

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

Amendments to Parts 1, 2 and 101 of the Commission's Rules To License Fixed Services at 24 GHz)))) WT Docket No. 99-327

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Adopted: November 4, 1999

Released: November 10, 1999

By the Commission:

Comment Due Date: December 10, 1999

Reply Comment Due Date: December 27, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table with 2 columns: Section Title and Paragraph Number. Includes sections like I. INTRODUCTION, II. DISCUSSION, A. Background, B. Licensing Plan for 24 GHz Services, C. Application, Licensing, and Processing Rules.

D.	Operating Rules	32
1.	Performance Requirements	32
2.	Application of Title II Requirements to Common Carriers	35
E.	Technical Rules	36
1.	Licensing and Coordination of 24 GHz Stations	38
2.	RF Safety	41
F.	Competitive Bidding Procedures	43
1.	Statutory Requirements	43
2.	Incorporation by Reference of Part 1 Standardized Auction Rules	46
3.	Provisions for Designated Entities	47
III.	PROCEDURAL MATTERS	52
A.	Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis	52
B.	Paperwork Reduction Analysis	54
C.	Ex Parte Presentations	55
D.	Comment Dates	58
E.	Further Information	60
IV.	ORDERING CLAUSES	61
	Appendix A — Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis	
	Appendix B — Proposed Rules	

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Notice), we propose licensing and service rules to govern the 24 GHz band generally. Specifically, in this Notice:

- We propose that future licensees in the 24 GHz band, as well as licensees relocated to the 24 GHz band from the 18 GHz band, will be generally subject to Part 101 of the Commission's Rules, as modified to reflect the particular characteristics and circumstances of this band.
- We also propose to apply competitive bidding procedures under the Commission's Part 1 competitive bidding rules for future licensing in the band.

We solicit comment on these and the various other proposals set out in this Notice, as well as Appendix B.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Background

2. In 1983, the Commission adopted rules for Digital Electronic Message Service (“DEMS”), which was envisioned as a high-speed, two-way, point-to-multipoint terrestrial microwave transmission system.¹ The service was allocated spectrum in the 18.36-18.46 GHz band paired with the 18.94-19.04 GHz band. Subsequently, the Commission modified the initial DEMS allocation, instead designating spectrum in the 18.82-18.92 GHz and 19.16-19.26 GHz bands.² The Commission began to grant DEMS licenses in the early 1980's, but the service was not initially commercially successful. Frequently, licensees had to return their licenses because they had not met construction requirements. The high cost of equipment appears to have been one of the many issues involved in the service's lack of early success. In the early 1990s, a small number of companies, including Associated Communications, L.L.C., Digital Services Corporation, Microwave Services, Inc., and Firstmark Communications, Inc., began acquiring licenses in approximately 30 of the country's largest markets.³

¹ DEMS systems are point-to-multipoint microwave networks designed to communicate information between a fixed main (nodal) station and a number of fixed user terminals. When the FCC originally identified spectrum in the 18 GHz band for DEMS in 1981, the primary use was expected to be by businesses requiring internal networks to distribute documents, share data, and hold teleconferences. Licensed for both common carrier and private use, DEMS is now governed by Part 101 of the FCC's rules. For additional background on the development of DEMS, see Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Relocate the Digital Electronic Message Service From the 18 GHz Band to the 24 GHz Band and to Allocate the 24 GHz Band for Fixed Service, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, FCC 98-155 (rel. July 17, 1998) (“*DEMS MO&O*”).

² See *id.*

³ See generally *DEMS MO&O*.

3. In January 1997, and again in March 1997, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration ("NTIA"), on behalf of the United States Department of Defense ("DoD"), formally requested that the Commission take action to protect military satellite system operations in the 18 GHz band.⁴ NTIA stated that DEMS use of frequencies in the 17.8-20.2 GHz bands within 40 kilometers of existing Government Fixed-Satellite Service ("FSS") earth stations "will not be possible." As a result, NTIA asked the Commission to protect those government satellite earth stations operating in the 18 GHz band in Washington, D.C. and Denver, and "[e]xpediently undertake any other necessary actions, such as amending the Commission's rules and modifying Commission issued licenses." Specifically, in its January 1997 letter,⁵ NTIA stated:

We are asking that these actions be undertaken on an expedited basis. As we have previously indicated, this matter involves military functions, as well as specific sensitive national security interests of the United States. These actions are essential to fulfill requirements for Government space systems to perform satisfactorily.

The Commission is permitted to amend its Rules without complying with the notice provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) in cases involving any "military, naval or [sic] foreign affairs function of the United States" or where the agency for good cause finds "notice and public procedure... are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest."⁶ To protect the two government earth stations from interference, NTIA proposed to make 400 MHz of spectrum available in the 24 GHz band so that the Commission could relocate DEMS licensees. Recognizing the Commission's objective of maintaining DEMS on a uniform, nationwide frequency band, NTIA stated that "[t]aking into account our common interests, [NTIA] could make available spectrum in the region of 24.25-24.65 GHz" and suggested that "the Commission take such steps as may be necessary to license DEMS stations in this spectrum . . ."⁷

4. For its part, the Commission had before it sharing issues between 18 GHz non-Government satellite services and DEMS.⁸ In July 1996, the Commission designated 500 MHz of spectrum in the 18.8-19.3 GHz band for non-geostationary satellite orbit, fixed satellite service (NGSO/FSS) downlinks to help meet increasing demand for spectrum for this service.⁹ Initially, it

⁴ See *id.* at 5.

⁵ See *id.* at 5.

⁶ See *id.* at 5.

⁷ See *id.* at 5.

⁸ See Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Relocate the Digital Electronic Message Service from the 18 GHz Band to the 24 GHz Band and To Allocate the 24 GHz Band For Fixed Service, Order, 12 FCC Rcd 3471 at ¶¶ 10-19. (1997) ("*Reallocation Order*").

⁹ See Rulemaking to Amend Parts 1, 2, 21, and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5-29.5 GHz

appeared that sharing between NGSO/FSS and DEMS would be possible. However, subsequent to that allocation, the Teledesic Corporation, the only applicant for an NGSO/FSS system in the 18 GHz band, indicated that coordination between the two services might present difficulties.

5. Finally, on March 5, 1997, NTIA reiterated its request for protection of government systems, using the 18 GHz band and further discussed the issues regarding use of that spectrum.¹⁰ NTIA stated again that it had "determined that both existing and anticipated FCC licensees could cause interference problems to the Federal Government use of the 18 GHz band." Consequently, NTIA offered to withdraw government co-primary allocations for radionavigation¹¹ service in the 24.25-24.45 and 25.05-25.25 GHz bands to clear the way for DEMS relocation. Accordingly, in the *Reallocation Order*,¹² adopted on March 14, 1997, the Commission amended the Table of Frequency Allocations and Part 101 of the Commission's Rules¹³ regarding Fixed Microwave Services to permit fixed service use of the 24.25-24.45 GHz and 25.05-25.25 GHz bands (24 GHz band). This also had the practical effect of resolving potential interference concerns between non-Government NGSO/FSS and DEMS operations at 18 GHz.

B. Licensing Plan for 24 GHz Services

1. Table of Allocations

6. In the *Reallocation Order*,¹⁴ the Commission amended the Table of Allocations in Part 2 of the Commission's Rules¹⁵ to add the fixed service on a primary basis in the 24 GHz band, and the Commission recognized the deletion of radionavigation by the government from its portion of the 24 GHz band.¹⁶ One issue we intend to examine in this rulemaking is whether the Table of Allocations should be

Frequency Band, to Reallocate the 29.5-30.0 GHz Frequency Band, to establish Rules and Policies for Local Multipoint Distribution Service and for Fixed Satellite Services, 11 FCC Rcd. 19005 (1996).

¹⁰ See *DEMS MO&O*, *supra* at 5.

¹¹ Radionavigation is a service used to determine the position, velocity and/or other characteristics of an object, through the use of propagation properties of radio waves for purposes of navigation (e.g., obstruction warning). See 47 C.F.R. § 2.1.

¹² See *Reallocation Order*, *supra*, 12 FCC Rcd 3471.

¹³ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.

¹⁴ See *Reallocation Order*, *supra* at 3480-81 (Appendix A).

¹⁵ See 47 C.F.R. § 2.

¹⁶ *Reallocation Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 3473, ¶ 6 (footnote omitted):

amended further to facilitate other possible uses of spectrum in the 24 GHz band. We have focused our initial review on the issue of whether mobile service should be added to the Table of Allocations for the 24 GHz band. Based on the information currently available, it appears that, in the near term, equipment may not be available for mobile use in the 24 GHz band. Licensees at 18 GHz are limited to fixed service, and no one has requested the opportunity to provide mobile service at 24 GHz. If, contrary to our assumption, equipment is available for mobile use in this band, and interference problems can be resolved, we know of no reason why we would not allow mobile operations. We believe this would be consistent with our goal of providing 24 GHz licensees with flexibility in designing their systems. We seek comment on whether the Commission should include an allocation in the 24 GHz band for mobile service.

7. In response to a Petition filed by DirecTV, the Commission proposed to amend the Commission's Table of Allocations and rules to provide, among other things, for the use of the 24.75-25.25 GHz band for Broadcasting Satellite Service (BSS) Earth-to-space "feeder links" in the FSS.¹⁷ Current 24 GHz licensees contend that the Commission would have to prohibit 24 GHz BSS feeder link sites within 300 miles of the boundaries of each 24 GHz service area, a requirement that would be too impractical and inefficient to be consistent with the public interest.¹⁸ On the other hand, DirecTV takes the position that it is possible for BSS feeder links and 24 GHz nodal stations, which are the central or controlling station in a radio system operating on point-to-multipoint frequencies, in the 25.05-25.25 GHz band to share spectrum on a co-frequency basis at distances in the range of 0.2 miles.¹⁹ Because BSS feeder link stations need not be ubiquitously employed and can be located outside population centers, we

On March 5, 1997, [the Commission] received a . . . letter from NTIA [National Telecommunications and Information Administration] making the [24 GHz band] available for non-Government uses The [letter] reiterates the Government's determination that existing DEMS licensees must relocate to minimize potential interference to Government Earth stations in the 18 GHz band pursuant to footnote US334 and national security interests. To this end, NTIA has withdrawn the allocation for the Government radionavigation service in the [24 GHz band] to permit relocation of DEMS from the 18 GHz band. In addition, NTIA requires that the Commission limit future FCC licensees from using the 17.8-20.2 GHz band for operations in the Washington, D.C. and Denver areas

¹⁷ See Redesignation of the 17.7-19.7 GHz Frequency Band, Blanket Licensing of Satellite Earth stations in the 17.7-20.2 GHz and 27.5-30.0 GHz Frequency Bands, and the Allocation of Additional Spectrum in the 17.3-17.8 GHz and 24.75-25.25 GHz Frequency Bands for Broadcast Satellite-Service Use, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 13 FCC Rcd 19923 (1998) ("*18 GHz Band Plan*"). See also DirecTV Enterprises, Inc. Petition, To Amend Parts 2, 25, and 100 of the Commission's Rules To Allocate Spectrum for the Fixed-Satellite Service and the Broadcasting Satellite Service, filed June 5, 1997. DirecTV also seeks amendment of the Table of Allocations and the service rules to provide for the use of the 17.3-17.8 GHz band in the space-to-earth direction for BSS, and to adopt a 4.5° orbital spacing policy for the use of these bands to provide BSS service.

