

Exhibit A

Technical Analysis

Viasat submits the following showing to demonstrate that the proposed gateway-type earth station, or satellite access node (“SAN”), located in Lafayette County, MS, is compatible with Upper Microwave Flexible Use Service (“UMFUS”) operations in accordance with Section 25.136(a)(4) and therefore should be authorized with the rights and protections afforded by Section 25.136(a).

The Viasat SAN antenna is configured to operate with the ViaSat-3 satellite at 88.9° W.L., and this configuration provides the relevant operational azimuth and elevation angles. In normal operation, the input power density is constant for all atmospheric conditions and is not increased during rain fade events and thus, the operations during clear sky conditions will be the same as worst-case operating scenarios.

The antenna parameters used in the analysis are identified in the FCC Form 312 application and supporting exhibits, and reflect measured gain patterns for the proposed earth station antenna.

Description	Value	Unit
Antenna Diameter	1.8	m
Antenna Gain	51.9	dB(i)
Antenna Input Density	-18.7	dB(W/MHz)
EIRP Density	33.2	dB(W/MHz)
Average Antenna Disc toward Horizon	69.8	dB
Density toward Horizon	-36.6	dB(W/MHz)
Polarization Discrimination	1.5	dB
Gain of m ² area (28.35 GHz)	50.5	dB(m ²)
Boundary Limit in flux density	-107.6	dB(W/(m ² *MHz))
Average free space distance to limit	844.1	m

The above calculation provides a simple baseline estimate of the average required separation distance for all azimuths around the 1.8 meter SAN antenna to meet the -77.6 dB(mW/(m² * MHz)) power flux density (“pfd”) limit based only on free space loss and 1.5 dB of polarization discrimination¹. The minimum and maximum required free space distances to meet the -77.6 dB(mW/(m² * MHz)) pfd limit range from 145 meters to 3,449 meters depending on azimuth, but are typically much lower once terrain and clutter are considered, as described further below.

A. Computation of pfd Contour

¹ Use of 1.5 dB for polarization discrimination is a conservative value consistent with Appendix 8 Section 2.2.3 of the ITU-R Radio Regulations.

While the above table provides an estimate of the average distance around the earth station where the pfd at a height of 10 meters above ground level would be equal to or greater than $-77.6 \text{ dB(mW/(m}^2 * \text{ MHz))}$ for a flat field with no obstructions nearby, in most cases, terrain and objects on the Earth's surface provide for some additional reduction of the region around the SAN antenna where the pfd value above is exceeded.

To determine whether terrain or surface obstructions around the SAN antenna would provide any further reduction of the pfd at a 10 meter reference height, an analysis was performed using the NTIA ITS Irregular Terrain Model.² In the computation of the contour, surface data with 1 meter resolution from Intermap was used to provide both clutter height and terrain information.

The computation of the contour around the antenna used the nominal input power density to the SAN antenna along with measured antenna gain information to determine the e.i.r.p. density along a particular azimuth. Next, path and clutter/terrain losses were taken into consideration for all the locations around a SAN site along with polarization discrimination to determine which blocks around the SAN site exceed the $-77.6 \text{ dB(mW/(m}^2 * \text{ MHz))}$ limit at the 10 meter reference height.

Finally, once the analysis is completed, a GIS shape file of the resulting contour is created for import into Viasat's ArcGIS tool and can be examined with respect to population and other elements of Section 25.136. An illustration of the contour is included below as Figure 1, and is also included in a .kmz file attached separately in IBFS.

B. Satisfaction of Section 25.136 Criteria

a. Section 25.136(a)(4)(i)

The earth station location is in Lafayette County, MS. A search of the IBFS database indicates that there are no other earth stations licensed in the 27.5-28.35 GHz band segment in that county.

Therefore, the earth station satisfies the requirement in Section 25.136(a)(4)(1) that there be no more than two other earth stations operating or authorized to operate in the 27.5-28.35 GHz band within the county on a protected basis under Section 25.136.

² See NTIA Report 82-100 (Apr. 1, 1982), available at: <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/report/1982/guide-use-its-irregular-terrain-model-area-prediction-mode>. A link to the particular implementation used can be found here: <https://www.its.blrdoc.gov/media/50674/itm.pdf>.

b. Section 25.136(a)(4)(ii)

The total population covered by the $-77.6 \text{ dB(mW/(m}^2 * \text{ MHz))}$ contour is below the applicable threshold specified in Section 25.136(a)(4)(ii).

