

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Inmarsat Mobile Networks, Inc.) File Nos. SES-LIC-20120426-00397,
) SES-AMD-20120823-00781, and
Application to Operate a Fixed-Satellite) SES-AMD-20150114-00008
Service Gateway Earth Station Facility in)
Lino Lakes, Minnesota with the) Call Sign: E120072
Inmarsat-5 F2 Space Station)

**REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OR
CLARIFICATION**

On April 29, 2015, Iridium Satellite LLC (“Iridium”) filed a Petition for Reconsideration or Clarification (“Petition”) of the *Order*¹ issued by the International Bureau (“Bureau”) in the above-captioned proceeding. On May 11, 2015, Inmarsat Mobile Networks, Inc. (“Inmarsat”) filed an Opposition to Iridium’s Petition.²

Iridium, by its attorneys, hereby replies to Inmarsat’s Opposition. Iridium demonstrates in this Reply that Inmarsat has mischaracterized the terms of its coordination with Iridium and has made claims that are unrelated to the relief Iridium requested. Once these errors are rectified, no basis remains for Inmarsat’s Opposition. Accordingly, Inmarsat’s arguments should be disregarded and Iridium’s Petition should be granted.

¹ *Order and Authorization and Declaratory Ruling*, DA 15-392, released March 30, 2015 (“*Order*”).

² *Opposition to Petition for Reconsideration or Clarification* (“*Opposition*”).

I. Inmarsat Has Mischaracterized the Terms of its Coordination with Iridium

In the United States, there is no designation in the Commission's band plan for GSO FSS operations in the 29.1-29.25 GHz band, *i.e.*, such operations are a non-conforming use.³ In recognition of this non-conforming status, the Bureau in its *Order* required that Inmarsat's Lino Lakes earth station not cause harmful interference to NGSO MSS feeder links, and not claim interference protection from NGSO MSS feeder links, in the 29.1-29.25 GHz band.⁴

Iridium requested in its Petition that the Bureau either clarify or determine on reconsideration that these requirements apply both to U.S. NGSO MSS feeder links that already are licensed and to U.S. NGSO MSS feeder links that may be licensed in the future. Iridium demonstrated that applying the requirements to existing U.S. NGSO MSS feeder links and future U.S. NGSO MSS feeder links: (1) would be in keeping with basic allocation principles that give primary operations priority over non-conforming uses; and (2) would avoid a preclusive effect on Iridium's U.S. use of the 29.1-29.25 GHz band for the primary purposes for which it has been designated.

Inmarsat opposed Iridium's request to apply the "do not interfere" and "do not claim interference protection" conditions to future Iridium feeder links. According to Inmarsat, Iridium's request "could inadvertently change the terms of the [Inmarsat-

³ See *Order* at ¶ 14.

⁴ See *Order* at ¶ 17.

Iridium] coordination and improperly expand the scope of Iridium's rights under those [coordination] agreements."⁵

Inmarsat has mischaracterized the terms of its coordination with Iridium.

[REDACTED]

In sum, Inmarsat's argument is based on an erroneous factual premise. Protecting operation in the United States of future Iridium feeder links using the 29.1-29.25 GHz band cannot "inadvertently change the terms of the [Inmarsat-Iridium] coordination," because [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

⁵ Opposition at 3.

II. Inmarsat Has Made Claims That Are Unrelated to the Relief Iridium Requested

Iridium also requested in its Petition that the Bureau either clarify or determine on reconsideration that Inmarsat's inability to claim interference protection from U.S. NGSO MSS feeder links in the 29.1-29.25 GHz band applies to the receivers on the Inmarsat-5 F2 satellite. Iridium showed that this clarification or determination is appropriate because the receivers on the Inmarsat-5 F2 satellite are where Inmarsat's 29.1-29.25 GHz band transmissions from the Lino Lakes gateway earth station will be received.

