

# Exhibit A

## PETITION FOR WAIVER OF SECTIONS 25.137 AND 25.114

Pursuant to Section 25.137 of the Federal Communications Commission’s (“Commission” or “FCC”) rules, earth station applicants “requesting authority to communicate with a non-U.S. licensed space station” to serve the United States must demonstrate that U.S.-licensed satellite systems have effective competitive opportunities to provide analogous services in certain countries and must provide the same legal and technical information for the non-U.S.-licensed space station as required by Section 25.114 for U.S.-licensed space stations.<sup>1</sup> Intelsat License LLC (“Intelsat”) herein seeks authority to provide launch and early orbit phase (“LEOP”) services—not commercial services—to the United States, and thus believes that Section 25.137 does not apply.<sup>2</sup>

To the extent the Commission determines, however, that Intelsat’s request for authority to provide LEOP services on a special temporary basis is a request to serve the United States with a non-U.S.-licensed satellite, Intelsat respectfully requests a waiver of Sections 25.137 and 25.114 of the Commission’s rules.<sup>3</sup> The Commission may grant a waiver for good cause shown.<sup>4</sup> The Commission typically grants a waiver where the particular facts make strict compliance inconsistent with the public interest.<sup>5</sup> In granting a waiver, the Commission may take into account considerations of hardship, equity, or more effective implementation of overall policy on an individual basis.<sup>6</sup> Waiver is therefore appropriate if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule, and such a deviation will serve the public interest.

In this case, good cause exists for a waiver of both Section 25.137 and Section 25.114 of the FCC’s rules. With respect to Section 25.114, Intelsat seeks authority only to provide

---

<sup>1</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 25.137.

<sup>2</sup> See *EchoStar Satellite Operating Company Application for Special Temporary Authority Related to Moving the EchoStar 6 Satellite from the 77° W.L. Orbital Location to the 96.2° W.L. Orbital Location, and to Operate at the 96.2° W.L. Orbital Location*, Order and Authorization, 28 FCC Rcd. 4229 (2013) (noting that operating TT&C earth stations in the United States with a foreign-licensed satellite does not constitute “DBS service”).

<sup>3</sup> 47 C.F.R. §§ 25.137 and 25.114.

<sup>4</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

<sup>5</sup> *N.E. Cellular Tel. Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (“*Northeast Cellular*”).

<sup>6</sup> *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 419 F.2d 1153, 1159 (D.C. Cir. 1969); *Northeast Cellular*, 897 F.2d at 1166.

LEOP services for the TIBA-1 satellite. The information sought by Section 25.114 is not relevant to LEOP services. Moreover, Intelsat does not have—and would not easily be able to obtain—such information because Intelsat is not the operator of the TIBA-1 satellite. Intelsat has a contract with Airbus, the manufacturer of the TIBA-1 satellite, to conduct LEOP services.

The information required under Section 25.114 of the FCC’s rules is not necessary to determine potential harmful interference. The Schedule S information for this satellite would pertain to the operation of the TIBA-1 satellite at its final orbital location. However, the present application for LEOP services involves communications *prior* to the satellite attaining its final location in the geostationary orbit. In other words, during the LEOP mission, the earth station will not be communicating with a satellite located in the geostationary orbit. Rather, it will be transmitting to a satellite traveling on its “transfer orbit” or “LEOP path,” which starts immediately following its separation from a launch vehicle, and ends when the satellite reaches its geostationary orbital location. Moreover, as with any STA, Intelsat will perform the LEOP services on a non-interference basis.

Because it is not relevant to the service for which Intelsat seeks authorization, and because obtaining the information would be a hardship, Intelsat seeks a waiver of all the information required by Section 25.114 of the Commission’s rules. Intelsat has provided in this STA request the required technical information that is relevant to the LEOP services for which Intelsat seeks authorization.

Good cause also exists to waive Section 25.137 of the agency’s rules. Section 25.137 is designed to ensure that “U.S.-licensed satellite systems have effective competitive opportunities to provide analogous services” in other countries.<sup>7</sup> Here, there is no service being provided by the satellite; it is simply being placed in its orbital location after separating from the launch vehicle. Thus, the purpose of Section 25.137 would not be served by applying these rules to LEOP services. For example, Section 25.137(d)(4) requires earth station applicants requesting authority to operate with a non-U.S.-licensed space station that is not in orbit and operating to post a bond.<sup>8</sup> The underlying purpose of Section 25.137(d)(4)—to provide parity between U.S.-licensed and non-U.S.-licensed commercial satellite systems in discouraging orbital location warehousing—would not be served by requiring Intelsat to post a bond to provide approximately 5 days of LEOP services to the TIBA-1 satellite.

It is Intelsat’s understanding that TIBA-1 is licensed by Egypt, which is a WTO-member country. Thus, the purpose of Section 25.137—to ensure that U.S. satellite operators

---

<sup>7</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 25.137(a).

<sup>8</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §25.137(d)(4).

enjoy “effective competitive opportunities” to serve certain foreign markets—will not be undermined by grant of this waiver request.

Finally, Intelsat notes that it expects to operate with the TIBA-1 satellite using its U.S. earth station for a period of approximately 5 days. Requiring Intelsat to obtain copious technical and legal information from an unrelated party, where there is no risk of harmful interference and the operations will cease after approximately 5 days, would pose undue hardship without serving underlying policy objectives. Given these particular facts, the waiver sought herein is plainly appropriate.