

From: Steven Doiron

To: Doug Young
Date: February 03, 2009

Subject: Request for Info - File #0013-EX-ML-2009

Message:

Mr. Douglas Young
Office of Engineering and Technology
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: HNS License Sub, LLC, Application for Modification of Experimental License
(Call Sign WE2XEW; FCC File No. 0013-EX-ML-2009) --
Correspondence Ref. No. 8010

Dear Mr. Young:

This letter responds on behalf of HNS License Sub, LLC (?Hughes?) to your email correspondence to Steven Doiron, dated February 2, 2009, requesting additional information and clarification concerning the above-referenced application. In particular, you requested that Hughes: (1) provide an explanation of how its application fits into one or more of the categories under which OET will consider expedited processing, and (2) clarify the maximum number of units that would be involved in any market studies permitted under the requested modification.

With respect first to the maximum number of units that would be subject to market study authority, Hughes clarifies that no more than six (6) units would be used for this purpose either under the operations planned in connection with Row 44 or with respect to any future, similar uses. As only six units are required for the tests currently planned, Hughes revises this aspect of its proposal to specify a maximum number of six (6) units. Hughes will have the opportunity to file a further limited modification at some future point should future demands result in a need for additional terminals to be used for limited market studies.

With respect to the subject of expedited processing, Hughes?s modification request does not directly implicate matters involving national defense, weapons development, homeland security, public safety or safety of life. Although the in-flight broadband system that would be tested under the limited market study authority requested would provide additional communications capability for airline flight and cabin crews, it is not intended that such links be used primarily for flight safety purposes or in emergency situations, where other communications links are primary. This aspect of Hughes? request was intended only to alert the staff to the pressing near-term need of a Hughes customer to make use of the authority sought, and to reinforce the fact that ? based on the non-technical nature of the requested change ? evaluation of the request might be able to be processed more rapidly than a modification application that sought approval for a change in technical characteristics. Hughes asks only that the current application be considered as quickly as OET?s current workload permits; it is not seeking formal expedited processing pursuant to the established OET standards for such treatment.

Should there be any further questions regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen D. Baruch
Counsel to HNS License Sub, LLC

