



FiberTower

1667 K Street, NW
Suite 250
Washington DC 20036
Main: 202.223.9690
Fax: 202.223.9692

August 11, 2008

James R. Burtles, Chief
Experimental Licensing Branch
Office of Engineering and Technology
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

**RE: FiberTower Corporation's Informal Objection to Experimental License
Application 0051-EX-PL - 2008**

Dear Mr. Burtles:

Pursuant to Sections 1.41 and 5.95 of the Commission's rules,¹ FiberTower Corporation ("FiberTower") submits this informal objection in response to Wireless Strategies Inc.'s ("WSI") experimental license application. FiberTower recommends that the application be dismissed because it is incomplete. WSI's application does not offer adequate technical detail to allow potentially affected existing or future licenses to properly assess the interference risk of the proposed tests. WSI's experimental testing could potentially negatively affect vital traffic transmitted on fixed microwave networks. On the other hand, WSI's experimental authority should be conditioned on full compliance with completing the pre-coordination procedures set forth in Section 101.103(d) of the Commission's rules² and provide adequate technical detail. Finally, FiberTower generally endorses the comments filed on this matter by AT&T and Verizon.³

Background on Experimental Application. Three of WSI's licenses provide it with authority to deploy fixed point-to-point stations at specific locations in Maryland. WSI requests authority to perform experiments of controversial transmission concepts.

¹ 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.41, 5.95.

² 47 C.F.R. § 101.103(d).

³ See AT&T, "Informal Objection to Experimental License Application," File Number 0051-EX-PL-2008 April 2, 2008; Verizon, "Application of Wireless Strategies, Inc. for Experimental Radio Service Authorization," File Number 0051-EX-PL-2008 April 14, 2008.

In addition, WSI suggests that the operating parameters for the experimental facilities be incorporated into licenses WQGH695, WQGH696, and WQGH697.⁴

Furthermore, WSI currently has a Petition for Declaratory Ruling awaiting review. In its petition, WSI asserts that notions that would be the focal point of the proposed test, such as “concurrent coordination” and “distributed radiating elements” are coherent with Part 101 licensing requirements.⁵ WSI’s Petition caused numerous concerns raised by affected parties, which have demonstrated that WSI’s requests are conflicting with the Commission’s licensing and coordination rules.⁶

Objections. WSI’s application lacks adequate technical detail to permit evaluation of its proposed operations. Pursuant to Section 5.55(c), applications for experimental authorization must be “specific and complete with regard to station location, proposed equipment, power, antenna height, and operating frequency.”⁷ The Technical Submissions submitted by WSI does not specify how the system will work, how interference will be avoided, and how the proposal complies with FCC rules and policies. Rather, WSI’s application uses vague terms and notions such as, “DREs”, “smart antennas”, “concurrently coordinated”, and “interference contours” which have yet to be sufficiently defined. WSI must define its experiment and all the boundaries involved in the test. Additionally, Section 5.63(a) requires that each application contain a narrative statement adequately describing the program of research and experimentation proposed, the specific objectives sought to be achieved, and how the program of experimentation has a reasonable promise of contribution to the development and extension of the radio art.⁸

The application provides no information on the specific transmission facilities that would be activated under WSI’s proposed experiment. Specifically, WSI does not identify the precise locations of each transmitting DRE, the amount of radiated power that each DRE would transmit, the operating height of each DRE, the distance of each point-to-point path created by a DRE and a thorough description of the antenna pattern. As a result of the lack of information, there is no way to validate WSI’s assertion that the radiation patterns of the DREs would be completely contained within the patterns authorized under its licenses.

Furthermore, WSI contends that it will perform a “study” in order to prevent any interference received at any existing or proposed licensees.⁹ However, WSI’s technical report does not provide an adequate description of how the “study” will be conducted, what it will measure, and how it is a sufficient alternative to the Commission’s bilateral

⁴ Wireless Strategies Inc., “Application for New or Modified Radio Station Under Part 5 of FCC Rules – Experimental Radio Service,” File No. 0051-EX-PL-2008 February 22, 2008 at 1.

⁵ See Wireless Strategies Inc., Request for Declaratory Ruling on Compliance of Fixed Microwave Antennas Having Distributed Radiating Elements, WTB Docket No. 07-121 (filed Feb. 27, 2007) (“Request”).

⁶ See AT&T, “Informal Objection to Experimental License Application,” File Number 0051-EX-PL-2008 April 2, 2008; Verizon, “Application of Wireless Strategies, Inc. for Experimental Radio Service Authorization,” File Number 0051-EX-PL-2008 April 14, 2008.

⁷ 47 C.F.R. § 5.55(c).

⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 5.63(a).

⁹ Technical Submission at 1.