¹⁸ Joint Opposition of Digital Services Corporation, Microwave Services, Inc., and Teligent, L.L.C., filed July 31, 1997.

¹⁹ Technical Response of DirecTV, filed Aug. 27, 1997.

believe sharing between these services may be feasible. In the *18 GHz Band Plan* proceeding, the Commission noted that the corresponding downlink BSS allocation in the 17.3-17.8 GHz band cannot become effective until after April 1, 2007; and thus there is no immediate need to implement the FSS allocation in the 25.05- 25.25 GHz band. Delaying the FSS allocation would allow sufficient time for a detailed sharing methodology to be formulated between terrestrial fixed service interests and satellite interests.²⁰ In light of the foregoing, we tentatively conclude, based on preliminary review of the petition and comments filed regarding such FSS use of this band, that the criteria need not be as severe and restrictive as that put forth by the current 24 GHz licensees, and that a more workable solution can be developed. We solicit comment on the interaction between these two services.

8. We propose to revise the Table of Frequency Allocations in Part 2 of our rules²¹ to delete the non-Government radionavigation service allocations in the 24.25-24.45 GHz and 25.05-25.25 GHz bands, which is consistent with previous Government action taken with respect to these bands. The Commission has not issued any licenses for the use of these bands by the radionavigation service, and we do not anticipate any demand for this service in these bands. Further, we also propose to delete footnote US341 from the Table of Frequency Allocations because the Federal Aviation Administration has decommissioned its remaining radar facility at the Newark, New Jersey International Airport and thus, concluded its operations in the 24.25-24.45 GHz band.²² In light of the foregoing, we propose to amend the frequency table in the aviation service rules, specifically Section 87.173(b), by changing the entry for 24.25-25.45 GHz to 24.45-25.05 GHz, which would remain available for use by the aeronautical radionavigation service.²³

2. Geographic Area-Wide Licensing

9. We propose to license the 24 GHz band spectrum on the basis of 172 Economic Areas (EAs), which were developed by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA),²⁴ because we believe this licensing scheme would best serve the public interest in facilitating efficient use of this spectrum. We seek comment on this proposal. We tentatively conclude that using EAs for 24 GHz

²⁰ *18 GHz Band Plan, supra* at 19959, ¶ 81.

²¹ *See* 47 C.F.R. 2.106.

²² *See* 47 C.F.R. § 2.106; *see also* letter from Gerald J. Markey, Program Director for Spectrum Policy and Management, Federal Aviation Administration to William Hatch, Chairman, Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, June 17, 1999.

²³ *See* 47 C.F.R. 87.173(b).

²⁴ The Bureau of Economic Analysis has divided the Nation into regional economic areas that consist of metropolitan areas that are centers of economic activity and their economically related surrounding counties. *See* Final Redefinition of the BEA Economic Areas, 60 Fed. Reg. 13114 (March 10, 1995).

licenses in connection with our proposed partitioning and disaggregation rules discussed below,²⁵ will create reasonable opportunities for the dissemination of 24 GHz licenses among a large number of entities.^{26 27} We also tentatively conclude that using EAs for 24 GHz licenses will facilitate service to rural areas.²⁸ Specifically, because EAs typically contain both urban and rural areas, licensees will have both the legal authority to provide service in both areas and the financial incentive to do so in order to earn a return on their investment in their licenses. In contrast, the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (“SMSA”) which were originally used to license DEMS service did not include rural areas, and thus, rural areas were not provided the service. Further, the relatively small size of EAs will allow for a more rapid build-out than might be the case in a larger geographic area. In addition, to give licensees maximum flexibility, we tentatively conclude that licensees will be permitted to aggregate licenses in order to operate in larger geographic areas. We seek comment on these tentative conclusions. Because the Commission used SMSAs to license those that were originally relocated from 18 GHz to 24 GHz, we propose to exclude from the applicable EAs, the areas currently licensed in the 24 GHz band, and to add as three additional areas for licensing the United States territories and possessions over which we have jurisdiction: Guam and the Commonwealth of Northern Marianas (EA 173), Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands (EA 174), and American Samoa (EA 175).²⁹ We seek comment on these proposals.

10. We also request comment on alternative geographic areas, including nationwide licenses, and licenses based upon Metropolitan and Rural Service Areas (MSAs and RSAs),³⁰ Regional Economic Area

²⁵ See *infra* at ¶¶ 26-28.

²⁶ See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(3)(B).

²⁷ This decision is consistent with our recent decision to use EAs for licensing the service areas in the 39 GHz proceeding. See *In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Regarding the 37.0-38.6 GHz and 38.6-40.0 GHz Band, (“39 GHz ”) MO&O, ET Dkt. No. 95-183, (rel July 26, 1999) at ¶ 46. There, we relied upon many of the same factors: (a) foster investment in and rapid deployment of new technologies and services; and (b) encourage economic opportunities among a wide variety of applicants; which we cite in support of our decision to use EAs in this proceeding. *Id.* In the 39 GHz proceeding, we declined to adopt our initial decision to use BTAs for licensing purposes, stating: “new developments concerning Rand McNally’s copyright interest in BTAs lead us to conclude that using BTAs as service areas for 39 authorizations could result in extended delays in the 39 GHz licensing process.” (footnote omitted) *Id.* at ¶ 46 In light of the foregoing, we are persuaded to not employ BTAs, which were used for licensing purposes in the Local Multipoint Distribution Service (“LMDS”) proceeding. See *LMDS Second Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 12545 at 22604, ¶ 135.*

²⁸ See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(3)(A).

²⁹ See *e.g.*, Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Provide for the Use of the 220-222 MHz Band by the Private Land Mobile Radio Service, *Third Report and Order; Fifth Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 12 FCC Rcd 10943, 10983-84, ¶ 80 (1997).

³⁰ See Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act--Competitive Bidding, *Fourth Report*

Groupings (REAGs), Major Economic Areas (MEAs) or other relevant geographic areas. Commenters supporting alternative geographic areas should specify which areas they support and explain in detail why those alternatives would be superior to the use of EAs for 24 GHz licensing areas.

3. Treatment of Incumbents

11. As the Commission discussed in the *Reallocation Order*,³¹ incumbent licensees would begin to transfer their operations to frequencies in the 24 GHz band over a period of time commencing with the effective date, June 24, 1997, of the Order which modified the licenses.³² After the transfer of operations by an incumbent licensee to the 24 GHz band, such licensee generally shall be governed by Part 101 of the Commission's rules.³³ Under those rules, transferred licensees are generally subject to the same rules as applied to operations in the 18 GHz band.

12. By this *Notice*, we propose to make licensees subject to any changes we make in this proceeding to the Part 101 rules that are generally applicable to the 24 GHz band, including interference criteria. Therefore, it is our tentative view that no special rules for protection of incumbents alone are necessary, any more than special protections would be required if additional providers were licensed in the 18 GHz band. We believe that the protection requirements of Part 101.509 will accommodate the new stations and allow licensees to effectively coordinate their systems. To the extent that any incumbent licensee wishes to use additional frequencies at 24 GHz or to extend its currently authorized service area,³⁴ then such licensee may apply for such a license or licenses subject to the Commission's competitive bidding and other assignment procedures available. Any incumbent licensee may also acquire additional frequencies in the 24 GHz band through the partitioning and disaggregation procedures proposed in Section II.C.4, *infra*.³⁵ We seek comment on these proposals.

4. Authorized 24 GHz Services

13. In the *Reallocation Order*, we adopted fixed service in this band as the only authorized use

and Order, 9 FCC Rcd 2330, 2333, ¶ 16 (1994).

³¹ See *Reallocation Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 3476-77, ¶ 14.

³² See *In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Relocate the Digital Electronic Message Service from the 18 GHz Band to the 24 GHz Band and to Allocate the 24 GHz Band for Fixed Service*, 12 FCC Rcd. 8266 (1997)

³³ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.

³⁴ Each SMSA is comprised of at least one or more counties, except for the New England area where some areas consist of partial counties. See 1975, Office of Management and Budget Report, as amended, June, 1981.

³⁵ See ¶¶ 26-28, *infra*.

under the Commission's Table of Frequency Allocations. In keeping with this allocation, we propose to permit any 24 GHz licensee to use spectrum in the band for any fixed service. In addition, as discussed in Section II.B.1, *supra*, we seek comment on whether we should permit the use of this band for mobile services, should it become technically feasible to do so. While we propose general “fixed” use for this spectrum, we do not know precisely the types of services new licensees will seek to provide. We therefore propose rules that will enable licensees to offer a wide variety of services and that will minimize regulatory barriers and costs of operation. It is our tentative view that the proposals we are making regarding licensed services areas,³⁶ spectrum blocks,³⁷ and partitioning and disaggregation³⁸ will provide both incumbent and new licensees with a wide variety of options for using 24 GHz spectrum to meet market demands.

14. We note that Section 303(y) of the Communications Act grants the Commission “authority to allocate electromagnetic spectrum so as to provide flexibility of use,” if “such use is consistent with international agreements to which the United States is a party”³⁹ and if the Commission makes certain findings.⁴⁰ We have not proposed to allocate this spectrum to multiple categories of service listed in the Table of Allocations, but rather have allocated spectrum only to the Fixed Service. However, in this service rule proceeding, we are seeking comment on whether to expand or revise our earlier approach. We seek comment on the findings required by Section 303(y) of the Act and whether Section 303(y) applies here.

15. We propose to modify Part 101 of the Commission's rules to include the entire range of digital services to be provided at 24 GHz, so that the use of the 24 GHz band by new and relocated licensees⁴¹ in the 24 GHz band shall be subject to those rules.⁴² We also propose to modify Part 101 of the Commission's rules to the extent necessary to reflect the particular characteristics and circumstances

³⁶ See ¶¶ 9-10, *supra*.

³⁷ See ¶¶ 16-17, *infra*.

³⁸ See ¶¶ 26-28, *infra*.

³⁹ See 47 C.F.R. § 303(y)(1). See also, *supra* at ¶ 6.

⁴⁰ See 47 U.S.C. § 303(y)(2). This section states that the Commission must find that: (1) such an allocation would be in the public interest; (2) such use would not deter investment in communications services and systems, or technology development; and (3) such use would not result in harmful interference among users.

⁴¹ Because relocated and new licensees in the 24 GHz band will be treated the same, we will refer to both as “24 GHz licensees.” We will refer to them separately as “relocated licensees” and “new licensees.”

