adjacent band CMRS licensees should be analyzed and submitted with Applications for Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses.

Interference studies should consider the impact to incumbent licensed services and the compatibility with licensed operations on uplink and downlink spectrum bands and FDD vs. TDD operation in the intended and adjacent bands to confirm that harmful interference will not be caused to existing CMRS services. Interference studies should also consider the potential effects of long distance propagation (i.e. enhanced Tropospheric propagation, RF ducting, and propagation over water) particularly for outdoor transmitters at high elevations that can interfere with licensed services in distant markets within the U.S. and over international borders. In some cases, long distance propagation can extend the range of interference to licensed services operating in distant markets hundreds of kilometers away.

Coordination and notification to CMRS licensees operating on adjacent bands and adjacent markets should be required for all radio experiments and testing activities. Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses should be required to perform the same Coordination and Notification Requirements specified above in Section II.

Experimental licenses should also comply with FCC rules for frequency coordination to adjacent CMRS markets for the specific CMRS bands utilized in the experiments. For example, in cellular spectrum the FCC Rule § 22.907 requires "Licensees in the Cellular Radiotelephone Service must coordinate with the appropriate parties channel usage at each transmitter location within 121 kilometers (75 miles) of any transmitter locations authorized to other licensees or proposed by tentative selectees or other applicants, except those with mutually exclusive applications." Other CMRS spectrum bands have similar coordination requirements when operating base stations at high power levels in rural areas.

Innovation Zone Experimental Licenses must maintain a central point of contact and positive control of all radio devices and equipment operating within the Innovation Zone authorized areas. If harmful interference is identified to an incumbent licensed service during the radio experiments, the point of contact must control all experimental devices and cease all transmissions within the Innovation Zone areas until such interference is resolved.

Experimental licenses should be required to submit reports prior to and upon completion of testing experiments, in addition to annual progress and findings reports. Reports should be submitted in a FCC web-based reporting system, which supports electronic notification to CMRS licensees in adjacent bands and adjacent markets respect to the experimental licenses. Reports should contain sufficient detail to understand the nature and objectives of the experiment, the frequency bands utilized, radio equipment setup, operating characteristics, transmitted power

levels, antenna information, detailed location of transmitters, indoor and outdoor operations, dates, times and duration of testing experiments planned and conducted. Proofs of non-interference to licensed CMRS services should be included in the report documentation. The sharing of experimental licenses' report findings will benefit other researchers and enhance innovations of new technologies.

Although they are not subject to equipment type certification, all experimental radio equipment should comply with applicable FCC rules for the intended bands of operation. This includes power limits, emission limits, power flux density limits, field strength limits, and RF safety limits. Any non-compliant radio equipment should be required to obtain specific waivers for experimental operation. Proof of compliance documentation should be provided upon request.

## **V. MARKET TRIALS OF EXPERIMENTAL EQUIPMENT**

The comments and proposed rules outlined in the above section for University, Research & Health Care Experimental Licenses equally apply to Market Trials experimental authorizations. Market trials in licensed CMRS spectrum should not be authorized to third parties absent an agreement from the CMRS licensee due to the additional complexity and potential interference from thousands of devices used in market trials. Market trials in licensed CMRS spectrum should be managed by CMRS licensees, which are able to manage the use of their spectrum and prevent harmful interference to incumbent CMRS users. In addition, due to the extent and enforcement of potentially thousands of experimental market trial devices operating in licensed spectrum we recommend the following additional requirements for third party market trials of experimental equipment to protect existing CMRS services operating in adjacent bands and adjacent markets.

The authorized party must have the ability to retrieve and remove all experimental radio devices operating during and upon completion of the marketing trials. They must have the ability to maintain positive control and enforcement of all devices participating in Market Trials. This is a requirement to resolve any incidences of harmful interference occurring to existing licensed users during the marketing trial, and upon completion of the marketing trial to remove the trial devices from the market to clear the spectrum.

All of the experimental equipment and devices operating in Market Trials should be capable of control functions such as "remote kill", periodic "keep alive", and other capabilities to manage and render experimental devices inoperable as required during and upon completion of the market trials. Further, the radio portion of the trial devices should be designed to be tamper resistant, and not capable of being hacked or modified in ways that can cause interference to existing CMRS services during or after the market trials.

Market trials of experimental equipment should consist of participants that are signed up for the specific objectives of the trial, and generally not offer experimental radio equipment for sale off-the-shelf to consumers. This will facilitate the appropriate controls and safeguards of maintaining the participating experimental devices. Also, the experimental authorizations for Market Trials should be limited in operational use to specific areas, to manage the collection of trial devices at the completion of the market trial.

All market trials must maintain a central point of contact and positive control of all radio equipment and devices operating pursuant to the authorized market trial to be able to immediately cease any transmissions causing harmful interference to existing licensed services.

Enforcement and removal of Market Trial devices can be difficult particularly for devices with peer to peer capabilities. Therefore, appropriate safeguards as noted above are required to

ensure all experimental trial devices are removed upon completion of the experimental market trial.

## **VI. THIRD PARTY EXPERIMENTS IN CMRS SPECTRUM WILL DIMINISH CMRS QUALITY OF SERVICE AND INNOVATIONS OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES**

Experimental licenses should not be authorized to third parties in active CMRS spectrum, because it would divert the engineering staff of CMRS network operators and manufacturers in their efforts to provide high quality CMRS service, optimize networks and spectrum efficiency, and advance new technologies like LTE.

CMRS engineering staff are required to support the daily operation, maintenance, and optimization of the CMRS network to provide high quality services to its customers. Diverting their attention to other causes can result in delays in network optimization, reduced spectrum efficiency, and lower quality of service for its customers. Therefore, the Commission should not divert the limited engineering resources of CMRS network providers to investigating and addressing unproven radio experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum. In addition to causing harmful interference to CMRS service, investigating and addressing such third party spectrum uses will slow the rate of innovation and advancement of new CMRS technologies.

CMRS licensees have been successful in advancing new technologies in CMRS spectrum for the past 30 years, which include the evolution of the following wireless technologies into CMRS networks for the benefit of CMRS consumers representing 93% of the nation.<sup>13</sup>

- 1st Generation (1G) - analog voice AMPS technology.

---

<sup>13</sup> Reference of U.S. wireless penetration is [www.ctia.org/consumer\\_info/service/index.cfm/AID/10323](http://www.ctia.org/consumer_info/service/index.cfm/AID/10323).

- 2nd Generation (2G) - digital voice and data technologies CDMA, GSM, TDMA, ESMR, NAMPS, GPRS and EDGE technologies.
- 3rd Generation (3G) - improved voice and data technologies including EVDO Rev. 0, EVDO Rev. A, UMTS and HSPA technologies.
- 4th Generation (4G) - enhanced broadband data technologies including LTE and WiMAX technologies.
- Ongoing network technology enhancements and incremental improvements in CMRS spectrum efficiency are continuously made with minor upgrades and incremental enhancements to CMRS networks and consumer devices.

Further, the continued development of advanced 4G technology standards are currently in process with final stages of standards work and initial stages of research and development, which include the IMT-Advanced 4G standards LTE Advanced and WiMAX 2.<sup>14</sup> The objectives of IMT-Advanced standards are the criteria of 1 Gbit/s for stationary and low mobility reception, and 100 Mbit/s for mobile reception according to ITU requirements. This will achieve peak spectral efficiencies of 15 bit/s/Hz in the downlink, and 6.75 bit/s/Hz in the uplink.

To maintain this high level of innovation and advancement of CMRS technologies, high quality of service of CMRS networks, and high level of efficiency and utilization of CMRS spectrum, the Commission should not authorize third party experimental licenses or market trials in licensed CMRS spectrum bands.

---

<sup>14</sup> International Mobile Telecommunications (IMT) Advanced 4G standards are the 3GPP Long Term Evolution Advanced (LTE Advanced) standard, and the Worldwide Interoperability for Microwave Access II (WiMAX 2) standard, according to International Telecommunication Union (ITU) requirements. WiMAX 2 is also known as IEEE 802.16m and WirelessMAN-Advanced standards.

## **VII. ANECHOIC CHAMBERS, FARADAY CAGES, AND OPEN AREA TEST SITES**

Radio experiments performed inside anechoic chambers and faraday cages should not require experimental licenses, however radio experiments performed at open area test sites should require experimental licenses to operate in licensed spectrum bands for reasons provided below. For all cases, FCC rules should require sufficient shielding to prevent signals from leaking outside such facilities and causing harmful interference to existing services in licensed spectrum bands.

Anechoic Chambers and Faraday Cages. Experiments performed inside anechoic chambers and faraday cages should not require experimental licenses due to the RF isolation and shielding provided by these types of facilities. However, FCC rules should require sufficient isolation and shielding effectiveness to prevent signals from leaking outside such facilities and causing harmful interference to existing services in licensed spectrum bands. Shielding effectiveness and signal leakage measurements should be performed on all frequency bands and power levels utilized in tests to confirm non-interference to existing services operating in licensed spectrum bands outside the facilities. Proof of compliance documentation should be provided upon request. In addition, anechoic chambers and faraday cages should be properly designed, installed and operated in compliance with manufacturer specifications.

Open Area Test Sites (OATS). Radio experiments performed at OATS should continue to require experimental licenses to operate in licensed spectrum bands, and should be required to show substantial justifications for operation in licensed bands and proofs of non-interference to existing licensed services. Signal leakage measurements should be performed on all frequency bands and power levels utilized in tests to confirm non-interference to existing services operating in licensed spectrum bands outside the facilities.

