STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MIGNON L. CLYBURN

Re: *Promoting Expanded Opportunities for Radio Experimentation and Market Studies under Part 5 of the Commission's Rules and Streamlining Other Related Rules, ET Docket No. 10-236, 2006 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations—Part 2 Administered by the Office of Engineering and Technology (OET), ET Docket No. 06-155*

Research and development, or R&D, has always been an important pillar of a country's economy. It spurs innovation, which in turn, drives economic growth, and job creation. Last year, the Department of Commerce, estimated that R&D accounted for more than 16 percent of our nation's total growth. So I enthusiastically support this Order, which substantially advances a policy goal, critical to maintaining the United States' leadership in communications services and technology.

The evolution we are seeing in the communications field has underscored the importance of R&D to those services. When you consider that, in January 2008, there were no mobile apps on the market and now there are more than 1.3 million available, you come to terms with the fact that technological change in the communications industry is moving at a breathtaking pace. To promote our Nation's global competitiveness in communications, the federal government must do its part to encourage industry to invest more in research and development.

Today's Order furthers this goal by comprehensively updating and streamlining our experimental radio service rules. We are establishing three new types of experimental licenses and are changing other rules to create stronger incentives for industry to innovate in service and product offerings. The program experimental license will allow universities, research labs, health care facilities, and manufacturers of radio frequency equipment to plan more broadly and creatively as they design experiments requiring an FCC license. By giving these entities more flexibility, these licenses will allow them to follow their research wherever it leads them without the administrative constraints of a conventional experimental license. The compliance testing license will give laboratories authority to certify more products, which together with changes to our market trial rules, should accelerate the delivery of new products to consumers. The medical testing license will allow entities to conduct clinical trials, most notably, for those devices used for home care. This could lead to technologies and innovations that offer patients greater mobility and independence.

I also want to commend the staff of the Office of Engineering and Technology for the collaborative approach they took in arriving at the final rules for these new experimental licenses. Using their technical expertise, combined with decades of experience with experimental licensing, they presented us with creative proposals in the November 2010 NPRM that I and my colleagues unanimously praised. They also carefully considered comments filed in the proceeding and incorporated those ideas that would improve on the proposals in the NPRM. As a result, we are adopting a structure that will offer entities greater authorizations, reduced oversight, and more streamlined procedures, than our previous experimental license rules. In addition, this Order includes new practical notification rules that will further protect primary and secondary incumbent licensees from potential interference.

Special thanks are due to Julie Knapp, Ira Keltz, Bruce Romano, Rodney Small, and the other talented staff members in OET, for their excellent work throughout this proceeding.