

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

In the matter of)
)
Satamatics, Inc.) File No. SES-STA-20061221-02209 (Call Sign E020074)

REPLY OF MOBILE SATELLITE VENTURES SUBSIDIARY LLC

Mobile Satellite Ventures Subsidiary LLC (“MSV”) hereby files this Response to the Joint Reply of Satamatics, Inc. (“Satamatics”) and Inmarsat Ventures Limited (“Inmarsat”) to MSV’s Comments on the above-captioned request for a new grant of Special Temporary Authority (“STA”) to operate earlier-generation mobile earth terminals using the uncoordinated Inmarsat 4F2 satellite at 52.75° W.L. (“Inmarsat 4F2”).¹ As MSV explained in its Comments, the Bureau should continue to apply the conditions imposed on the original STA grant for earlier-generation services provided by Satamatics over Inmarsat 4F2 as well as to (i) immediately terminate Satamatic’s existing STA if this STA request is granted;² (ii) immediately require Inmarsat to return the loaned frequencies; and (iii) establish a firm expiration date for this STA without Inmarsat having completed coordination of the Inmarsat 4F2 satellite with the United States.³

¹ See Satamatics, Inc., Request for Special Temporary Authority, File No. SES-STA-20061221-02209 (Call Sign E020074) (filed December 21, 2006) (“*Satamatics Application*”).

² In the Joint Response, Satamatics states that it does not object to this request. See Joint Response of Satamatics, Inc. and Inmarsat Ventures Limited, File No. SES-STA-20061221-02209 (Call Sign E020074) (filed January 18, 2007) (“*Joint Response*”), at 2 n.1.

³ See Comments of Mobile Satellite Ventures Subsidiary LLC, File No. SES-STA-20061221-02209 (Call Sign E020074) (January 3, 2007) (“*MSV Comments*”).

In the Joint Response, Satamatics and Inmarsat claim that use of the Inmarsat 4F2 satellite for earlier-generation services has not resulted in interference. *Joint Response* at 1.⁴ In fact, the opposite is true. Inmarsat and its distributors continue to refuse to relinquish the loaned frequencies despite the harm that is being caused to MSV and its customers. *MSV Comments* at 2-4. This harm is occurring today by precluding MSV from using these frequencies to support existing customers, including MSV's unique satellite-based push-to-talk ("PTT") service which offers critical communications capabilities to first responders when terrestrial infrastructure is impaired. *Id.* at 3. As MSV noted in its Comments, public safety users have been particularly harmed by Inmarsat's refusal to return the loaned frequencies. *Id.* at 2-3. For example, the Commonwealth of Kentucky's Division of Emergency Management, an MSV user, has informed

⁴ In the Joint Response, Satamatics and Inmarsat incorporate various pleadings by reference. *Joint Response* at 2. MSV hereby incorporates by reference the following pleadings. *See* Letter from Jennifer A. Manner, MSV, to Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, FCC, File No. SES-MFS-20051122-01614 (Call Sign E000180) et al (June 20, 2006); Letter from Ms. Jennifer A. Manner, MSV, to Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, FCC, File No. SES-MFS-20051122-01614 (Call Sign E000180) et al (July 18, 2006) (responding to the Opposition of Inmarsat and its distributors to MSV's request that, to the extent the Commission grants the pending applications to operate with the uncoordinated Inmarsat 4F2 satellite despite the facts that (i) harmful interference will likely occur, (ii) grant of the applications prior to a coordination agreement is inconsistent with precedent, (iii) grant will condone Inmarsat's usurpation of spectrum coordinated by the United States and Canada as well as Inmarsat's continued abdication of its obligation to coordinate its satellites internationally, and (iv) grant would endorse the current inefficient, non-contiguous assignment of L band frequencies, then the Commission should attach certain conditions intended to mitigate some of this harm); Letter from Jennifer A. Manner, MSV, to Mr. John Giusti and Mr. Julius Knapp, FCC, Call Signs E010011 et al. (June 20, 2006); Letter from Ms. Jennifer A. Manner, MSV, to Mr. John Giusti and Mr. Julius Knapp, FCC, Call Signs E010011 et al. (July 18, 2006) (responding to the Opposition of Inmarsat and its distributors to MSV's request that the Commission preclude Inmarsat from using frequencies licensed to and coordinated for MSV and MSV Canada); Mobile Satellite Ventures Subsidiary LLC, Petition to Hold in Abeyance, File No. SES-MFS-20060118-00050 et al (March 3, 2006); Reply of MSV, File No. SES-MFS-20060118-00050 et al. (March 28, 2006) (responding to Inmarsat's Opposition to MSV's Petition to Hold in Abeyance Telenor Satellite Inc.'s application to provide non-BGAN Inmarsat service over Inmarsat 4F2); Comments of MSV, File No. SES-STA-20060710-01131 et al. (July 17, 2006); Response of MSV, File No. SES-STA-20060710-01131 et al. (August 11, 2006); Comments of MSV, File No. SES-STA-20060511-00788 et al. (May 15, 2006).