Applications for OATS experimental licenses should include a detailed description of the test site facility, the power and frequency bands utilized in tests, the types of antenna used in tests, radio frequency techniques used to minimize signal reflections and leakage from the facility, proof of non-interference to existing licensed services, and justifications for not using anechoic chambers for such experiments. Construction of such facilities require sufficiently open areas free of reflections, an advanced competence in radio frequency engineering, and should meet qualifications described in ANSI C63 standards for open area test sites.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> ANSI C63.4-2009, American National Standard for Methods of Measurement of Radio - Noise Emissions from Low-Voltage Electrical and Electronic Equipment in the Range of 9 kHz to 40 GHz. ANSI C63.7-2005, American National Standard Guide for Construction of Open-Area Test Sites for Performing Radiated Emission Measurements.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

For reasons provided above, the Commission should not authorize Experimental Licenses or Market Trials to third parties in licensed CMRS spectrum. CMRS spectrum bands are not suitable and not compatible with third party radio experiments by universities, research organizations, and health care facilities. CMRS spectrum bands are intensely utilized and have high mobility users that are not suitable for radio experimentation or underlay spectrum sharing, which would result in harmful interference to existing CMRS services including Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services. Further, CMRS licensees have limited engineering staff that are not capable of investigating and addressing third party experiments in their licensed bands. Such a distraction will diminish the quality of service of CMRS networks and slow the rate of innovation of new CMRS technologies including LTE. The Commission should consider other bands more suitable for researching, testing, and developing new and unproven technologies, which will not interfere with existing licensed services.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Sean Haynberg  
Director of RF Technologies

David Hunt, Senior RF Engineer  
David Stern, Vice President  
Dominic Villecco, President

V-COMM, L.L.C.  
2540 US Highway 130, Suite 101  
Cranbury, NJ 08512  
(609) 655-1200

Filed: March 10, 2011

## **APPENDIX A – COMPANY INFORMATION & BIOGRAPHIES**

V-COMM is a leading provider of quality engineering and engineering consulting services to the worldwide wireless telecommunications industry with offices in Cranbury, NJ and Blue Bell, PA. V-COMM's engineering staff is experienced in Cellular, Personal Communications Services, 700 MHz Spectrum, Wireless Broadband Data, Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio, Paging, Public Safety, 2-Way radio, Microwave, and Broadcast Mobile TV. We have provided our expertise to wireless operators in engineering, system design, implementation, performance, optimization, and evaluation of new wireless technologies. We have extensive experience in studying interference in various spectrum bands including Cellular, SMR, PCS, AWS, Air-to-ground, Public Safety, and 700 MHz spectrum. We have engineering experience in all commercial wireless technologies, including LTE, HSPA, UMTS, EVDO, CDMA, GSM, EDGE, WiMAX, MediaFLO, DVB-H, and Public Safety wireless technologies including analog and digital Project 25, EDACS, Opensky, and other trunking and conventional radio networks. Further, V-COMM was selected by the FCC & Department of Justice to provide expert analysis and testimony in the Nextwave and Pocket Communications Bankruptcy cases. For additional information, visit V-COMM's web site at [www.vcomm-eng.com](http://www.vcomm-eng.com).

### **BIOGRAPHIES OF SENIOR MEMBERS OF ENGINEERING STAFF**

#### **Dominic C. Villecco President and Founder, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Dominic Villecco, President and founder of V-COMM, is a pioneer in wireless telecommunications engineering, with over 29 years of executive-level experience and various engineering management positions previously held. Under his leadership, V-COMM has grown from a start-up venture in 1995 to a highly respected full-service wireless telecommunications engineering firm.

In managing V-COMM's growth, Mr. Villecco has overseen expansion of the company's portfolio of consulting services, which today include a full range of RF and Network support, network design tools, measurement hardware, and database services as well as time-critical engineering-related services such as business planning, zoning hearing expert witness testimony, regulatory advisory assistance, and project management.

Before forming V-COMM, Mr. Villecco spent 10 years with Comcast Corporation, where he held management positions of increasing responsibility, his last being Vice President of Wireless

Engineering for Comcast International Holdings, Inc. Focusing on the international marketplace, Mr. Villecco helped develop various technical and business requirements for directing Comcast's worldwide wireless venture utilizing current and emerging technologies.

Previously he was Vice President of Engineering and Operations for Comcast Cellular Communications, Inc. His responsibilities included overall system design, construction and operation, capital and operating budget preparation and execution, interconnection negotiations, vendor contract negotiations, major account interface, new product implementation, and cellular market acquisition. Following Comcast's acquisition, Mr. Villecco successfully merged the two departments and managed the combined department of 140 engineers and support personnel.

Mr. Villecco served as Director of Engineering for American Cellular Network Corporation (AMCELL), where he managed all system implementation and engineering design issues. He was responsible for activating the first cellular system in the world utilizing proprietary automatic call delivery software between independent carriers in Wilmington, Delaware. He also had responsibility for filing all FCC and FAA applications for AMCELL.

Prior to joining AMCELL, Mr. Villecco worked as a staff engineer at Sherman and Beverage (S&B), a broadcast consulting firm. He designed FM radio station broadcasting systems and studio-transmitter link systems, performed AM field studies and interference analysis, and TV interference analysis, and helped build a sophisticated six-tower arrangement for a AM antenna phasing system. He also designed software for FM allocations pursuant to FCC Rules Part 73.

Mr. Villecco started his career in telecommunications engineering as a wireless engineering consultant at Jubon Engineering, where he was responsible for the design of cellular systems, both domestic and international, radio paging systems, microwave radio systems, two-way radio systems, microwave multipoint distribution systems, and simulcast radio link systems, including the drafting of all FCC and FAA applications for these systems.

Mr. Villecco has testified as an expert witness in federal court on behalf of the Department of Justice and the Federal Communications Commission on two separate high profile cases involving wireless system design, implementation and operation.

Mr. Villecco has a BSEE from Drexel University, in Philadelphia. He is also a member of the Drexel ECE (Electrical and Computer Engineering) Department advisory board. In February 2001, Mr. Villecco received the "2001 Distinguished Alumnus Award" from the Drexel ECE Department for his continued contributions to the engineering profession. Since 1983, Mr. Villecco has been an active member of IEEE.

Relevant Expert Witness Testimony Experience:

Over the past fifteen years, Mr. Villecco had been previously qualified and provided expert witness testimony in the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Michigan. Mr. Villecco has also provided expert witness testimony in the following cases:

- United States Bankruptcy Court
- NextWave Personal Communications, Inc. vs. Federal Communications Commission \*\*
- Pocket Communications, Inc. vs. Federal Communications Commission \*\*

\*\* In these cases, Mr. Villecco was retained by the FCC and the Department of Justice as a technical expert on their behalf, pertaining to matters of wireless network design, optimization and operation.

**David K. Stern**  
**Vice President, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

David Stern, Vice President and co-founder of V-COMM, has over 27 years of hands-on operational and business experience in telecommunications engineering. He began his career with Motorola, where he developed an in-depth knowledge of the wireless engineering technologies CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, as well as AMPS and Nextel's iDEN.

While at V-COMM, Mr. Stern oversaw the design and implementation of several major Wireless markets in the Northeast United States, including Omnipoint - New York, Verizon Wireless, Unitel Cellular, Alabama Wireless, PCS One and Conestoga Wireless. He has testified at a number of Zoning and Planning Boards in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan.

Prior to joining V-COMM, Mr. Stern spent seven years with Comcast Cellular Communications, Inc., where he held several engineering management positions. As Director of Strategic Projects, he was responsible for all technical aspects of Comcast's wireless data business, including implementation of the CDPD Cellular Packet Data network. He also was responsible for bringing into commercial service the Cellular Data Gateway, a circuit switched data solution.

Also, Mr. Stern was the Director of Wireless System Engineering, charged with evaluating new digital technologies, including TDMA and CDMA, for possible adoption. He represented Comcast on several industry committees pertaining to CDMA digital cellular technology and served on the Technology Committee of a wireless company on behalf of Comcast. He helped to direct Comcast's participation in the A- and B-block PCS auctions and won high praise for his recommendations regarding the company's technology deployment in the PCS markets.

At the beginning of his tenure with Comcast, Mr. Stern was Director of Engineering at Comcast, managing a staff of 40 technical personnel. He had overall responsibility for a network that included 250 cell sites, three MTSOs, four Motorola EMX-2500 switches, IS-41 connections, SS-7 interconnection, and a fiber optic and microwave "disaster-resistant" interconnect network.

Mr. Stern began his career at Motorola as a Cellular Systems Engineer, where he developed his skills in RF engineering, frequency planning, and site acquisition activities. His promotion to Program Manager-Northeast for the rapidly growing New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia markets gave him the responsibility for coordinating all activities and communications with Motorola's cellular infrastructure customers. He directed contract preparations, equipment orders and deliveries, project implementation schedules, and engineering support services.

Mr. Stern earned a BSEE from the University of Illinois, in Urbana, and is a member of IEEE.

**Sean Haynberg**  
**Director of RF Technologies, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Sean Haynberg, Director of RF Technologies at V-COMM, has over 21 years of experience in wireless engineering. Mr. Haynberg has extensive experience in wireless system design, implementation, testing and optimization for wireless broadband data and voice systems utilizing UMTS, HSPA, LTE, EVDO, CDMA, GSM, EDGE, ESMR and Analog wireless technologies. In his career, he has conducted numerous new technology deployments, compatibility & interference studies, and evaluations to assess, develop and integrate new technologies that meet industry and FCC guidelines. His career began with Bell Atlantic Mobile, where he developed an in-depth knowledge of wireless engineering.

