Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

)
)
) IBFS File No. SAT-AMD-20170301-00026
) Call Sign S2935
)
) IBFS File No. SAT-LOA-20170301-00027
) Call Sign S2992
)
) IBFS File No. SAT-PDR-20170301-00023
) Call Sign S2991
)

CONSOLIDATED REPLY OF VIASAT, INC.

ViaSat, Inc. hereby replies to the responses filed by O3b Limited ("O3b"), Space Exploration Holdings, LLC ("SpaceX"), and Telesat Canada ("Telesat") in connection with the above-captioned applications, which were filed in the pending non-geostationary-satellite orbit ("NGSO") processing round covering frequencies in the V-band (the "Applications").¹

ViaSat's comments on the Applications urged the Commission to facilitate shared and efficient use of V-band spectrum by NGSO systems and geostationary satellite orbit ("GSO") networks by conditioning each NGSO Application grant to ensure that future deployment of GSO systems is not precluded or impeded, and that multiple NGSO systems can coexist through

¹ See Satellite Policy Branch Information, Boeing Application Accepted for Filing in Part, IBFS File No. SAT-LOA-20160622-00058, Cut-Off Established for Additional NGSO-Like Satellite Applications or Petitions for Operations in the 37.5-40.0 GHz, 40.0-42.0 GHz, 47.2-50.2 GHz, and 50.4-51.4 GHz Bands, Public Notice, DA 16-1244 (rel. Nov. 1, 2016) ("Public Notice").

any sharing mechanisms that may be adopted in the future for V-band NGSO systems.² Specifically, ViaSat proposed that grant of any Application for an NGSO system in the processing round be conditioned upon compliance with Article 22.2 of the ITU's Radio Regulations—which requires NGSO systems to protect GSO networks from unacceptable interference—and that this condition apply pending the Commission's adoption of any other NGSO-GSO sharing criteria for the V-band. In addition, ViaSat urged that any such grants be subject to the outcome of any future proceeding regarding V-band NGSO operations, including any proceeding to address EPFD limits in the V band.

Since ViaSat filed those comments, the Commission adopted default sharing rules for NGSO and GSO systems that allow both types of systems to be licensed in bands where the Commission has not yet adopted specific service rules.³ Those default rules are based on the Article 22.2 obligations of NGSO systems not to cause unacceptable interference to GSO networks.

In their respective responses, SpaceX, O3b and Telesat do not object to ViaSat's comments or proposed conditions. Specifically, SpaceX indicated that it does not object to conditions designed to protect GSO networks, and expressed support for the international efforts underway to develop EPFD limits for NGSO operations in V-band frequencies.⁴ Moreover, O3b

² See Consolidated Comments of ViaSat, Inc., File Nos. SAT-AMD-20170301-00026, SAT-LOA-20170301-00027, SAT-PDR-20170301-00023 (September 25, 2017) ("ViaSat Consolidated Comments").

³ See Update to Parts 2 and 25 Concerning Non-Geostationary, Fixed-Satellite Service Systems and Related Matters, IB Docket No. 16-408, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 17-122, at ¶ 39 & Appendix A, Section 25.289 (rel. Sept. 27, 2017) ("NGSO Order").

⁴ *See* Consolidated Response to Comments of Space Exploration Holdings, LLC, File No. SAT-LOA-20170301-00027, at 5 (filed Oct. 10, 2017).

agreed with ViaSat regarding the need for NGSO networks to protect GSO operations, including through conditions that would subject authorized V-band NGSO operations to any rules adopted in the future. O3b also urged that the Commission develop "effective regulatory measures and enforcement mechanisms to protect GSO satellites from the potential for aggregate interference from multiple NGSO systems."⁵ Similarly, Telesat indicated that it has no objection to conditions requiring NGSO systems to comply with EPFD limits or other technical limits that may be adopted in the future to protect co-frequency V-band GSO operations, and urged that each grant of authority in the V-band processing round be subject to such conditions.⁶

For these reasons and those set forth in its initial comments, ViaSat urges the Commission to impose conditions on any grant of the Applications to ensure compliance with requirements to protect GSO operations from unacceptable interference, and subject to the outcome of any future proceeding addressing V-band NGSO operations.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Christopher J. Murphy Associate General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Daryl H. Hunter Senior Director, Regulatory Affairs VIASAT, INC. 6155 El Camino Real Carlsbad, CA 92009 John P. Janka Elizabeth R. Park Jarrett S. Taubman LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 555 Eleventh Street, N.W. Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20004

Counsel for ViaSat, Inc.

October 23, 2017

⁵ Response of O3b Limited, File No. SAT-AMD-20170301-00026, at 3-4 (filed Oct. 11, 2017).

⁶ See Consolidated Response of Telesat Canada, File No. SAT-PDR-20170301-00023, at 3-4.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kayla Ernst, hereby certify that on this 23rd day of October, 2017, I served a true copy of the foregoing Consolidated Reply of ViaSat, Inc. via first-class mail upon the following:

Suzanne Malloy O3b Limited 900 17th Street, NW Suite 300 Washington, DC 20006

Karis Hastings SatCom Law LLC 1317 F Street, NW Suite 400 Washington, DC 20004

Counsel to O3b Limited

Elisabeth Neasmith Telesat Canada 1601 Telesat Court Ottawa, Ontario Canada, K1B 5P4 Tim Hughes Patricia Cooper Space Exploration Technologies Corp. 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 220E Washington, DC 20005

William M. Wiltshire Paul Caritj Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis LLP 1919 M. Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Counsel to SpaceX

Joseph A. Godles Goldberg, Godles, Wiener & Wright, LLP 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

Counsel to Telesat Canada

<u>/s/</u>

Kayla Ernst