Inmarsat opposed Iridium's request for two reasons. Neither has any merit.

First, Inmarsat asserts that a condition relating to the receivers on the Inmarsat-5 F2 satellite is "unnecessary because the operations of the Lino Lakes gateway with Inmarsat-5 F2 will be fully consistent with the terms of Inmarsat's coordination with Iridium."⁶ This assertion is a *non sequitur*, because [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Second, Inmarsat claims that a non-interference condition would be "overbroad" because "the receivers on the [Inmarsat-5 F2] spacecraft receive signals from other parts

⁶ Opposition at 3.

of the world.”⁷ This claim also is a *non sequitur*, because Iridium’s Petition does not address signals emanating from “other parts of the world.” Rather, Iridium’s Petition seeks reconsideration or clarification of the portion of the *Order* that implements the Commission’s band plan. This band plan establishes terms under which FCC-licensed terrestrial stations, GSO FSS earth stations, and NGSO MSS earth stations share spectrum in the United States. Inmarsat’s claims based on earth stations that are located in other parts of the world, therefore, are irrelevant to Iridium’s Petition.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated herein and in Iridium’s Petition, the Bureau should either clarify or determine on reconsideration that the interference-related restrictions on Inmarsat’s operations in the 29.1-29.25 GHz band apply to future Iridium U.S. feeder link earth stations. The Bureau also should either clarify or determine on

⁷ Opposition at 3.

reconsideration that Inmarsat's inability to claim interference protection from U.S. NGSO MSS feeder links in the 29.1-29.25 GHz band applies to the receivers on Inmarsat-5 F2.

Respectfully submitted,

IRIDIUM SATELLITE LLC

By: /s/ Joseph A. Godles
Joseph A. Godles
GOLDBERG, GODLES, WIENER
& WRIGHT LLP
1229 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Its Attorneys

May 18, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OR CLARIFICATION** was sent electronically this 18th day of May, 2015, to each of the following:

Inmarsat Hawaii Inc.
Chris Murphy
Chris_murphy@inmarsat.com

Latham & Watkins
John P. Janka
john.janka@lw.com

Latham & Watkins
Elizabeth R. Park
Elizabeth.park@lw.com

Globe Wireless LLC
David B. Kagan
President & CEO
David.Kagan@globewireless.com

Chris Gray
Vice President of Marketing and
Business Development
Chris.Gray@globewireless.com

Gogo LLC
William J. Gordon
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
Bgordon@gogoair.com

American Airlines
Robert A. Wirick
Managing Director, Regulatory and International Affairs
Robert.Wirick@aa.com
Will Ris
Will.Ris@aa.com

Honeywell
Chris Benich
Vice President, Aerospace Regulatory Affairs
Chris.Benich@honeywell.com

Encompass Digital Media, Inc.
Chris Weissinger
cweissinger@encompass-m.com

VT iDirect, Inc.
Kevin Steen
VP Corporate Development
Ksteen@idirect.net
Cynthia Harty
Vice President of Contracts
charty@idirect.net

Skyware Global
Gopi Sundaram
Vice President, Product Strategy
GopiSundaram@skywareglobal.com

The Boeing Company
Audrey L. Allison
Director, Frequency Management Services
Audrey.Allison@boeing.com

And Its Attorneys,

Bruce A. Olcott
Jones Day
bolcott@jonesday.com

TracStar Systems Inc., dba Cobham SATCOM Mike
Gregg
Mike.Gregg@cobham.com

ARINC Incorporated
John C. Smith Pompano Beach
Vice President-Law, Secretary and
General Counsel
JSmith@arinc.com

And Its Attorneys,

Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
CYorkgitis@KellyDrye.com

GMPCS Personal Communications,
Inc.*
1501 Green Road, Suite A-B
Pompano Beach, FL 33064
Attention: Timothy R. Young

/s/ Deborah Wiggins
Deborah Wiggins

*via U.S. mail, first class