While at V-COMM, Mr. Haynberg was responsible for the performance of RF engineering team supplying total RF services to a diverse client group. His projects included managing a team of RF Engineers to perform interference testing & analysis, FCC reporting and presentations, studying new wireless technology compatibility and integration with existing CMRS network technologies, conducting technology interference studies at CMRS base stations and customer provided equipment, design, deploy and optimize numerous CMRS wireless networks in various markets, wireless system design & expansion of international markets in Brazil and Bermuda, and development and procurement of hardware and software engineering tools. He has also developed tools and procedures to assist carriers in compliance to FCC rules & regulations for RF Safety, international TV band interference studies, and other FCC regulatory issues. In addition, Mr. Haynberg was instrumental in providing leadership, technical analysis, engineering expertise, and management of a team of RF Engineers to deliver expert engineering support and reporting on behalf of the FCC & Department of Justice, in the NextWave and Pocket Communications Bankruptcy proceedings.

Prior to joining V-COMM, Mr. Haynberg held various management and engineering positions at Bell Atlantic NYNEX Mobile (BANM). He was responsible for evaluating new technologies and providing support for the development, integration and implementation of first office applications (FOA), including CDMA, CDPD, and RF Fingerprinting Technology. Beyond this, Haynberg provided RF engineering guidelines and recommendations to the company's regional network operations, supported the evaluation and integration of new wireless equipment and technologies, including indoor wireless PBX/office systems, phased/narrow-array smart antenna systems, interference and inter-modulation analysis and measurements, and cell site co-location and acceptance procedures. He was responsible for the procurement, development and support of engineering tools for RF and system performance engineers to enhance the performance, design and optimization of the regional cellular networks. He began his career as an RF Engineer responsible for the system design and expansion of cellular markets in New Jersey, Philadelphia, PA; Pittsburgh, PA; Washington, DC; and Baltimore, MD markets.

Mr. Haynberg earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering with high honors, and attended post-graduate work, at Rutgers University in Piscataway, New Jersey. While at Rutgers, Mr. Haynberg received numerous honors including membership in the National Engineering Honor Societies. In addition, Mr. Haynberg has qualified and provided expert witness testimony in the subject matter of RF engineering and the operation of wireless network systems for many municipalities in the State of New Jersey.

**David Hunt**  
**Senior Staff RF Engineer, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Mr. Hunt has over 27 years of experience in RF engineering including extensive experience in wireless planning, RF design, optimization, and performance of wireless systems utilizing OFDM, CDMA, EVDO, GSM/GPRS/EDGE, UMTS/HSPA, LTE, SMR/IDEN and other wireless technologies. In his career, he was responsible for the specification, design, proof-of-performance tests, implementation, and optimization of numerous wireless communications systems, detection and measurement systems including advanced military systems. His career began in the specification, design, and implementation of underwater acoustic warfare systems and continued with commercial wireless communications systems while at V-COMM.

While at V-COMM, Mr. Hunt has been responsible for the performance of a RF engineering team supplying a variety of RF services to a diverse client group. Projects include: system performance monitoring, frequency planning, adjacent market coordination, inter-modulation analysis, RF propagation prediction, system technology evaluation. Mr. Hunt designed, tested, optimized, and maintained new and existing cellular, PCS, MMDS, SMR, 700 MHz and other wireless voice and/or data systems throughout the United States and the Caribbean. In addition, Mr. Hunt has been involved in special technology evaluations and the development and procurement of hardware and software engineering tools to enhance both V-COMM and its client's capabilities. Mr. Hunt has lead the development of tools and procedures to assist clients and carriers in meeting compliance with FCC Rules & Regulations for RF Safety, emission standards and other FCC regulatory issues including FCC, FAA and AM tower studies and filings. David's activities included the development and submission of comprehensive engineering studies for consideration in numerous FCC proceedings.

While at the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC), Mr. Hunt designed and wrote computer programs to generate and display antenna beam pattern for various conditions of a linear array of hydrophones for display of receiver gain calculations. He documented this work in Technical Memorandum 5032 TM-887-IBP-08. Mr. Hunt was involved in all aspects of the SSQ-101 Air Deployable Active Receiver (ADAR) sonobuoy development including: signal processing software, hardware design and development, test planning, setup and testing. Mr. Hunt designed, developed and implemented an All-Threat In-Buoy Signal Processing (IBSP) Program used to detect, classify and localize enemy targets on the SUN workstation using standard signal to noise ratio measurements and advanced detection methods. This involved analyzing signal to noise ratio performance requirements and the design/implementation of specific portions of the preprocessor including modulation, filter decimation, windowing with redundancy, frequency analysis, magnitude/phase detection and a short term integration process.

While at NAWC, he received seven Performance Awards, a Quality Step Increase, three Letters of Appreciation, and one Special Act Award.

Mr. Hunt has a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Temple University emphasizing Signal Processing, Digital Signal Processing and Communications. In addition, Mr. Hunt has earned a Masters of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Drexel University in Philadelphia.

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission’s Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules	)	ET Docket No. 10-236
	)	
2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations – Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology (OET)	)	ET Docket No. 06-105
	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Sean Haynberg  
Director of RF Technologies

David Hunt  
Senior Staff RF Engineer

David Stern  
Vice President

Dominic Villecco  
President

V-COMM, L.L.C.  
2540 US Highway 130, Suite 101  
Cranbury, NJ 08512  
(609) 655-1200

April 11, 2011

## **Table of Contents**

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	1
II.	LICENSED CMRS SPECTRUM IS INTENSIVELY UTILIZED AND ILL-SUITED FOR CONDUCTING UNPROVEN EXPERIMENTS .....	4
III.	CURRENT FCC RULES FOR EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES WORK WELL AND ARE NOT AN IMPEDIMENT TO INNOVATION .....	6
IV.	COORDINATION AND CONSENT IS REQUIRED FOR EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES .....	9
V.	POWER FLUX DENSITY THRESHOLDS AND PART 15 LIMITS WILL NOT PROTECT CMRS SERVICES FROM HARMFUL INTERFERENCE .....	16
VI.	ANECHOIC CHAMBERS, FARADAY CAGES AND OPEN AREA TEST SITES ....	18
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	22
	APPENDIX A – COMPANY INFORMATION & BIOGRAPHIES .....	24

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission’s Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules	)	ET Docket No. 10-236
	)	
2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations – Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology (OET)	)	ET Docket No. 06-105
	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF V-COMM, L.L.C**

V-COMM, L.L.C. (V-COMM)<sup>1</sup> submits reply comments in response to the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in the above-captioned proceeding.<sup>2</sup>

**I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

In response to the FCC's NPRM on experimental licensing and market trials, V-COMM analyzed the comments submitted in the proceeding and prepared these reply comments. The NPRM seeks comments on enhancing the development of innovative and new technologies by expanding the scope of its radio experimental licensing program pursuant to Part 5 of its rules. Herein, we address the comments and technical issues associated with the FCC's proposed

---

<sup>1</sup> V-COMM, L.L.C. is a wireless telecommunications consulting company with principal members having over 29 years experience in the wireless industry. We have provided our expertise to wireless operators in RF engineering, system design, implementation, performance, optimization, and evaluation of new wireless technologies. We have extensive industry experience in all CMRS technologies. V-COMM’s company information and experiences are highlighted in this report’s Appendix A, along with biographies of senior members of its engineering team. Verizon Wireless retained V-COMM to evaluate the comments submitted in the NPRM proceeding and their potential impact on wireless networks.

expansion of its experimental licensing authorizations for applications in licensed Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) bands (i.e. Cellular, PCS, AWS, SMR, 700MHz bands, etc.). Previously, V-COMM submitted comments in this NPRM proceeding on March 10, 2011.<sup>3</sup> V-COMM also submitted comments and reply comments in the FCC's Dynamic Spectrum Use Technologies Notice of Inquiry (NOI) proceeding,<sup>4</sup> on February 28, 2011 and March 28, 2011.<sup>5</sup> Therein, we provided reasons that opportunistic underlay spectrum sharing technologies are not compatible with and will cause harmful interference to existing licensed CMRS services.

V-COMM is an independent engineering firm with extensive experience in CMRS technologies and systems. We have significant experience in CMRS and Public Safety network design and deployments, engineering networks for high performance, optimizing spectrum efficiency, and evaluating new wireless technologies. V-COMM has conducted extensive interference and compatibility studies within CMRS networks,<sup>6</sup> performed noise and interference

---

<sup>2</sup> *Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Trials under Part 5 of the Commission's Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, ET Docket No. 10-236 (released November 30, 2010) ("NPRM").

<sup>3</sup> Referred to as "V-COMM Comments" in this report.

<sup>4</sup> *Promoting More Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Dynamic Spectrum Use Technologies*, Notice of Inquiry, ET Docket No. 10-237 (released November 30, 2010) ("NOI").

<sup>5</sup> V-COMM's NOI Comments was submitted as an attachment to Verizon Wireless' comments on February 10, 2011, and V-COMM's NOI Reply Comments was submitted separately on March 28, 2011.

<sup>6</sup> V-COMM has conducted extensive compatibility and interference studies within AT&T Wireless' and Verizon Wireless' networks including interference testing of spectrum-sharing technologies and trials within CMRS spectrum.

studies in CMRS spectrum bands,<sup>7</sup> and participated in numerous FCC proceedings with comprehensive engineering reports.<sup>8</sup>

For reasons provided herein, the expanded opportunities as proposed in the NPRM for radio experimentation and market trials should not be authorized to third parties in licensed CMRS spectrum. CMRS spectrum bands are intensely utilized, have highly mobile users, and are not suitable for radio experimentation and market trials which would result in harmful interference to existing CMRS services. In addition, CMRS bands provide critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services that must be fully protected from harmful interference.

CMRS licensees have limited engineering staff that are not capable of investigating and addressing third party experiments in their licensed bands. Such a distraction will diminish the quality of service of CMRS networks and slow the rate of innovation of new CMRS technologies including LTE.<sup>9</sup> The Commission should consider other bands more suitable for researching, testing, and developing new and unproven technologies as we provided in our comments,<sup>10</sup> which will not interfere with existing licensed services.