⁴² Consequently, all applications for licenses will be filed pursuant to § 101 of 47 C.F.R..

of the services to be offered. We seek comment on this general approach. We discuss several specific issues in this *Notice*, but also request comment on any other changes in the existing Part 101 rules that might be useful or necessary for the 24 GHz band. We believe that making this spectrum available for use under these rules is in the public interest because it will contribute to technological and service innovation and, more robust competition in the telecommunications service markets.

5. Spectrum Blocks

16. In the *Reallocation Order*, the Commission decided to license relocated operations in 40 megahertz channel pairs.⁴³ We propose that the same amount of spectrum be provided to each new 24 GHz licensee as is provided under the rules for the relocated licensees adopted in the *Reallocation Order*. In the *Reallocation Order*, the Commission discussed the basis for its conclusion that DEMS licensees need 40 megahertz channel pairs at 24 GHz for their capacity to be equivalent to the capacity they have at 18 GHz. We found that differences in propagation, rain attenuation, and available equipment between the two bands would require DEMS systems at 24 GHz to use approximately four times as much bandwidth as DEMS systems at 18 GHz to maintain comparable reliability and coverage.⁴⁴ While this analysis would not necessarily apply to non-DEMS use at 24 GHz, we believe that 40 megahertz paired blocks would be efficient for such use. Thus, we propose that we license five spectrum blocks, except in the SMSAs where there are incumbent licensees. Each spectrum block shall consist of a pair of 40 megahertz channels. We also propose to modify the emission mask in Section 101.111 to accommodate the changes in spectrum and bandwidth.⁴⁵ We seek comment on these proposals.

17. We tentatively conclude that the use of EAs, described in Section II.B.2, *supra*, as well as the partitioning and spectrum disaggregation, described in Section II.C.4, *infra*, will result in economic opportunity for a wide variety of applicants, including small business, rural telephone, and minority-owned and women-owned applicants, as required by Section 309(j)(4)(C). These proposals, we tentatively conclude, will lower entry barriers through the creation of licenses for smaller geographic areas, thus requiring less capital and facilitating greater participation by such entities.

C. Application, Licensing, and Processing Rules

1. Regulatory Status

18. In this Notice, we are proposing a broad licensing framework for implementing services in the 24 GHz spectrum band. Under our proposal, a 24 GHz licensee would be allowed to provide a variety

⁴³ See Section 101.109(c) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 101.109(c), as amended by the *Reallocation Order* (providing for 40 megahertz spectrum blocks).

⁴⁴ See *Reallocation Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 3475, ¶12, 3483-85 (Appendix B).

⁴⁵ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.111.

or combination of fixed services.⁴⁶ In order to fulfill its enforcement obligations and ensure compliance with the statutory requirements of Titles II and III of the Communications Act, the Commission has required applicants to identify whether they seek to provide common carrier services.

19. In the *LMDS Second Report and Order*, the Commission required applicants for fixed services to indicate if they planned to offer services as a common carrier, a non-common carrier, or both, and to notify the Commission of any changes in status without prior authorization.⁴⁷ We seek comment on a similar proposal to permit an applicant for a 24 GHz license to request common carrier status as well as non-common carrier status for authorization in a single license, rather than require the applicant to choose between common carrier and non-common carrier services, and to change regulatory status upon notification without prior approval. The licensee would be able to provide all allowable services anywhere within its licensed area at any time, consistent with its regulatory status. This approach, we tentatively conclude, would achieve efficiencies in the licensing and administrative process. This is consistent with our approach with respect to Multipoint Distribution Service (“MDS”) and the Local Multipoint Distribution Service (“LMDS”).⁴⁸ Apart from the designation of regulatory status, we propose not to require 24 GHz license applicants to describe the services they seek to provide. We believe it is sufficient that an applicant indicate its choice for regulatory status in a streamlined application process.⁴⁹ In providing guidance on this issue to MDS and LMDS applicants, we pointed out that an election to provide service on a common carrier basis requires that the elements of common carriage be present;⁵⁰ otherwise, the applicant must choose non-common carrier status.⁵¹ Accordingly, a determination of

⁴⁶ The Commission amended the Part 101 Rules to apply to incumbent licensees moved to the 24 GHz band in the *Reallocation Order*, *supra* at 3478-3485.

⁴⁷ *LMDS Second Report and Order*, *supra*, at 12636-38, 12644-45, 12652-53, ¶¶ 205-208, 225-226, 245-251. *See also* 47 C.F.R. § 101.1017.

⁴⁸ *See* Revisions to Part 21 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Multipoint Distribution Service, 2 FCC Rcd 4251, 4252-53, ¶¶ 9-16 (1987) (“*MDS Report and Order*”); *LMDS Second Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 12643-45, ¶¶ 221-227.

⁴⁹ The Commission has explained that any video programming service will be treated as a non-common carrier service. *See LMDS Second Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 12639-41, ¶¶ 213-215. Thus, any applicant intending to provide a video programming service would appropriately indicate a choice of non-common carrier regulatory status.

⁵⁰ Section 3 of the Communications Act defines telecommunications as: “the transmission between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user’s choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.” *See* 47 U.S.C. § 153(43). “A telecommunications carrier shall be treated as a common carrier only to the extent that it is engaged in providing telecommunications services, except that the Commission shall determine whether the provision of fixed and mobile satellite service shall be treated as common carriage.” *See* 47 U.S.C. § 153(44)

⁵¹ *See MDS Report and Order*, 2 FCC Rcd at 4252-53, ¶¶ 9-16; *LMDS Second Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 12643-45, ¶¶ 221-227.

regulatory status will be based on the service actually provided, rather than the service proposed. We also propose that if licensees change the service they offer such that it would change their regulatory status, they must notify the Commission, although such change would not require prior Commission authorization. We propose that licensees notify the Commission within 30 days of this change, unless the change results in the discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of the existing service, in which case the licensee is also governed by Section 101.305 and submits the application under Section 101.61 in conformance with the time frames and requirements of Section 101.305.⁵²

2. Eligibility

20. Our primary goal in the present proceeding is to encourage efficient competition, particularly in the local exchange telephone market. In assessing whether to restrict the opportunity of any class of service providers to obtain and use spectrum to provide communications services in the 24 GHz band, we seek to determine whether open eligibility poses a significant likelihood of substantial competitive harm in specific markets, and, if so, whether eligibility restrictions are an effective way to address that harm.⁵³ This approach relies on competitive market forces to guide license assignment absent a showing that regulatory intervention to exclude potential participants is necessary.⁵⁴ Such an approach is appropriate because it best comports with our statutory guidance. When granting the Commission authority in Section 309(j)(3) of the Communications Act to auction spectrum for the licensing of wireless services, Congress acknowledged our authority "to [specify] eligibility and other characteristics of such licenses."⁵⁵ However, Congress specifically directed that we exercise that authority so as to "promot[e] . . . economic opportunity and competition."⁵⁶ Congress also emphasized this pro-competitive policy in Section 257, where it articulated a "national policy" in favor of "vigorous economic competition" and the elimination

⁵² See 47 C.F.R. § 101.305. Section 101.305 (a) states in part: "If the public communication service provided by a station in the Common Carrier Radio Services and the Local Multipoint Distribution Service is involuntarily discontinued, reduced or impaired for a period exceeding 48 hours, the station licensee must promptly notify the Commission, in writing[.]" Section 101.305 (c) states in part: "Any licensee not subject to title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, who voluntarily discontinues, reduces or impairs public communication service to a community or a part of a community must give written notification to the Commission within 7 days thereof."

⁵³ See Amendment of the Commission's Rules Regarding the 37.0-38.6 GHz and 38.6-40.0 GHz Bands and Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act — Competitive Bidding, 37.0-38.6 GHz and 38.6-40.0 GHz, *Report and Order and Second Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 12 FCC Rcd 18600, 18619, ¶ 32 (1997) ("*39 GHz Report and Order*").

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(3).

⁵⁶ *Id.*

of barriers to market entry by a new generation of telecommunications providers.⁵⁷

21. Current providers in the 24 GHz band offer a range of services such as local and long distance telephony and internet access. We tentatively conclude that open eligibility for 24 GHz licenses will not pose a significant likelihood of substantial competitive harm in local exchange telephone markets, and that it is therefore unnecessary to impose eligibility restrictions on incumbent local exchange carriers (“ILECs”). This tentative conclusion is based on several factors. First, other wireless providers such as LMDS⁵⁸ and 39 GHz⁵⁹ licensees may provide competition in the local telephony markets. Second, other facilities-based, wireline entrants such as interexchange carriers and competitive LECs, and non-facilities-based wireline entrants utilizing the local competition provisions of the Communications Act, may provide competition in these markets as well. Third, in LMDS, a fixed broadband point-to-multipoint microwave service in the 28 GHz band, ILECs and cable companies have been prohibited from holding an attributable interest in any license whose geographic service area significantly overlaps such incumbent’s authorized or franchised service area.⁶⁰ This prohibition guaranteed that initially each one of those licenses will be acquired by a firm new to the provision of local exchange in the service area. These new providers have now had a significant opportunity to enter these markets without the participation of ILECs and cable interests. Finally, under our proposal in Section II.B.5. *supra*, we will make available five licenses for each geographic area. This number of licenses permits numerous 24 GHz licensees in any one market and, thus, numerous competitors for the licenses. This scenario makes it more difficult for an incumbent LEC to acquire all the licenses in a single geographic area. Taken together, these factors demonstrate that an incumbent strategy of trying to forestall competition in local telephony by buying 24 GHz licenses cannot succeed because there are several other sources of actual and potential competition.

22. Given all these competitive possibilities, we tentatively conclude that it would be exceedingly difficult for an incumbent LEC to pursue a strategy of buying 24 GHz licenses in the hope of foreclosing or delaying competition, and implausible that it would succeed at that strategy. As noted, we seek comment on these tentative conclusions. We also tentatively conclude that the spectrum made

⁵⁷ See 47 U.S.C. § 257.

⁵⁸ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.1003(a).

⁵⁹ Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Regarding the 37.0-38.6 GHz and 38.6-40.0 GHz Bands, ET Docket No. 95-183, *Report and Order and Second Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 12 FCC Rcd 18600 (1997).

