



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

DA 12-1547

September 27, 2012

Mr. Alan Rich  
IP Access International  
31831 Camino Capistrano  
Suite 301  
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Call Sign: E120068  
File No.: SES-LIC-20120409-00369

Dear Mr. Rich:

On April 9, 2012, IP Access International (IP Access) filed the above-captioned application for a new license to operate a fixed-satellite service VSAT network earth station. The proposed earth station will use 1.2 meter, 0.96 meter, and 1.8 meter antennas as remotes and will operate in the conventional Ku-band frequencies.<sup>1</sup> IP Access proposes to use an existing VSAT hub<sup>2</sup> to control its VSAT network. Pursuant to Section 25.112(a) of the Commission's rules<sup>3</sup>, we dismiss the application as defective without prejudice to refiling.<sup>4</sup>

Section 25.112(a) of the Commission's rules requires the Commission to return, as unacceptable for filing, any earth station application that is not substantially complete, contains internal inconsistencies, or does not substantially comply with the Commission's rules.<sup>5</sup> IP Access' application contains internal inconsistencies which renders it defective and subject to dismissal.

In response to item E48 of FCC Form 312 Schedule B (Schedule B), which relates to IP Access' proposed 1.2 meter antenna, the application lists the maximum EIRP per carrier for emission 1M82G7W as 52.8 dBW. This proposed carrier power level is greater than and therefore inconsistent with the Total EIRP for All Carriers of 51.0 dBW.<sup>6</sup> Given this inconsistency, we cannot accurately determine the emission power for the proposed antenna.

---

<sup>1</sup> The conventional Ku-band encompasses the 11.7-12.2 GHz downlink frequencies and 14.0-14.5 GHz uplink frequencies.

<sup>2</sup> Intelsat's existing hub control station under Call Sign E00074.

<sup>3</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 25.112(a).

<sup>4</sup> If IP Access International refiles an application identical to the one dismissed, with the exception of supplying the corrected information, it need not pay an application fee. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.1111(d).

<sup>5</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 25.112 (a).

<sup>6</sup> Item E40 Schedule B.

Likewise, in response to item E48 of Schedule B, which describes the proposed 0.96 meter antenna, the application lists the maximum EIRP per carrier for emission 1M82G7W as 52.8 dBW. This proposed carrier power level is greater than and therefore inconsistent with, the Total EIRP for All Carriers of 49.0 dBW.<sup>7</sup> Again, this inconsistency makes it impossible to accurately determine the emission power for proposed antenna.

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 25.112(a) of the Commission's rules<sup>8</sup> and Section 0.261 of the Commission's rules on delegations of authority,<sup>9</sup> we dismiss the application of IP Access International.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Blais  
Chief, Systems Analysis Branch  
Satellite Division  
International Bureau

---

<sup>7</sup> Item E40 Schedule B.

<sup>8</sup> 47 C.F.R. 25.112(a).

<sup>9</sup> 47 C.F.R. 0.261.