As addressed herein, neither party – the experimental applicant nor the licensed incumbent – has sufficient information on their own to make an adequate determination as to the extent of harmful interference that will occur to incumbent licenses services, and thus any

---

<sup>7</sup> V-COMM has conducted spectrum noise and interference measurements within Verizon Wireless and AT&T Wireless' CMRS networks. V-COMM submitted the "AMPS Noise Floor Study" within the FCC's AirCell spectrum-sharing proceeding (ET 02-86) on April 10, 2003, and the "PCS Noise Floor Study" within the FCC's Spectrum Policy Task Force Report proceeding (ET 02-135) on Sept. 16, 2003. These spectrum noise studies were also provided as Attachment B and Attachment C to Comments filed by V-COMM in the FCC's Interference Temperature (ET 03-237) comment proceeding on April 5, 2004.

<sup>8</sup> V-COMM has participated in numerous FCC proceedings with comprehensive engineering reports including experimental AirCell, Cellular Airborne, Spectrum Policy Task Force, Ultra-wide band, Interference Temperature, Cognitive Radio, PCS H-Block, AWS-III Block, and Low Power Auxiliary Stations, Wireless Microphones in 698-806 MHz band proceedings.

<sup>9</sup> LTE (Long Term Evolution) is a 4th generation wireless technology that is being deployed by wireless operators and under continued development with new releases and enhanced functionality.

authorizations for experimental licenses in CMRS spectrum would essentially become a responsibility of both parties to ensure incumbent license services are protected from harmful interference. Further, many parties commenting stated that coordination, notification and most importantly consent of CMRS licensees operating on co-channel, adjacent bands and adjacent markets should be required for all radio experimental licenses and testing activities by universities, research organizations, and health care facilities.

In addition, we address herein that the Commission's current experimental licensing rules work very well and are not an impediment to innovation, and that power flux density thresholds and Part 15 limits will not provide sufficient protection from harmful interference for CMRS services in CMRS bands.

Lastly, experiments performed inside anechoic chambers and faraday cages should not require experimental licenses, however open area test sites should continue to require them. FCC rules should require sufficient shielding and isolation to prevent signals leaking outside these facilities and causing harmful interference to existing services in licensed spectrum bands.

## **II. LICENSED CMRS SPECTRUM IS INTENSIVELY UTILIZED AND ILL-SUITED FOR CONDUCTING UNPROVEN EXPERIMENTS**

As addressed in V-COMM Comments, the expanded opportunities proposed in the NPRM for radio experimentation and market trials in licensed CMRS spectrum should not be authorized to third parties. Licensed CMRS spectrum is not suitable and not compatible with third party experimental uses. Therefore universities, research organizations, and health care facilities should not utilize licensed CMRS spectrum to conduct unproven radio experiments or market trials. Further, CMRS bands provide critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency

---

<sup>10</sup> V-COMM Comments at 11-12.

services that must be protected from harmful interference. Several parties including Cisco,<sup>11</sup> AT&T,<sup>12</sup> and V-COMM<sup>13</sup> noted that CMRS bands provide critical Public Safety, E911 and other emergency services that must be fully protected from harmful interference.

Universities, research organizations, and health care facilities should not utilize licensed CMRS spectrum to conduct unproven radio experiments, which can result in harmful interference to incumbent CMRS services. CMRS spectrum is intensely utilized, has highly mobile users, ubiquitous coverage, continuously changing network technologies, and is very sensitive to external system interference. Many parties indicated in the FCC's Dynamic Spectrum NOI proceeding including CTIA,<sup>14</sup> AT&T,<sup>15</sup> PSIC,<sup>16</sup> and Microsoft<sup>17</sup> that CMRS spectrum bands are intensively utilized and least suitable for third party uses. Thus, licensed CMRS spectrum bands are not suitable for radio experimentation or underlay spectrum sharing technologies, which would result in harmful interference to existing and future CMRS services.

---

<sup>11</sup> Cisco Comments at 4. "Bands used for the provision of commercial mobile services, public safety spectrum, emergency or public safety systems on the institution's grounds require special protections."

<sup>12</sup> AT&T Comments at 5. "Specifically, the Commission concludes that "experiments on bands assigned to mobile service providers (e.g., the Cellular Radiotelephone Service, broadband PCS, AWS, 700 MHz) could have the potential to disrupt mobile telephone use on campus—at a minimum inconveniencing one of the most active and engaged mobile device user communities, and at worst, impeding the ability to reach 911 or receive campus-wide emergency text alerts."

<sup>13</sup> V-COMM Comments at 3, 12.

<sup>14</sup> CTIA's NOI Comments at 4-5, CTIA commented that time and time again they have demonstrated that U.S. mobile wireless providers are the most efficient users of spectrum worldwide, and pack more subscribers into each megahertz of spectrum than the mobile providers of any other nation.

<sup>15</sup> AT&T's NOI Comments at i, CMRS bands are the "most heavily and efficiently used spectrum bands in the U.S., and are relied upon by public safety, utilities, the medical industry, and hundreds of millions of U.S. consumers" and third party "dynamic spectrum use technologies are technically unsuited for the licensed mobile bands, which are constantly changing and are characterized by an extremely large number of low power transmitters and sensitive receivers with unpredictable usage patterns,"

<sup>16</sup> Public Interest Spectrum Coalition's (PISC) NOI Comments at 28, "At the outset, PISC reiterates its contention that frequency bands that are intensively and efficiently in use – such as the bands used for CMRS – are the least suitable candidates for spectrum band sharing".

<sup>17</sup> Microsoft's NOI Comments at 2, "Notably, because Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) providers intensively use their spectrum, mandated access by smart radios would not be appropriate in spectrum bands licensed for their exclusive use."

Moreover, CMRS networks and technologies are not compatible with third party uses sharing licensed CMRS spectrum, which will result in harmful interference and lower quality CMRS services. CMRS networks and services will be affected by third party radio experiments conducted within its licensed spectrum bands. CMRS networks can experience losses in system capacity, reduced data throughputs, disruptions, and poor quality of service when third party experiments increase noise and interference levels within licensed CMRS spectrum.

In addition, CMRS licensees have limited engineering staff that are not capable of investigating and addressing third party experiments in their licensed bands. Such a distraction will diminish the quality of service of CMRS networks and slow the rate of innovation of new CMRS technologies.<sup>18</sup> This would divert the engineering staff of CMRS network operators and manufacturers in their efforts to provide high quality CMRS service, operate, maintain and optimize their networks and spectrum efficiency, and advance new technologies like LTE.<sup>19</sup> Thus, the Commission should consider other bands more suitable for researching, testing, and developing new and unproven technologies, which will not interfere with existing licensed CMRS services.<sup>20</sup>

### **III. CURRENT FCC RULES FOR EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES WORK WELL AND ARE NOT AN IMPEDIMENT TO INNOVATION**

A few parties reminded the Commission that its current experimental licensing rules work very well and are not an impediment to innovation. For example, Motorola Solutions, Inc. (MSI) commented that the current "process has developed well over the years and is now a

---

<sup>18</sup> V-COMM Comments at 17-18.

<sup>19</sup> LTE (Long Term Evolution) is a 4th generation wireless technology that is being deployed by wireless operators and under continued development with new releases and enhanced functionality.

<sup>20</sup> Instead, other more suitable bands should be considered for such third party radio experimentation and market trials as we noted in Section III of V-COMM Comments.

*model of efficiency* among FCC licensing programs ... the current process works very well today".<sup>21</sup> Further, MSI believes that the Commission should maintain its current experimental polices and that "[s]uch an approach is good engineering practice that MSI has followed for years".<sup>22</sup> Marcus Spectrum Solutions also noted that the current FCC experimental licensing rules are not an impediment to innovation:

"While the online filing systems for Part 5 licenses are awkward and dated, in general the Part 5 system works very well and is not a major impediment to innovation. When the Spectrum Policy Task Force specifically asked for comments on the experimental licensing system and possible improvements in Docket 02-135, it received **virtually no input** – at that time it was clear that Part 5 licenses were not a major problem area. We believe that the general conclusion of the UEWG in 2002 is equally valid today."<sup>23</sup>

"the present Part 5 Experimental License System is not a major obstacle to innovation and given the expected tightening of resources at FCC due to the budget situation it is questionable whether the proposals here have really significant enough impact on innovation to justify the diversion of staff effort from larger impact issues such as the more general Wireless Innovation NOI."<sup>24</sup>

Further, Marcus Spectrum Solutions comments that the issue of NTIA coordination and transparency on federal spectrum appears to be the roadblock to innovation and remains the “elephant in the room” in experimental licensing since the majority of spectrum is either federal government spectrum or shared spectrum subject to such coordination.<sup>25</sup> And, Marcus Spectrum Solutions believes that improving the present OET Experimental Licensing Filing System would be a better "bang per buck",<sup>26</sup> stating that "[a] total overhaul of the dated and obsolescent OET

---

<sup>21</sup> Motorola Solutions, Inc. (MSI) Comments at 1 (emphasis added).

<sup>22</sup> Id. at 4.

<sup>23</sup> Marcus Spectrum Solutions Comments at 5.

<sup>24</sup> Id. at 1-2.

<sup>25</sup> Id. at 2. Also, Marcus Spectrum Solutions Comments at 8-10, notes that 57% of spectrum in the range of 300 MHz to 3 GHz requires NTIA approval and such cases are generally classified. In addition, as noted in its Appendix at 3-5, from the experimental license section of the FCC's SPTF Report 2002, Ericsson & Motorola comments in the SPTF report cite similar concerns.

<sup>26</sup> Id. at 3.