the Commission that there is a significant risk that Inmarsat's uncoordinated operations will "interfere with our existing critical public safety operations" and that the loaned frequencies are "required for MSV to develop new and innovative service for public safety users, including additional services that further improve interoperable communications."⁵ Satamatics and Inmarsat do not refute the impact their usurpation of L band frequencies is having on MSV and MSV Canada and their customers. Moreover, as MSV explained previously, there is no analytical, statistical, or other evidence in the record of this or any other proceeding to support Inmarsat's alleged need for the loaned frequencies.⁶ As such, Inmarsat's refusal to return these frequencies is causing harm to MSV and MSV Canada and their customers without any apparent benefit for Inmarsat's users.


In its Comments, MSV requested that the Bureau provide a clear expiration date for this STA unless Inmarsat has completed coordination of its new and relocated satellites, including rebanding of L band spectrum into more contiguous frequency blocks, which will reduce the potential for harmful interference and promote efficient use of spectrum. *MSV Comments* at 4-6. In response, Inmarsat and Satamatics cite previous filings in which it claimed that rebanding should be resolved during the L band coordination process. *Joint Response* at 2. MSV agrees and once again invites Inmarsat to engage in coordination discussions. Commission action to facilitate rebanding, however, will in no way trump the international coordination process. Rather, such action will establish that the Commission expects L band operators to seek to maximize the potential of the L band for offering broadband services, which Chairman Martin

⁵ See Letter from Commonwealth of Kentucky's Division of Emergency Management to Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, FCC, File No. SES-LFS-20050826-01175 et al (July 24, 2006); see also Letter from Southwest Texas Regional Advisory Council for Trauma to Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, FCC, File No. SES-LFS-20050826-01175 et al (July 17, 2006).

⁶ See *MSV Comments* at 4; Comments of MSV, File No. SES-STA-20060710-01131 et al. (July 17, 2006), at 3-4.

recently explained is the Commission's top priority.⁷ If, however, the Bureau continues to grant and renew STAs for use of Inmarsat's uncoordinated satellites and services without insisting that it first complete coordination, there are no reasonable prospects that such coordination will ever be successfully completed.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce D. Jacobs
David S. Konczal
**PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP**
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128
(202) 663-8000



Jennifer A. Manner
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
**MOBILE SATELLITE VENTURES
SUBSIDIARY LLC**
10802 Parkridge Boulevard
Reston, Virginia 20191
(703) 390-2700

Dated: January 30, 2007

⁷ See Remarks of FCC Chairman Kevin J. Martin, Imagining the Digital Healthcare Future in the Rural West, Montana State University – Bozeman (July 7, 2006) (“Since becoming Chairman about 16 months ago, I have made broadband deployment the Commission’s top priority. . . Broadband technology is a key driver of economic growth. The ability to share increasing amounts of information, at greater and greater speeds, increases productivity, facilitates interstate commerce, and helps drive innovation. But perhaps most important, broadband has the potential to affect almost every aspect of our lives.”).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sylvia A. Davis, a secretary with the law firm of Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, hereby certify that on this 30th day of January 2007, served a true copy of the foregoing by first-class United States mail, postage prepaid, upon the following:


Diane J. Cornell
Vice President, Government Affairs
Inmarsat, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036

John P. Janka
Jeffrey A. Marks
Latham & Watkins LLP
555 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004

Alfred M. Mamlet
Steptoe & Johnson LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Brian Hester
Satamatics, Inc.
P.O. Box 393
Buckeystown, MD 21717

Counsel for Satamatics, Inc.


Sylvia A. Davis