Overlaying the $-77.6 \text{ dB(mW/(m}^2 * \text{ MHz))}$ contour on a map depicting census blocks, Viasat has calculated an estimate of the population covered by the contour using 2010 census data and assuming that the population coverage within a partially covered census block is equal to the percentage of the geographic area of the census block covered by the contour.³ Figure 1 below contains a diagram depicting the contour overlaid on a census block map.

³ This approach to estimating population coverage using the most recently available decennial census block data and the actual area method is consistent with the recommended approach in the International Bureau's guidance regarding earth station siting. *See International Bureau Issues Guidance on Siting Methodologies for Earth Stations Seeking to Operate in the 24.75-25.25 GHz, 27.5-28.35 GHz, 37.5-40 GHz, 47.2-48.2 GHz, and 50.4-51.4 GHz Frequency Bands to Demonstrate Compliance with Section 25.136*, 35 FCC Rcd 6347 (2020). Viasat notes that the Satellite Industry Association, of which Viasat is a member, has petitioned for reconsideration of this guidance. *See* Petition for Reconsideration of SIA, IB Docket. No. 17-172 (filed July 16, 2020). Nothing herein should be construed to prejudice that pending petition, or otherwise suggest that Viasat agrees with the Bureau's guidance.




Figure 1 – Oxford, MS SAN -77.6 dB(mW/(m2 * MHz)) pfd contour

The population of Lafayette County is 47351, and thus the applicable population limit under Section 25.136(a)(4)(ii) is 450.

The following identifies the census block, population and the population coverage estimate as determined by the actual area method.

Census Block Number	Total Population of Census Block	Population Coverage Estimate	Percent of Block Covered by Pattern
280719505031010	0	0	0.1738%
280719505031010	0	0	0.1738%
280719505031011	0	0	1.137%
280719505031011	0	0	1.137%
280719505031000	0	0	0.3727%

280719505031000	0	0	0.3727%
280719503022038	0	0	10.8315%
280719503022038	0	0	9.8312%
280719505031004	0	0	0.1394%
280719505031004	0	0	0.1394%
280719505031001	0	0	14.4225%
280719505031001	0	0	14.2853%
280719504013048	9	0	0.4171%
280719504013048	9	0	0.3434%
280719504013051	13	0	3.5791%
280719504013051	13	0	1.3002%
280719504012036	16	9	56.8289%
280719504012036	16	9	56.5724%
280719503022030	24	2	8.6989%
280719503022030	24	1	3.7755%
280719504012034	32	3	8.9982%
280719504012034	32	3	8.9982%
280719503022036	33	22	66.3974%
280719503022036	33	22	66.3974%
280719503022035	43	1	1.7386%
280719503022035	43	0	0.8693%
280719504013052	45	19	41.9147%
280719504013052	45	19	41.9147%
280719503022037	51	1	1.4009%
280719503022031	52	27	51.6131%
280719503022031	52	21	39.5633%
280719505031009	63	0	0.0165%
280719505031009	63	0	0.0165%
280719504012035	69	31	45.3185%
280719504012035	69	31	45.1838%
280719504013050	74	24	32.7405%
280719504013050	74	22	29.5388%
280719504012038	82	2	2.0115%
280719504012038	82	1	1.7472%
280719503022039	121	1	0.6324%
280719503022039	121	0	0.1154%
280719504012025	141	1	0.7115%
280719504012025	141	1	0.7115%
280719503022044	162	53	32.7725%
280719503022044	162	38	23.4183%
280719503022033	396	61	15.4979%
280719503022033	396	51	12.9662%
280719503022027	879	0	0.0558%
280719503022027	879	0	0.0412%

Total Estimated Population Coverage:		476	
--------------------------------------	--	-----	--

Table 2 – Population Coverage Overview

The total estimated population covered by the contour thus is below the applicable population limit.

c. Section 25.136(a)(4)(iii)

The -77.6 dB(mW/(m² * MHz)) contour does not contain any major event venue, urban mass transit route, passenger railroad, or cruise ship port, or any road identified as an Interstate, Other Freeway and Expressway, or Other Principal Arterial road in the Federal Highway Administration Office of Planning, Environment, and Realty Executive Geographic Information System map.⁴ Viasat notes that roads that intersect the contour (if any) have not been designated by the relevant state agency as Other Freeways and Expressways, or Other Principal Arterials.