Experimental Licensing System Electronic Filing System would be very helpful and would lower barriers to experimentation." <sup>27</sup>

In fact, V-COMM recognizes that CMRS licensees have been successful in advancing new technologies into their spectrum bands for the past 30 years for the benefit of wireless consumers representing 93% of the nation, which include 1st generation through 4th generation wireless technologies that continue to be advanced.<sup>28</sup> These advances in innovation and technologies were successful in CMRS spectrum within the current FCC experimental license rules. Therefore, the record and history demonstrates that the current FCC experimental licensing rules are not an impediment to innovation in CMRS spectrum bands.

Overall, the existing Part 5 experimental licensing system works well and does not inhibit innovation. Boeing was the only party commenting in the proceeding that cited difficulty obtaining licensee consent for experimental license testing. Boeing cited coordination issues with CMRS licensees when requesting to perform High Intensity Radiated Field (HIRF) aircraft testing in licensed CMRS bands.<sup>29</sup> However, in its comments, Boeing did not detail the extent of the high radio intensity levels that were requested or whether they were willing to perform such tests in off-hours or in other locations (i.e. remote areas without CMRS service, etc.) that may have less potential for interference to existing licensed CMRS services.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, it is uncertain whether consent was unreasonably withheld in this case, or was due to the high power levels Boeing was requesting that would cause harmful interference to local CMRS operations.

---

<sup>27</sup> Id. at 14.

<sup>28</sup> Id. at 17-18.

<sup>29</sup> Boeing Comments at 13. Also, see footnote 34, citing *Boeing Wireless NOI Comments*, at 10-12 (describing Boeing's difficulty in coordinating consent with wireless service licensees to enable High Intensity Radiated Field testing of new aircraft).

<sup>30</sup> We also note that there are test facilities that provide such FAA compliant HIRF RTCA/DO 160-F testing, which can be completed on components within anechoic chambers pursuant to FAA rules.

In general, however, experimental licenses have been successful in coordinating and receiving consent from licensees to conduct experiments in licensed spectrum.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, we agree with Marcus Spectrum Solutions and Motorola that the current experimental licensing system works very well and is not an impediment to innovation.

#### **IV. COORDINATION AND CONSENT IS REQUIRED FOR EXPERIMENTAL LICENSES**

University, research and health care experimental licenses should be grouped together within FCC rules, and have the same regulations apply to each of them, as they represent the same issues that can impact incumbent spectrum licensees and users. Whether the experimental license is for research, health care or even commercial purposes is irrelevant with regard to the potential for interference. Accordingly, we address them all collectively as a group in this section.

Coordination and Consent Requirements. Experimental licenses must provide detailed coordination information and obtain prior consent from CMRS licensees before any experiments are performed in licensed CMRS spectrum to ensure that harmful interference will not occur to existing CMRS services. Further, experimental licenses must coordinate with and obtain prior consent on an ongoing basis from the incumbent licensees to account for the frequent changes in CMRS networks. And, given that CMRS licensees are protected from harmful interference, obtaining consent of the licensee is required prior to performing any experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum.

Many parties commented on the importance of the coordination and consent requirements with regard to the expanded experimental licensing program proposed in the NPRM. We further

---

<sup>31</sup> Lockheed Martin Comments at 3, Lockheed confirmed most incumbents “are willing to accommodate coordination requests, and most coordinations are concluded without incident.”

note that the prevention of interference essentially become a shared responsibility of both parties, the experimental applicant and the incumbent licensee, in order to ensure that incumbent licensed services are protected from harmful interference. Therefore, the experimental applicant must obtain consent from the incumbent licensee.

In fact, the experimental researcher does not have enough information on the incumbent licensed systems, technologies, and use of spectrum to determine if harmful interference would occur. And, due to the lack of understanding of specific spectrum uses, the interference could be bi-directional affecting both the incumbent licensee's system and the experimenter's research, which runs counter-productive to testing and evaluating any new experimental technologies. Also, without sufficient coordination, the CMRS incumbent does not have enough information about the radio equipment and specific plans of the experimental research tests to determine the extent (i.e. the locations, the times, the impacted to its users) of the harmful interference that would occur to its network. Furthermore, CMRS networks are constantly upgrading technologies, re-configuring and optimizing systems, deploying new base stations, repeaters, picocells and other technologies within their networks, which represents a constant state of flux for its system operation and use of spectrum. Thus, ongoing coordination and ongoing consent is required for any experimental testing in CMRS spectrum in order to ensure that the essential CMRS services are not jeopardized.

The experimental researcher cannot conclusively determine the extent of harmful interference that would occur to incumbent CMRS services because they are unaware of the incumbent's detailed system information and spectrum uses. Thus, they must coordinate and obtain consent from the incumbent licensees. CMRS licensees frequently update and simultaneously operate a mix wireless technologies such as CDMA 1xRTT, EVDO, GSM, EDGE, UMTS, HSPA, and/or LTE technologies in their CMRS bands to meet market objectives.

In many cases, each technology has different interference requirements, bandwidths, frequencies, and operating signal levels. The frequency plan, spectrum use, and technology used will also change over time to meet market requirements. The experimental research applicant could not possibly obtain proprietary CMRS system information, operating network radio frequency parameters, technologies, and other detailed system information because it is proprietary information and constantly changing on a daily basis. Further, CMRS licenses are constantly upgrading technologies, site locations, in-building repeater and coverage equipment, tower locations and network changes. The experimental research applicant could not definitively assess the interference implications without coordinating and obtaining consent of the CMRS licensee.

In a similar regard, the incumbent licensee does not have sufficient information about the radio equipment and specific plans of the experimental research tests to determine the extent that harmful interference would occur to its network. Experimental research technologies and equipment are not always well defined, may not be FCC type certified, and will generally not be compliant to specific wireless standards.<sup>32</sup> In some cases the testing may either contain classified, sensitive or proprietary material which may not be completely shared. The research location, power, bandwidth, emissions, and specific test plan need to be coordinated and consented with the incumbent CMRS licensee to ensure the protection of the incumbent licensee's communications services. In most cases, the only practical way to conduct experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum would be to perform experiments in off-hours and on

---

<sup>32</sup> Wireless standards are developed and documented for engineers to understand the operation of specific wireless technologies and the compatibility issues associated with those technologies with other known technologies. Since experiments by their nature will involve new and unproven technologies there would be unknown consequences with respect to the compatibility of operating them with current systems.

specific channels taken out of service to ensure protection of CMRS operations, which is the process that CMRS licensees use to test new technologies in their networks.

The Satellite Industry Association (SIA) also opposes experimental license coordination that places the interference burden on the incumbent licensees:

"The Commission declined to propose imposing specific coordination obligations on program experimental licensees and, in lieu of coordination, proposed that a web-based registration be completed at least seven calendar days prior to commencement of any experiment. Under the proposal, service licensees would be responsible for monitoring the registration and raising interference concerns with the program licensee applicant within the seven-day period. The service licensee would also bear the burden of proving that a proposed experiment would cause harmful interference. SIA *opposes* the Commission's approach because it turns the notion of spectrum priority on its head. By requiring service licensees to monitor databases continually for potentially-interfering experiments and then prove the existence of such interference, the web-based registration proposal inappropriately shifts the burden of policing compliance with the Commission's interference-avoidance requirements to parties with superior spectrum rights."<sup>33</sup>

Moreover, it's not possible for CMRS licensees to support many wide-scale experiments in its licensed spectrum because they do not have the engineering resources to evaluate and monitor each of the experiments that would be very time consuming to ensure that such third-party spectrum uses do not interfere with providing high quality CMRS service. The Commission cannot divert the limited engineering resources of CMRS network providers to investigating and addressing unproven radio experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum. CMRS engineering staff are required to support the daily operation, maintenance, and optimization of the CMRS network to provide high quality services to its customers, and cannot support other third-party initiatives operating in the same spectrum bands.

Notification Requirement. Experiments conducted with licensee consent will need to provide proper coordination and sufficient notification to CMRS licensees. CMRS operators would need to review the details of the experiment and radio equipment utilized along with their

---

<sup>33</sup> Satellite Industry Association Comments at 11-12 (emphasis added).

incumbent uses of spectrum in the specific test areas with the licensee's engineering resources and with its vendor's engineering resources as well in some cases. Sufficient notification time is required to complete these tasks to ensure harmful interference would not occur to existing CMRS services. Therefore, the notification period for CMRS licensees needs to be open ended.

In some cases (i.e. for relatively limited experiments requested for off-hours testing) the notification, coordination and consent can be completed within 30 days. However, for other cases such tasks will generally require longer periods of time and may become an iterative process to clarify and fully understanding the requested testing experiments, to possibly revise specific testing plans, and to avoid interference to local CMRS operations. In addition, with any new technology experiments in licensed CMRS spectrum there would be unknowns with respect to the compatibility of such technologies with existing CMRS systems, and the testing process may need to be incremental to immediately address any instances of interference and to revise the test plans to ensure interference is avoided to CMRS networks. Accordingly, the coordination and consent needs to be ongoing and iterative for experiments conducted in licensed CMRS spectrum.

Consequently, we disagree with a few commenting parties and as initially proposed in the NPRM that a seven day notification period is acceptable for all cases. CTIA notes that "thirty days is the *minimum time* necessary for engineering personnel from affected CMRS licensees (and their vendors) to review the detailed plans and technical specifics, ensure that they will not pose an interference risk to existing or planned CMRS operations, and then notify the Commission and the applicant of any concerns."<sup>34</sup> However, as we outlined above, 30 days notification will not be sufficient time in most cases. Further, as provided in V-COMM's comments, we noted the importance of coordinating with adjacent markets and adjacent bands,

"experiments conducted on adjacent bands and adjacent markets should provide advance notice to CMRS licensees of a minimum of 30 days. Longer notification periods may be required depending on the nature of the planned testing activities, to understand the testing activities and assess the impact to the CMRS network, to resolve any test activities that can cause interference to CMRS services, and in cases that require the CMRS equipment manufacturer to be consulted for questions and compatibility issues."<sup>35</sup>

Incumbent Licensee Consent. Most of the commenting parties identified incumbent licensee consent and protection from interference as paramount requirements for experimental licenses. We agree with the CTIA's comments that "It is critical, however, that the Commission adopt appropriate safeguards and interference protections (especially for incumbent commercial mobile radio service ("CMRS") operations) to ensure that the additional experimentation does not harm consumers or undermine wireless investment, innovation, and efficient spectrum use."<sup>36</sup> Motorola also states that "protecting licensees from interference" is a main principal to safeguard.<sup>37</sup> Qualcomm concurs on providing incumbent protection by stating, "all testing conducted under the new ERS regulatory framework needs to provide full protection to authorized operations."<sup>38</sup> The Satellite Industry Association (SIA) writes that the Commission must "ensure that the newly flexible regime does not result in an unacceptable risk of harmful interference to existing service licensees."<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> CTIA Comments at 6 (emphasis added).