⁶⁰ The Commission adopted the temporary eligibility restriction in 1997. See *Second Report and Order, supra*, 12 FCC Rcd at 12616, ¶ 162 wherein we stated: “Based on the record here, standard economic theory, our experience, an analogous situation in the cable TV industry, and our assessment of competitive and regulatory developments in the local telephony and MVPD markets, we find on balance that a policy favoring restricted eligibility for a limited time would result in the greatest likelihood of increased competition in the local telephony and MVPD markets. By restricting in-region LEC and cable companies, we ensure the entry of a new LMDS operator that could provide competition in the LEC market, the MVPD market, or both.”

available for 24 GHz may be inadequate to enable the provision of competitive multi-channel video programming distribution (MVPD) service, and that incumbent cable company acquisition of these licenses does not raise anti-competitive concerns. We base this conclusion in part on Teligent's current service offerings, which are generally limited to voice and data, as well as our own assessment. We also rely on the number of licenses (five) available in each geographic area to check anti-competitive conduct by cable operators. Nevertheless, we do note, however, that cable companies are increasingly offering high speed internet access, a service offering that Teligent is currently providing. Our concerns about anti-competitive behavior by cable companies is substantially attenuated by the existence of alternative sources of such internet access, including digital subscriber lines, fixed wireless applications, and satellite. Furthermore, the cable companies are also subject to the restrictions in the LMDS service, which we have noted herein.⁶¹ We, therefore, tentatively conclude that it is unnecessary to impose eligibility restrictions on incumbent cable operators

3. Foreign Ownership Restrictions

23. Certain foreign ownership and citizenship requirements are imposed in Sections 310(a) and 310(b) of the Communications Act, as modified by the 1996 Act, that restrict the issuance of licenses to certain applicants.⁶² The statutory provisions are implemented in Section 101.7 of the Commission's Rules⁶³ and reflect the restrictions as they must be imposed on 24 GHz license applicants. Specifically, Section 101.7(a) prohibits the granting of any license to be held by a foreign government or its representative. Section 101.7(b) prohibits the granting of any common carrier license to be held by individuals who fail any of the four citizenship requirements listed in the rule.⁶⁴

24. Based on the prohibitions set forth in Section 101.7(a), we conclude that neither a foreign government, nor its representative can hold a license, including either a common carrier or non-common carrier license, to operate in the 24 GHz band. In addition, we conclude that Section 101.7(b) prohibits any individual who fails to meet the four citizenship requirements set forth therein from holding a license to operate as a common carrier in the 24 GHz band.⁶⁵ Further, any individual who elects both common carrier and non-common carrier status must comply with Section 101.7(b)'s four citizenship requirements. But, since the prohibitions set forth in Section 101.7(b) do not apply to non-common carriers, an individual may elect to hold a license, as a non-common carrier in the 24 GHz band, without

⁶¹ See note 60, *supra*.

⁶² See 47 U.S.C. §§ 310(a), 310(b).

⁶³ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.7, as amended by Amendment of Parts 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 80, 87, 90, 100, and 101 of the Commission's Rules to Implement Section 403(k) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Citizenship Requirements), *Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 13072 (1996), adopting revised Section 101.7.

⁶⁴ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.7(b).

⁶⁵ *Id.*

complying with the four citizenship requirements, as long as the individual is still in compliance with the requirements set forth in Section 101.7(a).⁶⁶

25. To assist our analysis of alien ownership restrictions, we tentatively conclude that applicants in the 24 GHz band shall file FCC Form 430. This requirement is identical to the information which we require MDS, satellite, and LMDS applicants to submit in order to assess the alien ownership restrictions under Section 101.7(b). Furthermore, both common carriers and non-common carriers would be required to file the information whenever there are changes to the foreign ownership information, as well as the other legal and financial qualifications. We would not disqualify an applicant requesting authorization exclusively to provide non-common carrier services solely because its citizenship information reflects that it would be disqualified from a common carrier license. However, consistent with what the Commission stated in the *Satellite Rules Report and Order* and in the *LMDS Second Report and Order*, we tentatively conclude that requiring non-common carriers to address all the alien ownership prohibitions better enables the Commission to monitor all of the licensed providers in light of their ability to provide both common and non-common carrier services.⁶⁷ We request comment on this proposal.

4. Aggregation, Disaggregation and Partitioning

26. As indicated above,⁶⁸ we propose to permit 24 GHz licensees to partition their service areas and to aggregate and disaggregate their spectrum. We believe that such an approach would serve to promote the efficient use of the spectrum. We thus tentatively conclude that partitioning and spectrum disaggregation will provide a means to overcome entry barriers through the creation of licenses for smaller geographic areas that require less capital, thereby facilitating greater participation by, and economic opportunity for, smaller entities such as small businesses, rural telephone companies, and businesses owned by minorities and women, as required by Section 309(j)(4)(C) of the Communications

⁶⁶ For entities who seek compliance with Section 101.7(b)(4), we note that in response to the World Trade Organization ("WTO") Basic Telecommunications Agreement, the Commission has liberalized its policy for applying its discretion with respect to indirect foreign ownership of common carrier radio licenses. In general, the Commission now presumes that indirect ownership by entities from WTO members serves the public interest. Ownership by entities from countries that are not WTO members continues to be subject to the "effective competitive opportunities" test (which examines the legal ability of U.S. carriers to enter the foreign destination market and provide the relevant service, and if there are no legal barriers to entry, considers the practical ability for U.S. carriers to compete in those markets). The Commission has eliminated the "effective competitive opportunities" test for common carrier licensees or applicants with foreign investment from WTO member countries. See 47 C.F.R. § 101.7(b)(4); See also Rules and Policies on Foreign Participation in the U.S. Telecommunications Market and Market Entry and Regulation of Foreign-Affiliated Entities, *Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration*, 12 FCC Rcd 23891, 23935-47, ¶¶ 97-132 (1997) ("*Foreign Participation Report and Order*"). *Recon. pending*

⁶⁷ *Id.*; *LMDS Second Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 12651, ¶ 243.

⁶⁸ See ¶ 17, *supra*.

Act.⁶⁹ We request comment on this conclusion.

27. We also request comment regarding what limits, if any, should be placed on the ability of a 24 GHz licensee to partition its service area and disaggregate its spectrum. We note that in the *Partitioning and Disaggregation Report and Order* the Commission permitted both geographic partitioning and spectrum disaggregation by broadband PCS licensees. In the case of broadband PCS service, the Commission decided to permit geographic partitioning along any service area defined by the partitioner and partitionee, and spectrum disaggregation without restriction on the amount of spectrum to be disaggregated, and to permit combined partitioning and disaggregation.⁷⁰ The Commission concluded that allowing parties to decide without restriction the exact amount of spectrum to be disaggregated will encourage more efficient use of the spectrum and permit the deployment of a broader mix of service offerings, both of which will lead to a more competitive wireless marketplace.⁷¹

28. We request comment regarding whether such an approach should apply to 24 GHz licenses. If commenters take the position that such an approach should apply, they should also address what information should be filed with the Commission to allow us to maintain our licensing records.

5. License Term and Renewal Expectancy

29. We propose that the 24 GHz license term for both incumbent and new licensees be 10 years, with a renewal expectancy similar to that afforded PCS and cellular licensees. In the case of either a cellular or PCS licensee, a renewal applicant shall receive a preference or renewal expectancy if the applicant has provided substantial service during its past license term and has complied with the Act and applicable Commission rules and policies.⁷² While preferring a substantial service requirement, we also invite comment on whether a build-out requirement is more appropriate for this service.⁷³ We believe that this 10-year license term, combined with a renewal expectancy, will help to provide a stable regulatory environment that will be attractive to investors and, thereby, encourage development of this frequency band. We also seek comment on whether a license term longer than 10 years is appropriate to achieve these goals and better serve the public interest. Commenters who favor a license term in excess of ten

⁶⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(4)(C). See Geographic Partitioning and Spectrum Disaggregation by Commercial Mobile Radio Services Licensees and Implementation of Section 257 of the Communications Act — Elimination of Market Barriers, *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 11 FCC Red 21831, 21843-44, ¶¶ 13-17 (1996) (“*Partitioning and Disaggregation Report and Order*”).

⁷⁰ *Id.* at 21847-48, ¶¶ 23-24.

⁷¹ *Id.* at 21860, ¶ 49.

⁷² See 47 U.S.C. § 151 *et seq.* Substantial service is service that is sound, favorable, and substantially above a level of mediocre service which might just minimally warrant renewal. See 47 C.F.R. § 22.940(a)(1)(i).

⁷³ See *infra* at ¶¶ 33-34.

years should specify the appropriate license term and include a basis for the period proposed.

30. We propose that the renewal application of a 24 GHz licensee must include at a minimum the following showings in order to claim a renewal expectancy:

- A description of current service in terms of geographic coverage and population served or links installed and a description of how the service complies with the substantial service requirement.
- Copies of any Commission Orders finding the licensee to have violated the Communications Act or any Commission rule or policy, and a list of any pending proceedings that relate to any matter described by the requirements for the renewal expectancy.⁷⁴
- If applicable, a description of how the licensee has complied with the build-out requirement.

These proposed requirements are based on those we ordered for LMDS.⁷⁵

31. Under our proposal, in the event that a 24 GHz license is partitioned or disaggregated, any partitionee or disaggregatee would be authorized to hold its license for the remainder of the partitioner's or disaggregator's original license term, and the partitionee or disaggregatee will be required to demonstrate that it has met the substantial service, or build-out standard, requirements in any renewal application. We believe that this approach, which is similar to the partitioning provisions the Commission adopted for MDS⁷⁶ and for current broadband PCS licensees,⁷⁷ is appropriate because a licensee, through partitioning or disaggregation, should not be able to confer greater rights than it was awarded under the terms of its license grant.

D. Operating Rules

1. Performance Requirements

32. We seek comment on whether licensees in the 24 GHz band should be subject to a

⁷⁴ Cf. Section 22.940(a)(2)(i) through Section 22.940(a)(2)(iv) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 22.940(a)(2)(i)-(iv).

⁷⁵ See Section 101.1011 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 101.1011.

⁷⁶ See Amendment of Parts 21 and 74 of the Commission's Rules With Regard to Filing Procedures in the Multipoint Distribution Service and in the Instructional Television Fixed Service, *Report and Order*, 10 FCC Rcd 9589, 9614, ¶ 46 (1995).

⁷⁷ See *Partitioning and Disaggregation Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 21870, ¶¶ 76-77.

substantial service requirement or a minimum coverage requirements as a condition of license renewal. We have imposed such requirements on licensees in other services to ensure that spectrum is used effectively and service is implemented promptly.⁷⁸

33. We seek comment on whether 24 GHz licensees should be required to provide “substantial service” to the geographic license area within ten years or any other license term which we adopt for this service.⁷⁹ We have defined substantial service as “service which is sound, favorable, and substantially above a level of mediocre service which just might minimally warrant renewal.”⁸⁰ Further, as an alternative, safe harbor standard, we seek comment on whether there should be a construction requirement that the licensee transmit to reach a minimum of one-third of the population in their licensed area, no later than the mid-point of the license term and two-thirds of the population by the end of the license term. We also seek comment on whether, in the event that a 24 GHz license is partitioned or disaggregated, a partitionee or disaggregatee should be bound by the standard, either substantial service or a construction requirement, which we may adopt in this proceeding.

34. If a licensee does not comply with whichever standard, we adopt, either substantial service or minimum coverage, the Commission must consider what action to take. We could adopt a standard whereby a licensee who does not comply with the appropriate standard, either substantial service or minimum coverage, is subject to license termination upon action by the Commission or alternatively, the license would automatically cancel. We seek comment on whether to adopt an automatic cancellation standard or cancellation only upon action by the Commission. If the geographic licensee loses its license for failure to comply with coverage requirements, should the licensee be prohibited from bidding on the geographic license for the same territory in the future? Is there a sanction more appropriate than automatic cancellation?