The Commission’s guidance regarding the computation of PFD contours and protection zones recognizes that applicants will need to use a propagation model for the proposed earth station taking into account terrain, clutter and shielding.⁵ As a practical matter, demonstrating compliance with Section 25.136 requires the use of propagation models and assumptions, which by their nature are predictive and yield an approximation of the actual contour at a particular location. Although there necessarily would be some variation between predicted and actual contours, because Viasat has selected a conservative propagation model, the actual contour is likely to be smaller than the predicted contour reflected in the Technical Analysis.

⁴ See Federal Highway Administration, Office of Planning, Environment, and Realty Executive Geographic Information System Map, *available at* <https://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/#>; see also *Use of Spectrum Bands Above 24 GHz for Mobile Radio Services*, Second Report and Order, 32 FCC Rcd 10988, App’x B (2017) (“[T]he roads listed in the revision to Section 25.136 . . . can readily be identified by consulting the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office of Planning, Environment, and Realty Executive Geographic Information System (HEPGIS) map HEPGIS allows the user to enter any street address in the U.S. and display an interactive map with a legend that identifies road classifications as they are defined by the Department of Transportation at 23 C.F.R. Section 470.105 pursuant to 23 U.S.C. Sections 101 and 103.”); 47 C.F.R. § 25.136(a)(4)(iii).

⁵ *International Bureau Issues Guidance on Siting Methodologies for Earth Stations Seeking to Operate in the 24.75-25.25 GHz, 27.5-28.35 GHz, 37.5-40 GHz, 47.2-48.2 GHz, and 50.4-51.4 GHz Frequency Bands to Demonstrate Compliance with Section 25.136*, Public Notice, 35 FCC Rcd 6347, at 3 (2020) (“*Siting Methodology Guidance*”).

Moreover, Section 25.136(a)(4)(iii) is clearly concerned with instances in which a roadway is “crossed” within the relevant contour. It is unclear that the proposed deployment would create any issue under this provision given that any potential incursion on the roadway would be de minimis in nature at the edge of the predicted contour; consequently, any coverage by the actual contour is unlikely to translate into any detectable interference to UMFUS operations. As shown in Figure 1, buildings surrounding the antenna site are likely to obstruct the signal from reaching the roadway. The predicted contour shows an overlap of the roadway of approximately 70 meters. A terrestrial wireless user traveling in a vehicle likely would pass through the overlapping area in an extremely short period of time and would be unlikely to detect any degradation of service.

No actual interference is likely to result based on the predicted contour. However, Viasat would accept a license condition on operations at this location in the 27.5-28.35 GHz band to take corrective action upon receipt of any complaint of actual interference occurring in the portions of the roads that lie inside the actual -77.6 dBm/m²/MHz PFD contour at ten meters above ground level.⁶

To the extent the Commission finds that a waiver of Section 25.136(a)(4)(iii) for the predicted contour illustrated in the Technical Analysis—which depicts a de minimis overlap of the estimated contour with a restricted roadway—is necessary in order to allow a grant of the application, Viasat requests such a waiver. Good cause exists for the Commission to grant the requested waiver.⁷ As discussed above, the actual contour generated at the earth station location is unlikely to reach the restricted roadway. In addition, to the extent there is any de minimis overlap of the actual contour with the roadway, any interference is unlikely to be detectable by users, and Viasat would commit to taking necessary action to resolve any actual interference that may occur on the roadway at issue. Therefore, grant of the requested waivers “would not undermine the policy objective of the rule in question.”⁸

⁶ See, e.g., HNS License Sub, LLC, File No. SES-LIC-20170807-00894, Call Sign E170169, Condition 900592 (granted May 15, 2020).

⁷ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

⁸ *Northeast Cellular Tel. Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990); see also *Fugro-Chance, Inc.*, 10 FCC Rcd 2860, at ¶ 2 (1995) (waiver of U.S. Table of Frequency Allocations appropriate “when there is little potential for interference into any service authorized under the Table of Frequency Allocations and when the non-conforming operator accepts any interference from authorized services.”)

d. Section 25.136(a)(4)(iv)

Viasat has completed frequency coordination with the UMFUS licensees within the area covered by the $-77.6 \text{ dB(mW/(m}^2 * \text{ MHz))}$ contour with respect to existing facilities constructed and in operation by the UMFUS licensees. The Prior Coordination Notice (PCN) was sent by Comsearch on 9/30/2021 and no objections were received within the 30 day notice period. The Comsearch coordination report is attached as Exhibit C.