<sup>35</sup> V-COMM Comments at 7.

<sup>36</sup> CTIA Comments at 2.

<sup>37</sup> Motorola Solutions Comments at 2.

<sup>38</sup> Qualcomm Comments at 3.

<sup>39</sup> Satellite Industry Association Comments at 1.

Many parties contend that coordination and consent of CMRS licensees operating on co-channel, adjacent bands and adjacent markets must be required for experimental licenses and any testing activities by universities, research organizations, and health care facilities. APCO states the experimental applicant "should be required to specifically notify licensees in affected bands and obtain prior concurrence."<sup>40</sup> AT&T states that "before adopting any proposals, however, the Commission should modify the proposed rules to better protect existing CMRS networks and subscribers...Failure to require notice and consent would expose CMRS networks and consumers to harmful interference, delay the detection of the source, and impede its rapid resolution." CTIA asserts that "the Commission should require an affected CMRS licensee's prior approval to a test or experiment." Lastly, the Wireless Communications Association International ("WCAI") says "The Commission should require that an applicant for a program experimental radio license obtain the consent of existing licensees before the applicant begins its experiment."<sup>41</sup> The TIA also urges the Commission "to ensure that adequate protection is afforded to primary and secondary licensees. The Commission should avoid transferring the burden of interference notification and detection to allocated frequency licensees, and TIA opposes rule changes that will result in such a shift."<sup>42</sup>

Thus it is critical for the experimental licenses to properly coordinate and obtain prior consent from the incumbent CMRS licensees for each experiment to prevent interference to CMRS services. For reasons provided above and in our comments, the expanded opportunities as proposed in the NPRM for radio experimentation and market trials should not be authorized to third parties in licensed CMRS spectrum without licensee consent.

---

<sup>40</sup> APCO Comments at 3.

<sup>41</sup> WCAI Comments at 1.

<sup>42</sup> TIA Comments at 3.

## **V. POWER FLUX DENSITY THRESHOLDS AND PART 15 LIMITS WILL NOT PROTECT CMRS SERVICES FROM HARMFUL INTERFERENCE**

As provided in V-COMM's comments, in response to the NPRM's request for comments on establishing power flux densities (PFD) to facilitate radio experiments,<sup>43</sup> the Commission cannot set a power flux density threshold in CMRS spectrum as any level would result in an increase in noise and interference levels from third party experiments in CMRS spectrum and cause harmful interference to CMRS and E911 services.<sup>44</sup> CMRS systems operate at very low signal and noise levels to optimize CMRS spectrum utilization and efficiency. Further, E911 calls require reception of multiple signals at very low levels for the CMRS system to be able to make location determinations, which is required for Public Safety call centers to accurately locate distressed E911 callers.<sup>45</sup> Given this, CMRS technologies are very sensitive to external system noise and interference and there are no additional noise and interference levels that are acceptable. Therefore, there is no threshold for PFD that will protect incumbent CMRS and public safety E911 services.

Wireless Communications Association International ("WCAI") also points out that instead of attempting to establish PFD thresholds for all frequency bands and services, the Commission should rely on existing licensee consent to establish permissible experimental operations:

"Relying on the consent of existing licensees would also obviate the need to establish a maximum measured power flux density (pfd) limit to ensure that PERL experiments do not extend beyond the boundaries of a PERL applicant's property. The number of frequency bands and services potentially affected by the Commission's proposal would

---

<sup>43</sup> NPRM at ¶ 22.

<sup>44</sup> V-COMM Comments at 10-11.

<sup>45</sup> This is referenced to network based time-difference-of-arrival (TDOA) and handset based E911 location systems that are used in CMRS systems today. These systems rely on very low level signals for location determination, which include signals that are lower level than those used to maintain the voice and data communications.

make the establishment of pfd limits by rule extraordinarily difficult. For a number of reasons, some services are more likely to suffer harmful interference from experimental radio use than others. This reality of physics means the Commission would either need to establish a relatively low overall pfd limit or establish separate pfd limits for various bands and services. Either approach would likely result in a suboptimal outcome. A restrictive pfd limit may unnecessarily limit the utility of PERL experiments in some cases, and separate pfd limits would be difficult to develop and complicated to apply. If the Commission instead relies on a consent-based approach, PERL applicants and licensees could tailor pfd limits to optimize the value of the experiment while avoiding the potential for harmful interference."<sup>46</sup>

V-COMM agrees that requiring existing licensee consent is the best and only alternative for conducting experiments in licensed CMRS bands.

Some parties commented that radio experiments operating at or below the maximum power levels for unlicensed Part 15 unintentional radiators should not require an experimental license for operation at any location,<sup>47</sup> and some parties proposed them for indoor demonstrations at trade shows.<sup>48</sup> Cisco adds that coordination with licensees is required for trade show demonstrations in its comments, "the manufacturer should be required to coordinate the frequencies to be used with existing licensees."<sup>49</sup>

However, V-COMM disagrees with comments that Part 15 radiation limits can serve as permissible emissions thresholds because such emission levels will not provide sufficient protection from interference on all frequency bands in all cases, such as in CMRS and Public Safety bands.<sup>50</sup> Further, emissions operating at Part 15 limits are strong enough to cause harmful interference to CMRS and Public Safety services in various spectrum bands. For example, Part 15 limits permit the receive levels of -79 dBm/MHz at 800 MHz, and -89 dBm/MHz at 1950

---

<sup>46</sup> WCAI Comments at 5-6.

<sup>47</sup> TIA Comments at 7, Lockheed Martin Comments at 6.

<sup>48</sup> Cisco Comments at 6, SIA Comments at 6.

<sup>49</sup> Cisco Comments at 6.

<sup>50</sup> We also note that FCC Part 15 limits are not appropriate as they are used for unintentional emissions, and not for the intended signal to be transmitted at Part 15 limits on a continuous basis. Normally, Part 15 compliant devices operate at levels significantly below these limits.

MHz.<sup>51</sup> Indoor and nearby CMRS and Public Safety services can operate at much lower levels than these Part 15 levels and result in harmful interference CMRS and Public Safety services. Therefore, emissions operating at Part 15 limits will not sufficiently protect CMRS and Public Safety services, and should not be used as a permissible limit for experiments in any locations without the consent of existing licensees.

In addition, many parties commented that experimental licenses must utilize the minimum power necessary and be restricted to the smallest practicable area needed to accomplish the experiments.<sup>52</sup> V-COMM agrees that experiments must utilize the minimum power necessary and restricted to smallest practical area to accomplish the objectives of the experiments. Further, utilization of indoor locations, non-mobile applications, and off-hours should be employed for the experiments to reduce the range and risk of interference to incumbent licensed services.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, transmissions at any power levels used in experiments within licensed spectrum must be coordinated with and consented by the incumbent licensee to ensure that harmful interference will not occur to incumbent services.

## **VI. ANECHOIC CHAMBERS, FARADAY CAGES AND OPEN AREA TEST SITES**

Parties submitting comments in the NPRM proceeding on these issues agree that radio experiments performed inside anechoic chambers and faraday cages should not require experimental licenses, while radio experiments performed at open area test sites should continue

---

<sup>51</sup> Pursuant to FCC Part 15.109 limits for unintentional radiators at a distance of 3 meters 200 uV/m and 500 uV/m limits are permitted within the measurement bandwidths of 100 kHz and 1 MHz for frequencies below and above 960 MHz, respectively. Receive levels provided in dBm/MHz reference isotropic antenna levels. The 800 MHz and 1950 MHz frequencies are representative of CMRS Cellular, Land Mobile Radio (LMR), and PCS bands.

<sup>52</sup> AT&T Comments at 8, Cisco Comments at 3, BAE Systems Comments at 9.

<sup>53</sup> CTIA Comments at 6, "conducted during off-peak usage hours whenever possible"; AT&T Comments at 7, "experiments should be confined to set locations and not made mobile."

to require experimental licenses to operate in licensed spectrum bands as noted below. Further, V-COMM states in its comments that sufficient RF shielding should be maintained and required to prevent signals from leaking outside such test facilities, which can cause harmful interference to existing services in licensed spectrum bands.<sup>54</sup>

Anechoic Chambers and Faraday Cages. Many parties stated that the Commission should codify its long-standing policy of permitting radio experiments performed inside anechoic chambers and faraday cages and should not require experimental licenses due to the RF isolation and shielding provided by these types of facilities.<sup>55</sup>

As previously noted in V-COMM Comments, the Commission should require sufficient isolation and shielding effectiveness be maintained to prevent signals from leaking outside such facilities, which can cause harmful interference to existing services in licensed spectrum bands such as CMRS bands. The Satellite Industry Association (SIA) also supports this provision that "any unlicensed RF testing conducted within an anechoic chamber or Faraday cage should be sufficiently shielded."<sup>56</sup> V-COMM adds that shielding effectiveness and signal leakage measurements should be performed on all frequency bands and power levels utilized to confirm the test facility and test equipment are operating properly and accordingly to manufacturer's specifications.<sup>57</sup> Boeing also commented that "entities should be able to continue to employ self-certification procedures to ensure that their test operations will not cause interference to authorized radio communications ... Boeing conducts an initial self-certification of each RF

---

<sup>54</sup> V-COMM Comments at 19-20.