2. Application of Title II Requirements to Common Carriers

35. We also seek comment on whether we should forbear from applying certain obligations on common carrier licensees in the 24 GHz band pursuant to Section 10 of the Act.⁸¹ In the case of commercial mobile radio service (“CMRS”) providers, the Commission concluded that it was appropriate to forbear from Sections 203, 204, 205, 211, 212, and most applications of Section 214.⁸² The

⁷⁸ See note 74, *supra*.

⁷⁹ See *LMDS Second Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 12659, ¶¶ 263-267.

⁸⁰ See e.g. 47 CFR § 22.940(a)(1)(i).

⁸¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 160(a)(1-3). Section 10 provides the Commission with authority to forbear from application of virtually any regulation or any provision of the Act to a telecommunications carrier or telecommunications service, or a class of carriers or services. But, the Commission may not forbear from applying the requirements of Sections 251(c) or 271 until it determines that those requirements have been fully implemented. See 47 U.S.C. § 160(d).

⁸² See Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 332 of the Communications Act, Regulatory Treatment of Mobile

Commission, however, declined to forbear from enforcing other provisions, including Sections 201 and 202.⁸³ The Commission has also exercised its forbearance authority in permitting competitive access providers (“CAPS”) and competitive local exchange carriers (“CLECs”) to file permissive tariffs.⁸⁴ We seek comment on whether it is appropriate to forbear from enforcing any provisions of the Act or the Commission’s rules in the 24 GHz band.⁸⁵

E. Technical Rules

36. As discussed above,⁸⁶ our general proposal is to apply the rules in Part 101 to govern the use

Services, *Second Report and Order*, 9 FCC Rcd. 1411, 1463-93, ¶¶ 124-219, 272. Although the Commission recently concluded that, pursuant to Section 10(a)(3), forbearance from the international Section 214 application process would not be consistent with the public interest, we substantially streamlined the international 214 process, providing significant regulatory relief. *See* 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review-Review of International Common Carrier Regulations, *Report and Order*, FCC 99-51, ¶ 18 (released March 23, 1999). *See also* In the Matter of Personal Communications Industry Association’s Broadband Personal Communications Services Alliance’s Petition for Forbearance For Broadband Personal Communications Services, Forbearance from Applying Provisions of the Communications Act to Wireless Telecommunications Carriers, *Memorandum Opinion and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, (“*Forbearance Order*”) FCC 98-134, ¶ 119, (released July 2, 1998). *See also* Implementation of Section 402(b)(2)(A) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Petition for Forbearance of the Independent Telephone & Telecommunications Alliance. *Report and Order in CC Docket No. 97-11, Second Memorandum Opinion and Order in AAD, File No. 98-43*, FCC 99-104 (released June 30, 1999) (eliminating entry certification filing requirements under Section 214 and significantly streamlining exit certification requirements, granting the substance of the Section 214 regulatory relief requested by the members of the Independent Telephone and Telecommunications Alliance in their petition for forbearance, and extending that relief to all other domestic carriers.)

⁸³ *See Forbearance Order, supra*, ¶¶ 14-31. The Commission also declined to forbear from applying Section 20.12(b) of the Commission’s rules, which requires broadband personal communications service, cellular, and covered specialized mobile radio carriers, to permit unrestricted resale of their services until five years after the last group of initial licenses for broadband PCS is awarded. *Id.* at 44.

⁸⁴ *See* In the Matters of Hyperion Telecommunications, Inc. Petition Requesting Forbearance, Time Warner Communications Petition for Forbearance, Complete Detariffing for Competitive Access Providers and Competitive Local Exchange Carriers, *Memorandum Opinion and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 12 FCC Rcd 8596 at ¶¶ 23-27, (1997).

⁸⁵ For example, the Wireless Communications Association International, Inc. has requested that the Commission forbear from imposing regulations on fixed wireless broadband telecommunications carriers, other than those classified as CMRS, in order to facilitate entry into the local exchange and other telecommunications markets. *See* In the Matter of Biennial Regulatory Review-Elimination or Streamlining of Unnecessary and Obsolete CMRS Regulations, Forbearance from Applying Revisions of Communications Act to Wireless Telecommunications Carriers, WT Docket 98-100.

⁸⁶ *See* ¶¶ 11-12, 15, *supra*.

of the 24 GHz band, except as they may be modified as a result of this proceeding. This would include technical parameters such as channelization, frequency tolerance and stability, power and emission limitations, antennas, and equipment authorization.⁸⁷ Also, general provisions of Part 101, such as environmental and radio frequency (RF) safety requirements, and the protection of quiet zones, would be applicable.

37. The technical parameters for operations at 24 GHz were adopted in the *Reallocation Order*. As discussed there, such parameters were derived, for purposes of expedience, from those applied to operations at 18 GHz, and may not have been exactly suited to operations at the higher 24 GHz band.⁸⁸ The use of the higher frequency band is, for example, one reason for the change in channelization. We have little information in the record at this time, however, on which to propose other specific changes to the Part 101 rules. New developments in fixed technology, besides those generated by the transition to a new band, may warrant other changes in the technical parameters.⁸⁹ Moreover, changes and advancements in technology may, in the future, warrant use of this band for not only digital modulation, but also other modulations. In that connection, it is not our intent to impose technological requirements which may in the future restrain more efficient and innovative use of this spectrum. Therefore, we solicit comment regarding whether this service should be limited to digital modulation and whether further development of service at 24 GHz will be facilitated by technical parameters different from those that are currently in Part 101. Regardless of the final set of technical rules adopted in this proceeding, we propose that they all apply to all licensees in the 24 GHz band, including licensees that acquire their licenses through partitioning and disaggregation. But, none of the proposed rule changes are directed at, nor intended to apply to DEMS licensees that operate in the 10 GHz band. While it is our tentative view that most technical issues are addressed by the current rules, there is one specific technical issue that warrants some attention and is therefore discussed below. We solicit comments, however, on all technical parameters that should apply to operations at 24 GHz.

1. Licensing and Coordination of 24 GHz Stations

38. With one exception, incumbent licenses have been granted, by waiver, on an area wide basis. However, nodal stations, which serve as the central or controlling station in a radio system operating

⁸⁷ See *Reorganization and Revision of Parts 1, 2, 21, and 94 of the Rules to Establish a New Part 101 Governing Terrestrial Microwave Fixed Radio Services*, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 13449 (1996), *Recon. Pending*.

⁸⁸ 12 FCC Rcd at 3483-3485 (Appendix A).

⁸⁹ For example, the architecture of Digital Electronic Messaging Service (DEMS) systems has evolved over the years such that the subchannels within the authorized channels are wider, that is, 10 megahertz rather than 300 kilohertz. Based on this, a number of waivers of the emission limitations have been issued to existing 24 GHz licensees to reflect current developments. For this particular parameter, therefore, we have proposed specific modifications to Section 101.111 as indicated in Appendix B. The antenna directivity of user stations may likewise be appropriate for modification.

on point-to-multipoint frequencies,⁹⁰ must be specifically applied for by licensees and authorized by the Commission.⁹¹ This could be viewed as a dual licensing situation and may not be necessary or administratively efficient.⁹² Section 101.103(d) of the Commission's Rules⁹³ contains guidelines for the current frequency coordination process for Fixed Microwave Services, while Section 101.509 of the Commission's Rules⁹⁴ sets forth interference protection criteria for 24 GHz licensees. These two rule sections have similar goals: to facilitate interference-free operations, to ensure cooperation among licensees to minimize and resolve potential interference problems, and to obtain the most efficient and effective use of the spectrum and authorized facilities. The Commission intends to auction⁹⁵ the remaining spectrum in geographic areas and believes that licensees must be assured a reasonable and effective use of their own areas, while equally protecting the interests of other licensees.

39. We tentatively conclude that a requirement to coordinate those 24 GHz nodal stations located within the boundaries of a licensed SMSA or other geographic licensing area prior to putting them into operation would be sufficient to achieve these goals, and we therefore propose to replace the individual licensing of nodal stations with a coordination requirement. Such coordination would be required with co-channel 24 GHz licensees in adjacent geographic areas and with adjacent channel 24 GHz licensees in adjacent geographic areas, as well as the same or overlapping area. Based on propagational characteristics at 24 GHz, our information on planned system configurations, the current technical parameters and similar distances adopted in Commission proceedings regarding other microwave bands,⁹⁶ we tentatively conclude that the 80 km coordination distance currently specified in our rules appears to be too large. However, we propose to have each licensee coordinate with licensees in other relevant areas and develop agreements between systems. Instead of specifying a fixed distance, we propose that licensees coordinate their facilities whenever their facilities have line-of-sight into other licensees' facilities or are within the same geographic area.⁹⁷ Under our proposal, both types of

⁹⁰ See Section 101.3 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 101.3.

⁹¹ See Section 101.503 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 101.503.

⁹² There may, however, be other purposes for the filing of specific station or site information with the Commission. Such information could, for example, be used in spectrum use or management studies.

⁹³ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.103(d).

⁹⁴ See 47 C.F.R. § 101.509.

⁹⁵ See ¶¶ 43-45, *infra*.

⁹⁶ See Sections 101.103(g) and 101.103(I) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§101.103(g), 101(i). The Coordination distances adopted were 20 km at 28 GHz and 16 km at 39 GHz. (An analysis of possible adverse impact on Canadian communications must still be done by the Commission for those stations within 56 km of the Canadian border.)

⁹⁷ At a minimum, stations whose radio horizon overlaps adjacent areas should contact the relevant licensees

coordination must be successfully completed before operation is permitted. In the event that there is no 24 GHz licensee immediately available in an adjacent, same or overlapping area, the licensee must be prepared to coordinate its stations in the future in order to accommodate other licensees to ensure cooperative and effective use of the spectrum in each area. These changes are reflected in the attached rule proposals. We solicit comment on these coordination procedures and criteria.

40. As noted above,⁹⁸ international coordination is also an issue that needs to be addressed. While no specific proposals are made at this time, operations at 24 GHz in the United States will be subject to any agreements reached with Canada and Mexico. We are in the process of holding discussions with these countries to determine the types of coordination that would be necessary.

2. RF Safety

41. We propose that licensees and manufacturers be subject to the RF radiation exposure requirements specified in Sections 1.1307(b), 2.1091, and 2.1093 of the Commission's Rules,⁹⁹ which lists the services and devices for which an environmental evaluation must be performed.¹⁰⁰ We tentatively conclude that routine environmental evaluations for RF exposure should be required in the case of fixed operations, including base stations, when the effective radiated power (ERP) is greater than 1,000 watts.