1. USE OF IRREGULAR TERRAIN MODEL (ITM) FOR COORDINATING EARTH STATIONS WITHIN 1 KM

Viasat has engaged RKF Engineering Solutions, LLC (RKF) to determine the model to calculate contours around each Satellite Access Node (SAN) earth station which exceeds a power flux density (PFD) of $-77.6 \text{ dBW/m}^2/\text{MHz}$.

RKF relied upon the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)'s Irregular Terrain Model (ITM)⁹ to compute the power densities from these transmitting earth stations / SANs for distances greater than 100 m. The ITM model was selected in large part because it is an accepted Federal Communications Commission (FCC) model and was assessed to produce conservative results (low path loss) for propagation paths for the site-specific geometries analyzed, thereby building confidence in the ability to achieve successful spectrum sharing. For elevation and terrain data RKF relied upon the 5-meter NEXTMap¹⁰ Elevation data suite.

In choosing ITM, there were several considerations. First, the Defense Information System's Agency (DISA) Spectrum Sharing Test and Demonstration (SSTD) working group, made up of many Government stakeholders, uses 2D terrain path loss models for predicting clutter in the band 1.755 to 1.780 GHz, for rural and suburban areas. These predictions were shown to be accurate when compared to measurements in the band. In the paper, *"What are the underlying calculations, parameters, and assumptions for the Longley-Rice (ITM) propagation model?"*¹¹, the nominal frequency range for the ITM model is listed as 20 MHz to 40 GHz. While the upper limit was modified to 20 GHz in some later documentation, 28 GHz frequencies, within these topologies, conform to the model.

While the ITM doesn't explicitly account for loss within the first kilometer, the model's formulas were used in association with the NEXTMap data. Specifically, to improve the fidelity of the estimates, NEXTMap terrain and clutter data were calculated from 100 m from the SAN sites. In his doctoral thesis, Kasampalis Stylianos¹² reviews many diffraction models including ITM and observed that the ITM model can be used for distances as low as 200 meters.

⁹ Model available at <https://github.com/NTIA/itm>

¹⁰ <https://www.intermap.com/nextmap>

¹¹ "What are the underlying calculations, parameters, and assumptions for the Longley-Rice (ITM) propagation model?" September 24, 2013, in RF Engineering Article, (<https://www.softwright.com/knowledgebase/faq/underlying-calculations-parameters-assumptions-longley-rice-itm-propagation-model/>)

¹² "Modelling and Coverage Improvement of DVB-T Networks," A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Kasampalis Stylianos, March 2018

The probability of reflections in rural and suburban areas is low at higher frequencies and reflections tend to attenuate quickly at these frequencies if they aren't close to the direct path. Furthermore, an accepted 3D model that accurately predicts loss is not available and the 5-meter NEXTMap data does not have enough resolution to predict reflections accurately. Consequently, a 3D model was not employed.

To demonstrate the conservative nature of the ITM model used, simulations were performed with a series of single knife edge terrain path, where the knife edge height was assumed to be 2 m. The table below compares the knife edge diffraction loss to the ITM predicted loss (ITM path loss minus free space loss) for paths equal to or less than 1 km. In all but one case shown, the ITM model significantly underestimates the loss compared to the knife edge prediction.

Frequency	Total Path Distance	Distance to Knife Edge	Knife Edge Loss	ITM Predicted Loss
GHz	meters	meters	dB	dB
28	1000	250	19.02	16.2
18	1000	250	17.28	10
28	800	200	19.94	14
18	800	200	18.15	8.4
28	500	100	22.57	23.6
18	500	100	20.71	15.1
28	200	60	25.33	7.3
18	200	60	23.43	3.5

In summary, the ITM propagation model is well-accepted by regulators and has been used in many instances up to the frequencies associated with the SANs under consideration and down to distances below 1 km, where results were shown to be conservative for pathloss thereby helping to build confidence in successful sharing with these earth station nodes.