<sup>55</sup> Boeing at 16-17, BAE Systems at 27, EIBASS at 15, Hewlett Packard at 3, Qualcomm at 10, Satellite Industry Association at iii, Lockheed Martin at 5.

<sup>56</sup> SIA Comments at 5.

<sup>57</sup> Anechoic chambers must be commercial grade and designed for high isolation test purposes to qualify for testing without experimental licenses. Similarly, any faraday cages utilized must have equivalent isolation performance of commercial grade anechoic chambers.

enclosure and periodically conducts follow up tests to verify continued compliance with its non-interference standards." <sup>58</sup>

Further, Boeing suggests that the "Commission should impose frequency-specific maximum emissions limits for the facilities as measured outside the facilities,"<sup>59</sup> while Lockheed Martin suggests that the "Commission should not, however, mandate compliance with a specific standard for shielding ... the entities conducting such experiments are still required to ensure that they operate on a non-interfering basis." <sup>60</sup> Specifically, Boeing and SIA proposed adopting the FCC's Part 15 limits for unintentional radiators as a standard for maximum permitted emissions outside these facilities.<sup>61</sup> V-COMM disagrees with Boeing and SIA on adoption of Part 15 radiation limits as a permissible standard because such emission levels will not provide sufficient protection for all frequency bands in all cases, such as in CMRS and Public Safety bands.<sup>62</sup> V-COMM maintains that no specific standard can be applied that would protect incumbent services on all frequency bands, and therefore the Commission must rely on licensee consent to ensure protection of incumbent services.

Further, emissions at Part 15 limits are strong enough to cause harmful interference to CMRS and Public Safety services in various spectrum bands. For example, Part 15 limits permit the receive levels of -79 dBm/MHz at 800 MHz, and -89 dBm/MHz at 1950 MHz.<sup>63</sup> Indoor and

---

<sup>58</sup> Boeing Comments at 20.

<sup>59</sup> Boeing Comments at 16.

<sup>60</sup> Lockheed Martin Comments at 5.

<sup>61</sup> Boeing Comments at 18-19, SIA Comments at 5-6.

<sup>62</sup> We also note that FCC Part 15 limits are not appropriate as they are used for unintentional emissions, and not for the intended signal to be transmitted at Part 15 limits on a continuous basis. Normally, Part 15 compliant devices operate at levels significantly below these limits.

<sup>63</sup> Pursuant to FCC Part 15.109 limits for unintentional radiators at a distance of 3 meters 200 uV/m and 500 uV/m limits are permitted within the measurement bandwidths of 100 kHz and 1 MHz for frequencies below and above 960 MHz, respectively. Receive levels provided in dBm/MHz reference

nearby CMRS and Public Safety services can operate at much lower levels than these Part 15 levels and result in harmful interference CMRS and Public Safety services. Therefore, emissions operating at Part 15 limits will not sufficiently protect CMRS and Public Safety services, and should not be used as a permissible limit for compliance of anechoic chambers and faraday cages. Further, properly installed and operating anechoic chambers and faraday cages should reduce emissions outside the facilities to well below the Part 15 permissible limits.

Open Area Test Sites (OATS). A few parties commented on OATS in the NPRM comment proceeding including V-COMM and the Engineers for the Integrity of Broadcast Auxiliary Services Spectrum (EIBASS). The parties stated that radio experiments performed at OATS should continue to require experimental licenses to operate in licensed spectrum bands. EIBASS also noted that licensing for OATS is important for tracking and interference resolution purposes. Therefore, OATS should remain as requiring an experimental license. EIBASS notes:

"Because such sites by definition are not screened or shielded, OATs should always require an FCC license; this could be an experimental license, a Manufacturer's Radio Service (MRS) license, or other Commission authorization. But an OAT facility should always have an authorization record in an FCC database and resultant accountability in the event that harmful interference is caused to any licensed service. Since an OAT facility generally requires a substantial investment in land, structures and hardware, requiring the licensing of such a site in all cases would represent a small and reasonable burden."<sup>64</sup>

V-COMM agrees that such facilities should require experimental licenses, and we add that they should be required to confirm that signals are not leaking outside the test facilities where it could interfere with existing licensed services. Signal leakage measurements should be performed on all frequency bands and power levels utilized in tests. Further, V-COMM notes

---

isotropic antenna levels. The 800 MHz and 1950 MHz frequencies are representative of CMRS Cellular, Land Mobile Radio (LMR), and PCS bands.

<sup>64</sup> EIBASS Comments at 15.

additional information and requirements that should be required for OATS experimental license applications:

"Applications for OATS experimental licenses should include a detailed description of the test site facility, the power and frequency bands utilized in tests, the types of antenna used in tests, radio frequency techniques used to minimize signal reflections and leakage from the facility, proof of non-interference to existing licensed services, and justifications for not using anechoic chambers for such experiments. Construction of such facilities require sufficiently open areas free of reflections, an advanced competence in radio frequency engineering, and should meet qualifications described in ANSI C63 standards for open area test sites." <sup>65</sup>

## **VII. CONCLUSION**

For reasons provided, the Commission should not authorize Experimental Licenses or Market Trials to third parties in licensed CMRS spectrum. CMRS spectrum bands are not suitable and not compatible with third party radio experiments by universities, research organizations, and health care facilities. CMRS spectrum bands are intensely utilized and have high mobility users that are not suitable for radio experimentation or underlay spectrum sharing, which would result in harmful interference to existing CMRS services including E911 and other emergency services. The Commission should consider other bands more suitable for research, testing, and developing new and unproven technologies, which will not interfere with existing licensed services.

Further, CMRS licensees have limited engineering staff that are not capable of investigating and addressing third party experiments in their licensed bands. Such a distraction will diminish the quality of service of CMRS networks and slow the rate of innovation of new CMRS technologies including LTE.

---

<sup>65</sup> V-COMM Comments at 20. OATS facilities are generally confined areas that are designed to be radio frequency isolated from surrounded areas with minimized reflections.

In addition, we note that the Commission's current experimental licensing rules work very well and are not an impediment to innovation, coordination and consent must be required for any experiments in licensed spectrum, and power flux density thresholds and Part 15 limits will not provide sufficient protection from harmful interference for CMRS services and should not be adopted for experimental licenses absent licensee consent.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Sean Haynberg  
Director of RF Technologies

David Hunt, Senior RF Engineer  
David Stern, Vice President  
Dominic Villecco, President

V-COMM, L.L.C.  
2540 US Highway 130, Suite 101  
Cranbury, NJ 08512  
(609) 655-1200

Filed: April 11, 2011

## **APPENDIX A – COMPANY INFORMATION & BIOGRAPHIES**

V-COMM is a leading provider of quality engineering and engineering consulting services to the worldwide wireless telecommunications industry with offices in Cranbury, NJ and Blue Bell, PA. V-COMM's engineering staff is experienced in Cellular, Personal Communications Services, 700 MHz Spectrum, Wireless Broadband Data, Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio, Paging, Public Safety, 2-Way radio, Microwave, and Broadcast Mobile TV. We have provided our expertise to wireless operators in engineering, system design, implementation, performance, optimization, and evaluation of new wireless technologies. We have extensive experience in studying interference in various spectrum bands including Cellular, SMR, PCS, AWS, Air-to-ground, Public Safety, and 700 MHz spectrum. We have engineering experience in all commercial wireless technologies, including LTE, HSPA, UMTS, EVDO, CDMA, GSM, EDGE, WiMAX, MediaFLO, DVB-H, and Public Safety wireless technologies including analog and digital Project 25, EDACS, Opensky, and other trunking and conventional radio networks. Further, V-COMM was selected by the FCC & Department of Justice to provide expert analysis and testimony in the Nextwave and Pocket Communications Bankruptcy cases. For additional information, visit V-COMM's web site at [www.vcomm-eng.com](http://www.vcomm-eng.com).

### **BIOGRAPHIES OF SENIOR MEMBERS OF ENGINEERING STAFF**

#### **Dominic C. Villecco President and Founder, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Dominic Villecco, President and founder of V-COMM, is a pioneer in wireless telecommunications engineering, with over 29 years of executive-level experience and various engineering management positions previously held. Under his leadership, V-COMM has grown from a start-up venture in 1995 to a highly respected full-service wireless telecommunications engineering firm.

In managing V-COMM's growth, Mr. Villecco has overseen expansion of the company's portfolio of consulting services, which today include a full range of RF and Network support, network design tools, measurement hardware, and database services as well as time-critical engineering-related services such as business planning, zoning hearing expert witness testimony, regulatory advisory assistance, and project management.

Before forming V-COMM, Mr. Villecco spent 10 years with Comcast Corporation, where he held management positions of increasing responsibility, his last being Vice President of Wireless Engineering for Comcast International Holdings, Inc. Focusing on the international marketplace,

Mr. Villecco helped develop various technical and business requirements for directing Comcast's worldwide wireless venture utilizing current and emerging technologies.

Previously he was Vice President of Engineering and Operations for Comcast Cellular Communications, Inc. His responsibilities included overall system design, construction and operation, capital and operating budget preparation and execution, interconnection negotiations, vendor contract negotiations, major account interface, new product implementation, and cellular market acquisition. Following Comcast's acquisition, Mr. Villecco successfully merged the two departments and managed the combined department of 140 engineers and support personnel.

Mr. Villecco served as Director of Engineering for American Cellular Network Corporation (AMCELL), where he managed all system implementation and engineering design issues. He was responsible for activating the first cellular system in the world utilizing proprietary automatic call delivery software between independent carriers in Wilmington, Delaware. He also had responsibility for filing all FCC and FAA applications for AMCELL.