42. We propose to treat services and devices in the 24 GHz band in accordance with the Commission's exposure limits in OET Bulletin 65, which has replaced OST Bulletin No. 65.¹⁰¹

F. Competitive Bidding Procedures

1. Statutory Requirements

43. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 amended Section 309(j) of the Act to require the

regarding coordination of facilities.

⁹⁸ See note 96, *supra*.

⁹⁹ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1307(b), 2.1091, 2.1093.

¹⁰⁰ The RF radiation exposure limits are set forth in Sections 1.1310, 2.1091, and 2.1093 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1310, 2.1091, 2.1093, as modified in Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation, *Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 15123 (1996) ("*RF Guidelines Report and Order*"), *First Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 17512 (1996), *Second Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 13494 (1997).

¹⁰¹ OET Bulletin No. 65 (Edition 97-01) was issued on August 25, 1997. It is available for downloading at the FCC Web Site: www.fcc.gov/oet/rfsafety. Copies of OET Bulletin No. 65 also may be obtained by calling the FCC RF Safety Line at (202) 418-2464.

Commission to award mutually exclusive applications for initial licenses or permits using competitive bidding procedures, with very limited exceptions.¹⁰² Thus, if not exempted by the statute, a service will be auctionable if we implement a licensing process that permits the filing and acceptance of mutually exclusive applications. In establishing particular licensing schemes or methodologies, the Commission is required to consider the public interest objectives described in section 309(j)(3).

44. Pursuant to Section 309(j)(6)(E) of the Act, the Commission has an “obligation in the public interest to continue to use engineering solutions, negotiation, threshold qualifications, service regulations, and other means in order to avoid mutual exclusivity in application and licensing proceedings.”¹⁰³ In the Balanced Budget Act, Congress highlighted the Commission’s obligation under Section 309(j)(6)(E) by referencing that obligation in the general auction authority provision. The Commission recently sought comment on whether that reference changes the scope or content of the Commission’s obligation under Section 309(j)(6)(E).¹⁰⁴ In determining whether to resolve mutually exclusive applications for licenses in the 24 GHz band through competitive bidding, we intend to adhere to any conclusions we reach in the Balanced Budget Act proceeding regarding the scope of our auction authority.

45. In paragraphs 8-9, *supra*, we proposed to continue the use of a geographic area licensing scheme for the 24 GHz band, using EAs instead of SMSAs. Because we have tentatively concluded that it would serve the public interest to implement a licensing scheme under which mutual exclusivity is possible, we also tentatively conclude that mutually exclusive initial applications for the 24 GHz band must be resolved through competitive bidding. We seek comment on this tentative conclusion.

2. Incorporation by Reference of Part 1 Standardized Auction Rules

46. In the *Part 1 Third Report and Order*, the Commission streamlined its auction procedures by adopting general competitive bidding rules applicable to all auctionable services,¹⁰⁵ and, in the same proceeding, issued a *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making* concerning designated entities and attribution rules, among other issues.¹⁰⁶ We propose to conduct the auction for initial licenses in the 24

¹⁰² See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(1),(2). Section 309(j)(2) exempts from auctions licenses and construction permits for public safety radio services, digital television service licenses and permits given to existing terrestrial broadcast licensees to replace their analog television service licenses, and licenses and construction permits for noncommercial educational broadcast stations and public broadcast stations.

¹⁰³ See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(6)(E).

¹⁰⁴ See Implementation of Sections 309(j) and 337 of the Communications Act of 1934 as Amended, *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, FCC 99-52 (rel. March 25, 1999) (“*BBA NPRM*”).

¹⁰⁵ *Part 1 Third Report and Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 381-470.

¹⁰⁶ *Id.*, 13 FCC Rcd at 471-481.

GHz band in conformity with the general competitive bidding rules set forth in Part 1, subpart Q of the Commission's rules, and substantially consistent with the bidding procedures that have been employed in previous Commission auctions. Specifically, we propose to employ the Part 1 rules governing designated entities, application issues, payment issues, competitive bidding design, procedure and timing issues, and anti-collusion. These rules would be subject to any modifications that the Commission adopts in relation to the *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making*. We seek comment on this proposal and on whether any of our Part 1 rules would be inappropriate in an auction for this service.

3. Provisions for Designated Entities

47. The Communications Act provides that, in developing competitive bidding procedures, the Commission shall consider various statutory objectives and consider several alternative methods for achieving them.¹⁰⁷ Specifically, the statute provides that, in establishing eligibility criteria and bidding methodologies, the Commission shall:¹⁰⁸

promot[e] economic opportunity and competition and ensur[e] that new and innovative technologies are readily accessible to the American people by avoiding excessive concentration of licenses and by disseminating licenses among a wide variety of applicants, including small businesses, rural telephone companies, and businesses owned by members of minority groups and women.

48. In the *Competitive Bidding Second Memorandum Opinion and Order*, the Commission stated that it would define eligibility requirements for small businesses on a service-specific basis, taking into account the capital requirements and other characteristics of each particular service in establishing the appropriate threshold.¹⁰⁹ The *Part 1 Third Report and Order*, while it standardizes many auction rules, provides that the Commission will continue a service-by-service approach to defining small businesses. For the 24 GHz band, we propose to adopt the definitions the Commission adopted for broadband PCS for “small” and “very small” businesses,¹¹⁰ which the Commission also adopted for 2.3 GHz and 39 GHz applicants.¹¹¹ We tentatively conclude that the capital requirements are likely to be similar to the capital requirements in those services. Specifically, we propose to define a small business

¹⁰⁷ See Sections 309(j)(3) and 309(j)(4) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 309(j)(3), 309(j)(4).

¹⁰⁸ See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(3)(B).

¹⁰⁹ Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act – Competitive Bidding, *Second Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 9 FCC Rcd 7245, 7269, ¶ 145 (1994) (“*Competitive Bidding Second Memorandum Opinion and Order*”).

¹¹⁰ Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act – Competitive Bidding, *Fifth Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 10 FCC Rcd 403 (1994).

¹¹¹ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 27.210(b)(1)(2), 101.1209(b)(1)(i).

as any firm with average annual gross revenues for the three preceding years not in excess of \$40 million. For entities who qualify as a small business, we propose to provide them with a bidding credit of 15%.¹¹²

49. We observe that the capital costs of operational facilities in the 24 GHz band are likely to vary widely. Accordingly, we seek to adopt small business size standards that afford licensees substantial flexibility. Thus, in addition to our proposal to adopt the general small business standard the Commission used in the case of broadband PCS, 2.3 GHz, and 39 GHz licenses, we propose to adopt the definition for very small businesses used for 39 GHz licenses and for the PCS C and F block licenses: businesses with average annual gross revenues for the three preceding years not in excess of \$15 million. For entities who qualify as a very small business, we propose to provide them with a bidding credit of 25%.¹¹³

50. We seek comment on the use of these standards and associated bidding credits for applicants to be licensed in the 24 GHz band, with particular focus on the appropriate definitions of small and very small businesses as they relate to the size of the geographic area to be covered and the spectrum allocated to each license. In discussing these issues, commenters are requested to address the expected capital requirements for services in the 24 GHz band. Commenters are invited to use comparisons with other services for which the Commission has already established auction procedures as a basis for their comments regarding the appropriate definitions for small and very small businesses.

51. We seek comment here on whether there are any actions specific to the 24 GHz service that should be taken to insure that this service will be provided in rural areas. Relatedly, we note that Section 309(j) requires the Commission to “promote... economic opportunity for a wide variety of applicants, including... rural telephone companies.”¹¹⁴ Consistent with this mandate, we seek comment on whether there are specific measures that should be taken with respect to these entities.

III. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

A. Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

52. As required by Section 603 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) of 1980,¹¹⁵ the Commission has prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the possible significant economic impact on small entities of the policies and rules proposed in this *Notice*. The IRFA is set forth in Appendix A. We request written public comment on the IRFA. In order to fulfill the mandate of the Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996 regarding the Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, we ask a number of questions in our IRFA regarding the prevalence of small businesses in the affected

¹¹² See 47 C.F.R. § 1.2110(e)(2)(iii).

¹¹³ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.2110(e)(2)(ii).

¹¹⁴ See 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(3)(B).

¹¹⁵ See 5 U.S.C. § 603.

industries.

53. Comments must be filed in accordance with the same filing deadlines as comments filed in this rulemaking proceeding, but they must have a separate and distinct heading designating them as responses to the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis. The Office of Public Affairs, Reference Operations Division, shall send a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in accordance with Section 603(a) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

B. Paperwork Reduction Analysis

54. This *Notice* contains either a proposed or modified information collection. As part of our continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, we invite the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to take this opportunity to comment on the information collections contained in this *Notice*, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-13. Public and agency comments are due at the same time as other comments on this *Notice*; OMB comments are due 60 days from the date of publication of this Notice in the Federal Register. Comments should address:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility.
- The accuracy of the Commission's burden estimates.
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected.
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Written comments by the public on the proposed or modified information collections are due December 10, 1999. Written comments must be submitted by the OMB on the proposed or modified information collections on or before 60 days after the date of publication in the Federal Register. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the information collections contained herein should be submitted to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-C804, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554, or via the Internet to jboley@fcc.gov, and to Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20503, or via the Internet to fain_t@al.eop.gov.

C. Ex Parte Presentations

55. For purposes of this permit-but-disclose notice and comment rulemaking proceeding, members of the public are advised that *ex parte* presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine

Agenda period, provided they are disclosed under the Commission's Rules.¹¹⁶

D. Comment Dates

56. Pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before December 10, 1999, and reply comments on or before December 27, 1999. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies.¹¹⁷ All relevant and timely comments will be considered by the Commission before final action is taken in this proceeding. To file formally, interested parties must file an original and four copies of all comments, reply comments, and supporting comments. If interested parties want each Commissioner to receive a personal copy of their comments, they must file an original plus nine copies. Interested parties should send comments and reply comments to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554, with a copy to Howard Davenport, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Parties are also encouraged to file a copy of all pleadings on a 3.5-inch diskette in Word 97 format.

57. Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <<http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. In completing the transmittal screen, commenters should include their full name, Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket or rulemaking number. Parties may also submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail. To get filing instructions for e-mail comments, commenters should send an e-mail to ecfs@fcc.gov, and should include the following words in the body of the message, "get form <your e-mail address.>" A sample form and directions will be sent in reply.

58. Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and four copies of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appear in the caption of this proceeding, commenters must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number. All filings must be sent to the Commission's Secretary, Magalie Roman Salas, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

59. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D. C. 20554.

E. Further Information

60. For further information concerning this rulemaking proceeding, contact Howard

¹¹⁶ See generally 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1202, 1.1203, 1.1206(a).

¹¹⁷ See Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings, *Report and Order*, 13 FCC Rcd 11322 (1998); Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 13 FCC Rcd 21517 (1998).

Davenport at (202) 418-0585, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

61. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that these actions ARE TAKEN pursuant to Sections 1, 4(i), 7, 301, 303, 308 and 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 157, 301, 303, 308, 309(j).

62. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of the proposed regulatory changes described above, and that comment is sought on these proposals.

63. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this *NPRM* is hereby ADOPTED.

64. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commission's Office of Public Affairs, Reference Operations Division, SHALL SEND a copy of this Notice, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in accordance with Section 603(a) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-354 , 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. §§ 601-612.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary

APPENDIX A**Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis**

As required by Section 603 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act,¹¹⁸ the Commission has prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the expected impact on small and very small entities of the policies and rules proposed in this Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice). Written public comments are requested on the IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments on the Notice.

Reason for Action

This rulemaking is being initiated to adopt certain licensing and service rules for the 24 GHz band, to auction 24 GHz spectrum not used by Digital Electronic Message Service (DEMS) licensees relocated from the 18.82-18.92 and 19.16-19.26 GHz bands (18 GHz band) to the 24.25-24.45 and 25.05-25.25 GHz bands (24 GHz band).

Objectives

Our objectives are: (1) to accommodate the introduction of new uses of spectrum and the enhancement of existing uses; and (2) to facilitate the awarding of licenses to entities who value them the most.

Legal Basis for Proposed Rules

The proposed action is authorized under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553; and sections 1, 4(i), 7, 301, 303, 308 and 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 157, 301, 303, 308 and 309(j).

Description and Estimate of Small Entities Subject to the Rules

The rules will affect incumbent licensees who are relocated to the 24 GHz band from the 18 GHz band and applicants who wish to provide services in the 24 GHz band.

The Commission has not developed a definition of small entities applicable to licensees in the 24 GHz band. Therefore, the applicable definition of small entity is the definition under the Small Business Administration (SBA) rules for the radiotelephone industry that provides that a small entity is a radiotelephone company employing fewer than 1,500 persons.¹¹⁹ The 1992 Census of Transportation, Communications, and Utilities, conducted by the Bureau of the Census, which is the most recent

¹¹⁸ See 5 U.S.C. § 603.

¹¹⁹ See 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code 4812.

information available, shows that only 12 radiotelephone firms out of a total of 1,178 such firms that operated during 1992 had 1,000 or more employees.¹²⁰ We believe that there are only two licensees in the 24 GHz band that will be relocated, Teligent and TRW, Inc. It is our understanding that Teligent and its related companies have less than 1500 employees, although this may change in the future. On the other hand, TRW is not a small entity. We therefore believe that only one licensee in the 24 GHz is a small business entity.¹²¹ We seek comment on this analysis. In providing such comment, commenters are requested to provide information regarding how many total and small business entities would be relocated.

The proposals also affect potential new licensees on the 24 GHz band. Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 24.720(b), the Commission has defined “small entity” for Blocks C and F broadband PCS licensees as firms that had average gross revenues of less than \$40 million in the three previous calendar years. This regulation defining “small entity” in the context of broadband PCS auctions has been approved by the SBA.¹²² With respect to new applicants in the 24 GHz band, we also propose to use the small entity definition adopted in the Broadband PCS proceeding. With regard to “very small businesses” we propose to adopt the definition used for 39 GHz licenses and for the PCS C and F block licenses: businesses with average annual gross revenues for the three preceding years not in excess of \$15 million.

The Commission will not know how many licensees will be small or very small businesses until the auction, if required, is held. Even after that, the Commission will not know how many licensees will partition their license areas or disaggregate their spectrum blocks, if partitioning and disaggregation are allowed. In view of our lack of knowledge of the entities that will seek 24 GHz licenses, we therefore assume that, for purposes of our evaluations and conclusions in the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, all of the prospective licensees are either small or very small business entities.

We invite comment on this analysis.

Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements

Applicants for 24 GHz licenses will be required to submit applications. We request comment on how these requirements can be modified to reduce the burden on small entities and still meet the objectives of the proceeding.

Significant Alternatives Minimizing the Impact on Small Entities Consistent with Stated

¹²⁰ U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992 Census of Transportation, Communications, and Utilities, UC92-S-1, Subject Series, Establishment and Firm Size, Table 5, Employment Size of Firms: 1992, SIC Code 4812 (issued May 1995).

¹²¹ Teligent has acquired the DEMS licenses of FirstMark, the only other licensee in the 24 GHz band whose license has been modified to require relocation to the 24 GHz band.

¹²² See Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act — Competitive Bidding, *Fifth Report and Order*, 9 FCC Rcd 5532, 5581-82, ¶ 115 (1994).

Objectives

We have reduced burdens wherever possible. To minimize any negative impact, however, we propose certain incentives for small and very small entities that will redound to their benefit. These special provisions include partitioning and spectrum disaggregation. The regulatory burdens we have retained, such as filing applications on appropriate forms, are necessary in order to ensure that the public receives the benefits of innovative new services in a prompt and efficient manner. We will continue to examine alternatives in the future with the objectives of eliminating unnecessary regulations and minimizing any significant economic impact on small entities. We seek comment on significant alternatives commenters believe we should adopt.

Federal Rules That Overlap, Duplicate, or Conflict with These Proposed Rules

None.

Appendix B
Proposed Rules

Parts 1, 2, and 101 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as follows:

PART 1 -- PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

1. The authority citation for Part 1 continues to read as follows:

AUTHORITY: 47 U.S.C. sections 151, 154, 303, and 309(j) unless otherwise noted.

2. The entries on the Table in Section 1.1307(b)(1) for Wireless Communications Service are proposed to be amended to read as follows:

§ 1.1307 Actions which may have a significant environmental effect, for which Environmental Assessments (EAs) must be prepared.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) ***

TABLE 1: TRANSMITTERS, FACILITIES AND OPERATIONS SUBJECT TO ROUTINE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Service (Title 47 CFR Rule Part)	Evaluation Required if:
*	*
24 GHz (subpart G of part 101)	Total power of all channels > 1000 W ERP (1640 W EIRP)
*	*

* * * * *

PART 2 -- FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS AND RADIO TREATY MATTERS; GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

3. The authority citation for Part 2 continues to read as follows:

AUTHORITY: Section 4, 302, 303, and 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Sections 154, 302, 303 and 307, unless otherwise noted.

4. Section 2.106, the Table of Frequency Allocations, is proposed to be amended as follows:

- a. Remove the existing entries for 24.25 - 24.45 GHz and 25.05 - 25.25 GHz.
- b. Add entries in numerical order for 24.25 - 24.45 GHz and 25.05 - 25.25 GHz.
- c. Delete Footnote US341.

The proposed revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 2.106 Table of Frequency Allocations

* * * * *

International table			United States table		FCC use designators	
Region 1 -- allocation GHz	Region 2 -- allocation GHz	Region 3 -- allocation GHz	Government	Non-Government	Rule part(s)	Special-use frequencies
(1)	(2)	(3)	Allocation GHz (4)	Allocation GHz (5)	(6)	(7)
*	*	*	*	*	*	*
24.25 – 24.45	24.25 – 24.45	24.25 – 24.45	24.25 – 24.45	24.25 – 24.45		

FIXED	RADIONAVIGATION	RADIONAVIGATION FIXED MOBILE		FIXED	FIXED MICROWAVE (101)	
*	*	*	*	*	*	*
24.75 – 25.05 FIXED	24.75 – 25.05 FIXED- SATELLITE (Earth-to-space) S5.535	24.75 – 25.05 FIXED FIXED- SATELLITE (Earth-to-space) S5.535 MOBILE S5.534	24.75 – 25.05	24.75 – 25.05 RADIONAVIGATION	AVIATION (87)	
25.05 – 25.25 FIXED	25.05 – 25.25 FIXED- SATELLITE (Earth-to-space) S5.535	25.05 – 25.25 FIXED FIXED- SATELLITE (Earth-to-space) S5.535 MOBILE S5.534	25.05 – 25.25	25.05 – 25.25 FIXED	FIXED MICROWAVE (101)	
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

*

*

*

*

*

UNITED STATES FOOTNOTES

* * * * *

Section 87

5. Section 87.173(b): delete radionavigaion use from Table (Chart).

PART 101--FIXED MICROWAVE SERVICES

6. The authority citation for Part 101 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. §§ 154, 303, 309(j), unless otherwise noted.

7. Section 101.1 is proposed to be amended by inserting the words "24 GHz Service" between the words "carrier" and "and" in subsection 101.1(a).

8. Section 101.3 is proposed to be amended by replacing the definition of Digital Electronic Message Service to read as follows:

§ 101.3 Definitions

As used in this part:

* * * * *

24 GHz Service. A radiocommunication service that may encompass any digital fixed service.

* * * * *

9. Section 101.5(b) is reserved for future use. However, the text which currently appears in §101.5(b) is deleted.

10. Section 101.13 is proposed to be amended by deleting subsection 101.13(c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e) and (f) as (c), (d) and (e), respectively.

11. Section 101.15 is proposed to be amended by adding the words "and 24 GHz Service in subpart G of this part" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Service in subpart L of this part" in subsection 101.15(a).

12. Section 101.21 is proposed to be amended by:

(a) deleting the words "and Digital Electronic Message Services (excluding user stations)" and by adding the word "and" before "Local Television Transmission" in subsection 101.21(d).

(b) inserting the words "and 24 GHz Service" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Service" in subsection 101.21 (g).

13. Section 101.29 is proposed to be amended by deleting subsection 101.29(c)(1)(ix).

14. Section 101.37 is proposed to be amended by revising subsections 101.37 (a)(1) and (a)(3) to read as follows:

§ 101.37 Public notice period.

(a) At regular intervals, the Commission will issue a public notice listing:

* * * * *

(1) The acceptance for filing of common carrier applications, Local Multipoint Distribution Service applications, 24GHz Service applications, and major amendments thereto;

* * * * *

(3) The receipt of common carrier applications, Local Multipoint Distribution Service applications, and 24 GHz Service applications for minor modifications made pursuant to § 101.59;

15. Section 101.45 is proposed to be amended by adding the words "and in the 24 GHz Service" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Service" in subsection 101.45(b).

16. Section 101.57 is proposed to be amended by inserting the words "or in the 24 GHz Service after the effective date of the Order" after the words "March 11, 1997" in subsection 101.57(a)(1)(ii).

17. Section 101.61 is proposed to be amended by revising subsection 101.61(b)(1) to read as follows:

§ 101.61 Certain modifications not requiring prior authorization.

(b) * * *

(1) Frequency coordination procedures, as necessary, are complied with in accordance with § 101.103(d).

18. Section 101.61 is proposed to be amended by inserting the words "and in the 24 GHz Service" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Service" in subsections 101.61(c)(9) and 101.61(d) and by inserting the words "upon notification of the Commission within 30 days of the change" after the words "an existing license" in subsection 101.61(c)(9).

19. Section 101.63 is proposed to be amended by inserting the words "and in the 24 GHz Service" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Service" in subsection 101.63(a).

20. Section 101.105 is proposed to be amended by deleting the words "and all point-to-multipoint channels in the 18 GHz band" after the words "in the 10.6 GHz band" in subsection 101.105(c)(6).

