SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY (US) LLP



Suite 500 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004

Office: +1.202.626.6600 Fax: +1.202.626.6780

> Direct Dial: +1.202.626.6659 carlos.nalda@ssd.com

March 25, 2011

BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Satellite Division International Bureau Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Re: Panasonic Avionics Corporation; Minor Amendment to Application for Blanket AES Operating Authority; File No. SES-LIC-20100805-00992, Call Sign E1000890

Dear Sir or Madam:

Panasonic Avionics Corporation ("Panasonic"), through its attorneys, hereby submits a minor amendment to the above-captioned application filed on August 5, 2010.¹ This minor amendment, submitted on FCC Form 312, increases the requested number of authorized technically identical aircraft earth stations ("AES") from 15 to 50. This amendment is prompted by the projected installation schedule for Panasonic's launch customer, Lufthansa, and the desire to ensure that any long-term commercial authority issued by the Commission reflects the maximum number of MELCO terminals that may be simultaneously present in U.S. territory upon full implementation of this AES terminal type.

The instant amendment is a minor amendment pursuant to Section 25.116 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 25.116, because it does not increase the potential for interference, or change the proposed frequencies or orbital locations to be used. Panasonic proposes to operate a network of technically identical AES terminals using time division multiple access ("TDMA") technology at power levels that comply with the Commission's two-degree spacing policies. Thus, AES terminals in the Panasonic network operate at power levels equivalent to routinely authorized VSATs and are assigned individual transmission time slots, so only a single AES terminal transmits at any given point in time. Issues regarding aggregate interference from simultaneously transmitting AES terminals are not

37 OFFICES IN 17 COUNTRIES

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey (US) LLP is part of the international legal practice Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, which operates worldwide through a number of separate legal entities.

¹ See Application of Panasonic Avionics Corporation for Authority to Operate Up to 15 Technically Identical Aeronautical Mobile-Satellite Service ("AMSS") Aircraft Earth Stations ("AESs") in the 14.0-14.4 GHz and 11.7-12.2 GHz Frequency Bands, File Nos. SES-LIC-20100805-00992, SES-AMD-20100914-01163 and SES-AMD-20101115-01432 (Call Sign E100089) ("Application").

Satellite Division March 25, 2011 Page 2

implicated. Regardless of the maximum number of authorized terminals, the potential for interference from the network is limited to a single AES terminal transmitting in an assigned time slot.

Moreover, from a potential interference perspective, there is no material difference between the addition of AES terminals to a Ku-band aeronautical-mobile satellite service ("AMSS") network and the addition of remote terminals to a Ku-band VSAT network. It is well understood that the addition of remote terminals to a VSAT network is procedurally a minor modification because it does not increase the potential for interference to other spectrum users.² Similarly, the addition of a modest number of AES terminals, which operate like VSAT terminals from an interference standpoint, should be considered a minor amendment to a pending application because there is no increased potential for interference. As discussed above, this is particularly true in the TDMA context.

Panasonic would finally note that, regardless of their number, its AES terminals must necessarily operate on a non-harmful interference basis vis-à-vis other Ku-band spectrum users (particularly primary GSO FSS and government radio astronomy and space research operations) because they operate under the secondary aeronautical mobile-satellite service ("AMSS") allocation in the 14.0-14.5 GHz band. Furthermore, the maximum number of terminals at issue (50) is orders of magnitude less than the number of AMSS terminals previously authorized by the Commission to similarly operate on a secondary, non-harmful interference basis.³ Viewed in this context, the modest change in the number of authorized AES terminals from 15 to 50 would not increase the potential for interference from Panasonic's proposed operations.

² Section 25.118(a)(3) states that "[a]uthorized VSAT earth station operators may add VSAT remote terminals without prior authorization..." 47 C.F.R. § 25.118(a)(3). The Commission proposed the Part 25 rule changes that included Section 25.118(a)(3) to "clarify the distinction between major and minor modifications." *Amendment of the Commission's Space Station Licensing rules and Policies; 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review – Streamlining and Other Revisions of Part 25 of the Commission's Rules Governing the Licensing of, and Spectrum Usage by, Satellite Network Earth Stations and Space Stations, IB Docket Nos. 02-34 and 00-248, Third Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 03-154, ¶ 74 (2003).*

³ See Row 44, Inc. Application for Authority to Operate Up to 1,000 Technically Identical Aeronautical Mobile Satellite Service Transmit/Receive Earth Stations Aboard Commercial and Private Aircraft, Order and Authorization, DA 09-1752 (2009); ViaSat Inc., Application for Blanket Authority for Operation of Up to 1,000 Technically Identical Ku-Band Aircraft Earth Stations in the United States and Over Territorial Waters, Order and Authorization, DA 07-4674 (2007); ARINC Incorporated, Application for Blanket Authority for Operation of up to One Thousand Technically Identical Ku-Band Transmit/Receive Airborne Mobile Stations Aboard Aircraft Operating in the United States and Adjacent Waters, Order and Authorization, DA 05-1016 (2005); and The Boeing Company Application for Blanket Authority To Operate up to Eight Hundred Technically Identical Receive-Only Mobile Earth Stations Aboard Aircraft in the 11.7-12.2 GHz Frequency Band, Order and Authorization, DA 01-658 (2001).

Satellite Division March 25, 2011 Page 3

For these reasons, the Commission should treat the instant application amendment as a minor amendment under Section 25.116 of the rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey (US) LLP

/s/ Carlos M. Nalda

Carlos M. Nalda Joshua T. Guyan

Counsel for Panasonic Avionics Corporation

Att: FCC Form 312

cc (w/ att.): Stephen Duall Paul Blais