Prior to joining AMCELL, Mr. Villecco worked as a staff engineer at Sherman and Beverage (S&B), a broadcast consulting firm. He designed FM radio station broadcasting systems and studio-transmitter link systems, performed AM field studies and interference analysis, and TV interference analysis, and helped build a sophisticated six-tower arrangement for a AM antenna phasing system. He also designed software for FM allocations pursuant to FCC Rules Part 73.

Mr. Villecco started his career in telecommunications engineering as a wireless engineering consultant at Jubon Engineering, where he was responsible for the design of cellular systems, both domestic and international, radio paging systems, microwave radio systems, two-way radio systems, microwave multipoint distribution systems, and simulcast radio link systems, including the drafting of all FCC and FAA applications for these systems.

Mr. Villecco has testified as an expert witness in federal court on behalf of the Department of Justice and the Federal Communications Commission on two separate high profile cases involving wireless system design, implementation and operation.

Mr. Villecco has a BSEE from Drexel University, in Philadelphia. He is also a member of the Drexel ECE (Electrical and Computer Engineering) Department advisory board. In February 2001, Mr. Villecco received the "2001 Distinguished Alumnus Award" from the Drexel ECE Department for his continued contributions to the engineering profession. Since 1983, Mr. Villecco has been an active member of IEEE.

Relevant Expert Witness Testimony Experience:

Over the past fifteen years, Mr. Villecco had been previously qualified and provided expert witness testimony in the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Michigan. Mr. Villecco has also provided expert witness testimony in the following cases:

- United States Bankruptcy Court
- NextWave Personal Communications, Inc. vs. Federal Communications Commission \*\*
- Pocket Communications, Inc. vs. Federal Communications Commission \*\*

\*\* In these cases, Mr. Villecco was retained by the FCC and the Department of Justice as a technical expert on their behalf, pertaining to matters of wireless network design, optimization and operation.

**David K. Stern**  
**Vice President, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

David Stern, Vice President and co-founder of V-COMM, has over 27 years of hands-on operational and business experience in telecommunications engineering. He began his career with Motorola, where he developed an in-depth knowledge of the wireless engineering technologies CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, as well as AMPS and Nextel's iDEN.

While at V-COMM, Mr. Stern oversaw the design and implementation of several major Wireless markets in the Northeast United States, including Omnipoint - New York, Verizon Wireless, Unitel Cellular, Alabama Wireless, PCS One and Conestoga Wireless. He has testified at a number of Zoning and Planning Boards in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan.

Prior to joining V-COMM, Mr. Stern spent seven years with Comcast Cellular Communications, Inc., where he held several engineering management positions. As Director of Strategic Projects, he was responsible for all technical aspects of Comcast's wireless data business, including implementation of the CDPD Cellular Packet Data network. He also was responsible for bringing into commercial service the Cellular Data Gateway, a circuit switched data solution.

Also, Mr. Stern was the Director of Wireless System Engineering, charged with evaluating new digital technologies, including TDMA and CDMA, for possible adoption. He represented Comcast on several industry committees pertaining to CDMA digital cellular technology and served on the Technology Committee of a wireless company on behalf of Comcast. He helped to direct Comcast's participation in the A- and B-block PCS auctions and won high praise for his recommendations regarding the company's technology deployment in the PCS markets.

At the beginning of his tenure with Comcast, Mr. Stern was Director of Engineering at Comcast, managing a staff of 40 technical personnel. He had overall responsibility for a network that included 250 cell sites, three MTSOs, four Motorola EMX-2500 switches, IS-41 connections, SS-7 interconnection, and a fiber optic and microwave "disaster-resistant" interconnect network.

Mr. Stern began his career at Motorola as a Cellular Systems Engineer, where he developed his skills in RF engineering, frequency planning, and site acquisition activities. His promotion to Program Manager-Northeast for the rapidly growing New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia markets gave him the responsibility for coordinating all activities and communications with Motorola's cellular infrastructure customers. He directed contract preparations, equipment orders and deliveries, project implementation schedules, and engineering support services.

Mr. Stern earned a BSEE from the University of Illinois, in Urbana, and is a member of IEEE.

**Sean Haynberg**  
**Director of RF Technologies, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Sean Haynberg, Director of RF Technologies at V-COMM, has over 21 years of experience in wireless engineering. Mr. Haynberg has extensive experience in wireless system design, implementation, testing and optimization for wireless broadband data and voice systems utilizing UMTS, HSPA, LTE, EVDO, CDMA, GSM, EDGE, ESMR and Analog wireless technologies. In his career, he has conducted numerous new technology deployments, compatibility & interference studies, and evaluations to assess, develop and integrate new technologies that meet industry and FCC guidelines. His career began with Bell Atlantic Mobile, where he developed an in-depth knowledge of wireless engineering.

While at V-COMM, Mr. Haynberg was responsible for the performance of RF engineering team supplying total RF services to a diverse client group. His projects included managing a team of RF Engineers to perform interference testing & analysis, FCC reporting and presentations, studying new wireless technology compatibility and integration with existing CMRS network technologies, conducting technology interference studies at CMRS base stations and customer provided equipment, design, deploy and optimize numerous CMRS wireless networks in various markets, wireless system design & expansion of international markets in Brazil and Bermuda, and development and procurement of hardware and software engineering tools. He has also developed tools and procedures to assist carriers in compliance to FCC rules & regulations for RF Safety, international TV band interference studies, and other FCC regulatory issues. In addition, Mr. Haynberg was instrumental in providing leadership, technical analysis, engineering expertise, and management of a team of RF Engineers to deliver expert engineering support and reporting on behalf of the FCC & Department of Justice, in the NextWave and Pocket Communications Bankruptcy proceedings.

Prior to joining V-COMM, Mr. Haynberg held various management and engineering positions at Bell Atlantic NYNEX Mobile (BANM). He was responsible for evaluating new technologies and providing support for the development, integration and implementation of first office applications (FOA), including CDMA, CDPD, and RF Fingerprinting Technology. Beyond this, Haynberg provided RF engineering guidelines and recommendations to the company's regional network operations, supported the evaluation and integration of new wireless equipment and technologies, including indoor wireless PBX/office systems, phased/narrow-array smart antenna systems, interference and inter-modulation analysis and measurements, and cell site co-location and acceptance procedures. He was responsible for the procurement, development and support of engineering tools for RF and system performance engineers to enhance the performance, design and optimization of the regional cellular networks. He began his career as an RF Engineer responsible for the system design and expansion of cellular markets in New Jersey, Philadelphia, PA; Pittsburgh, PA; Washington, DC; and Baltimore, MD markets.

Mr. Haynberg earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering with high honors, and attended post-graduate work, at Rutgers University in Piscataway, New Jersey. While at Rutgers, Mr. Haynberg received numerous honors including membership in the National Engineering Honor Societies. In addition, Mr. Haynberg has qualified and provided expert witness testimony in the subject matter of RF engineering and the operation of wireless network systems for many municipalities in the State of New Jersey.

**David Hunt**  
**Senior Staff RF Engineer, V-COMM, L.L.C.**

Mr. Hunt has over 27 years of experience in RF engineering including extensive experience in wireless planning, RF design, optimization, and performance of wireless systems utilizing OFDM, CDMA, EVDO, GSM/GPRS/EDGE, UMTS/HSPA, LTE, SMR/IDEN and other wireless technologies. In his career, he was responsible for the specification, design, proof-of-performance tests, implementation, and optimization of numerous wireless communications systems, detection and measurement systems including advanced military systems. His career began in the specification, design, and implementation of underwater acoustic warfare systems and continued with commercial wireless communications systems while at V-COMM.

While at V-COMM, Mr. Hunt has been responsible for the performance of a RF engineering team supplying a variety of RF services to a diverse client group. Projects include: system performance monitoring, frequency planning, adjacent market coordination, inter-modulation analysis, RF propagation prediction, system technology evaluation. Mr. Hunt designed, tested, optimized, and maintained new and existing cellular, PCS, MMDS, SMR, 700 MHz and other wireless voice and/or data systems throughout the United States and the Caribbean. In addition, Mr. Hunt has been involved in special technology evaluations and the development and procurement of hardware and software engineering tools to enhance both V-COMM and its client's capabilities. Mr. Hunt has lead the development of tools and procedures to assist clients and carriers in meeting compliance with FCC Rules & Regulations for RF Safety, emission standards and other FCC regulatory issues including FCC, FAA and AM tower studies and filings. David's activities included the development and submission of comprehensive engineering studies for consideration in numerous FCC proceedings.

While at the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC), Mr. Hunt designed and wrote computer programs to generate and display antenna beam pattern for various conditions of a linear array of hydrophones for display of receiver gain calculations. He documented this work in Technical Memorandum 5032 TM-887-IBP-08. Mr. Hunt was involved in all aspects of the SSQ-101 Air Deployable Active Receiver (ADAR) sonobuoy development including: signal processing software, hardware design and development, test planning, setup and testing. Mr. Hunt designed, developed and implemented an All-Threat In-Buoy Signal Processing (IBSP) Program used to detect, classify and localize enemy targets on the SUN workstation using standard signal to noise ratio measurements and advanced detection methods. This involved analyzing signal to noise ratio performance requirements and the design/implementation of specific portions of the preprocessor including modulation, filter decimation, windowing with redundancy, frequency analysis, magnitude/phase detection and a short term integration process.

While at NAWC, he received seven Performance Awards, a Quality Step Increase, three Letters of Appreciation, and one Special Act Award.

Mr. Hunt has a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Temple University emphasizing Signal Processing, Digital Signal Processing and Communications. In addition, Mr. Hunt has earned a Masters of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Drexel University in Philadelphia.