21. Section 101.111 is proposed to be amended by revising subsection 101.111(a)(4) to read as follows:

§ 101.111 Emission Limitations.

(1) * * *

(a) * * *

(4) For DEMS channels in the 17,700-19,700 and 24,250-25,250 MHz bands:

(i) On any frequency removed from the center frequency of the DEMS channel by more than 50 percent of that channel's bandwidth:

$A = 35 + 0.75(F - 0.5B)$ dB (in any 4 kHz channel), or
 $A = 11 + 0.75(F - 0.5B)$ dB (in any 1 MHz channel),
but in no event greater than 80 decibels;

A = attenuation (in decibels) below mean output power level contained within the DEMS channel for a given polarization
B = bandwidth of DEMS channel (in MHz)
F = absolute value of the difference between the center frequency of the measured band and the center frequency of the DEMS channel

(ii) In any 4 kHz band, the center frequency which is outside the DEMS bands: At least $43 + 10 \log_{10}(\text{mean output power in watts})$ dB.

22. Section 101.147 is proposed to be amended by deleting the words "except that channels 35-39 are available only to existing 18 GHz licensees as of March 14, 1997" and by deleting subparagraphs (i) and (ii) in subsection 101.147(r)(9).

23. Section 101.305 is proposed to be amended by inserting a comma and deleting the word "and" after the words "Common Carrier Radio Services" and by inserting the words "and the 24 GHz Digital Electronic Message Service" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Services" in subsection 101.305(a).

24. Section 101.311 is proposed to be amended by inserting the words "and 24 GHz Service" after the words "Local Multipoint Distribution Service".

25. Section 101.501 is proposed to be amended to read as follows:

§ 101.501 Eligibility

"See § 101.147(n) for licensing of DEMS facilities in the 10.6 GHz band. Applications for new facilities using the 18 GHz band are no longer being accepted. Any entity, other than one precluded by § 101.7 or §101.1003 of this part, is eligible for authorization to provide DEMS under this subpart."

26. Section 101.503 is proposed to be amended by adding the words "10.6 GHz" before the word "DEMS" wherever it appears.

27. Section 101.505 is proposed to be amended by replacing the words "§ 101.147(r)(9)" with "§§ 101.147(m), (n), and (r)(9)."

28. Section 101.509 is proposed to be amended to read as follows:

§ 101.509 Interference Protection Criteria.

- (a) All harmful interference to other users and blocking of adjacent channel use in the same or adjacent geographical area is prohibited. In areas where EAs are in close proximity, careful consideration should be given to minimum power requirements and to the location, height, and radiation pattern of the transmitting antenna. Licensees are expected to cooperate fully in attempting to resolve problems of potential interference before bringing the matter to the attention of the Commission.
- (b) As a condition for use of frequencies in this service each licensee is required to:
 - (1) Engineer the system to be reasonably compatible with adjacent and co-channel operations in the same or adjacent areas; and
 - (2) Cooperate fully and in good faith to resolve whatever potential interference and transmission security problems may be present in adjacent and co-channel operations.
- (c) Licensee shall coordinate their facilities whenever the facilities have line-of-sight into other licensees' facilities or are within the same geographic area. Licensees are encouraged to develop operational agreements with relevant licensees in the same or adjacent areas.
- (d) Licensees shall comply with the appropriate coordination agreements between the United States and Canada and the United States and Mexico concerning cross-border sharing and use of the 24 GHz bands.

29. Section 101.511 is proposed to be amended to read as follows:

§ 101.511 Permissible services.

(a) Authorizations for stations in the 24 GHz Service will be granted to provide services on a common carrier basis or a non-common carrier basis or on both a common carrier and non-common carrier basis in a single authorization.

(b) Stations may render any kind of digital communications service consistent with the Commission's rules and the regulatory status of the station to provide services on a common carrier or non-common carrier basis.

(c) An applicant or licensee may submit a petition at any time requesting clarification of the regulatory status required to provide a specific communications service.

30. Section 101.521 is proposed to be amended by adding the words "in the 10.6 GHz band" after the word "frequencies."

31. Section 101.523 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.523 Geographic service areas and number of licenses.

The service areas for 24 GHz are Economic Areas (EAs). EAs are 175 areas, including U.S. territories and possessions, defined by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis, as

modified by the FCC.

32. Section 101.525 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.525 24 GHz system operations.

(a) A licensee using the 24 GHz band may construct and operate any number of fixed stations anywhere within the area authorized to serve without prior authorization, except as follows:

(1) A station would be required to be individually licensed if:

(A) international agreements require coordination;

(B) submission of an Environmental Assessment is required under § 1.1307.

(C) the station would affect the radio quiet zones under § 101.123.

(2) Any antenna structure that requires notification to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must be registered with the Commission prior to construction under § 17.4.

(b) Whenever a licensee constructs or makes system changes as described in paragraph (a), the licensee is required to notify the Commission within 30 days of the change under § 101.61 and include a statement of the technical parameters of the changed station.

33. Section 101.527 is proposed, as an alternative, safe harbor standard, to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.527 Construction requirements for 24 GHz operations.

(a) 24 GHz licensees must serve with a signal level sufficient to provide adequate service to at least one-third of the population in their licensed area within five years of being licensed and two-thirds of the population in their licensed area within 10 years of being licensed. Licensees may choose to define population using the 1990 census or the 2000 census. Failure by any licensee to meet these requirements will result in forfeiture or non-renewal of the initial license and the licensee will be ineligible to regain it.

(b) Licensees must file maps and other supporting documents showing compliance with the respective construction requirements within the appropriate five- and ten-year benchmarks of the date of their initial licenses.

34. Section 101.529 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.529 Renewal expectancy criteria for 24 GHz licenses.

(a) A renewal applicant involved in a renewal proceeding shall receive a preference, commonly referred to as a renewal expectancy, that is the most important factor to be considered in the proceeding as long as the applicant's past record for the relevant license period demonstrates that:

(1) The renewal applicant has provided "substantial" service, i.e. service which is sound, favorable,

and substantially above a level of mediocre service which just might minimally warrant renewal, during its past license term; and

(2) The renewal applicant has substantially complied with applicable FCC rules, policies, and the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

(b) In order to establish its right to a renewal expectancy, a licensee in the 24 GHz service involved in a renewal proceeding must submit a showing explaining why it should receive a renewal expectancy. At a minimum, this showing must include:

(1) A description of its current service in terms of geographic coverage and population served; and

(2) Copies of all FCC orders finding the licensee to have violated the Communications Act or any FCC rule or policy; and a list of any pending proceedings that relate to any matter described in this paragraph.

(c) In making its showing of entitlement to a renewal expectancy, a renewal applicant may claim credit for any system modification applications that were pending on the date it filed its renewal application. Such credit will not be allowed if the modification application is dismissed or denied.

35. Section 101.531 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.531 Application form and contents.

(a) Applications for initial authorization of 24 GHz facilities are filed on FCC Form 175 in accordance with Subpart M of this Part, and Subpart Q of Part 1. FCC Form 601 is submitted subsequently either by the winning bidder, if an auction is held to decide among two or more mutually exclusive applications, or, in cases of no mutual exclusivity, by the sole applicant. Applications to amend pending applications and to modify licenses are filed on FCC Form 600.

(b) *Foreign ownership information.* All applicants for 24 GHz licenses must provide the information requested on FCC Form 600 to address all of the eligibility requirements in § 101.7 of this Part. All licensees will keep the information updated.

36. Section 101.533 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.533 Regulatory status.

(a) *Initial applications.*

An applicant for a 24 GHz license must specify on FCC Form 601 if it is requesting authorization to provide services on a common carrier basis, a non-common carrier basis, or on both a common carrier and non-common carrier basis.

(b) *Amendment of pending applications.*

(1) Any pending application may be amended to: (i) change the carrier status requested, or (ii) add to the pending request in order to obtain both common carrier and non-common carrier status in a single

license.

(2) Amendments to change, or add to, the carrier status in a pending application are minor amendments filed under § 101.29 in this Part.

(c) *Modification of license.*

(1) A licensee may modify a license to: (i) change the carrier status authorized, or (ii) add to the status authorized in order to obtain both common carrier and non-common carrier status in a single license.

(2) Applications to change, or add to, the carrier status in a license are modifications not requiring prior Commission authorization filed under § 101.61 of this Part. If the change results in the discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of an existing service, the licensee is also governed by § 101.305(b) or (c) and submits the application under § 101.61 in conformance with the time frames and requirements of § 101.305(b) or (c).

37. Section 101.535 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.535 Geographic partitioning and spectrum disaggregation.

(a) Eligibility.

(1) Parties seeking approval for partitioning and disaggregation shall request from the Commission an authorization for partial assignment of a license.

(2) 24 GHz licensees may apply to partition their licensed geographic service area or disaggregate their licensed spectrum at any time following the grant of their licenses.

(b) Standards.

(1) Partitioning. In the case of partitioning, requests for authorization for partial assignment of a 24 GHz license must include, as attachments, a description of the partitioned service area and a calculation of the population of the partitioned service area and the licensed geographic service area. The partitioned service area shall be defined by coordinate points at every 3 degrees along the partitioned service area unless an FCC recognized service area is utilized (*i.e.*, Major Trading Area, Basic Trading Area, Metropolitan Service Area, Rural Service Area, Economic Area, or Major Economic Area) or county lines are followed. The geographic coordinates must be specified in degrees, minutes, and seconds to the nearest second of latitude and longitude and must be based upon the 1927 North American Datum (NAD27). Applicants may supply geographical coordinates based on 1983 North American Datum (NAD83) in addition to those required (NAD27). In the case where an FCC recognized service area or county lines are utilized, applicants need only list the specific area(s) (through use of FCC designations or county names) that constitute the partitioned area.

(2) Disaggregation. Spectrum may be disaggregated in any amount.

(3) Combined Partitioning and Disaggregation. The Commission will consider requests for partial assignment of licenses that propose combinations of partitioning and disaggregation.

(c) Unjust Enrichment. 24 GHz licensees that received a bidding credit and partition their licenses or disaggregate their spectrum to entities not meeting the eligibility standards for such a bidding credit, will be subject to the provisions concerning unjust enrichment as set forth in section 1.2111.

(d) License Term. The license term for a partitioned license area and for disaggregated spectrum shall be the remainder of the original licensee's license term as provided for in section 101.67.

38. Section 101.537 is proposed to be added to read as follows:

§ 101.537 Competitive bidding: definitions.

For the purpose of establishing eligibility requirements and bidding credits for competitive bidding for licenses at 24 GHz, pursuant to section 1.2110, the following definitions apply:

(a) A small business is an entity that, together with its affiliates and controlling principals, has average annual gross revenues that are not more than \$40 million for the preceding three years, as determined pursuant to section 1.2110.

(b) A very small business is an entity that, together with its affiliates and controlling principals, has average gross revenues that are not more than \$15 million for the three preceding years, as determined pursuant to section 1.2110.