UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS & INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT

+ + + + +

COMMERCE SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CSMAC)

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

DECEMBER 2, 2015

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the offices of Wilkinson, Barker, and Knauer LLP, Suite 800N, 1800 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C., at 1:00 p.m., Larry Alder and H. Mark Gibson, Co-Chairs, presiding.

PRESENT:

LARRY ALDER, Co-Chair H. MARK GIBSON, Co-Chair AUDREY ALLISON, Member MICHAEL A. CALABRESE, Member MICHAEL S. CHARTIER, Member MARTIN COOPER, Member (by telephone) MARK E. CROSBY, Member THOMAS S. DOMBROWSKY, JR., Member DAVID L. DONOVAN, Member HAROLD FELD, Member DALE N. HATFIELD, Member ROBERT KUBIK, Member MARK A. McHENRY, Member JANICE OBUCHOWSKI, Member CARL POVELITES, Member CHARLA RATH, Member RICHARD L. REASER, JR., Member JEFFREY H. REED, Member (by telephone) DENNIS A. ROBERSON, Member (by telephone) KURT SCHAUBACH, Member MARIAM SOROND, Member (by telephone) BRYAN TRAMONT, Member

JENNIFER WARREN, Member (by telephone)

ALSO PRESENT:

GLENN REYNOLDS, Chief of Staff, National
Telecommunications and Information
Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce
PAIGE ATKINS, Deputy Associate Administrator for
Spectrum Planning and Policy, National
Telecommunications and Information
Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome and Opening Remarks	
Glenn Reynolds for Larry Strickling	4
Opening Comments and Introductions by	
Co-Chairs Alder and Gibson	9
Spectrum Update	
Paige R. Atkins	19
FY 2015 Recommendations Summary Report -	
NTIA/OSM (Paige R. Atkins)	
Spectrum Management via Databases	38
Bi-Directional Sharing	43
Industry and Government Collaboration	44
General Occupancy Measurements/Quan-	47
tification of Federal Spectrum Use	4 / 62
EnforcementSpectrum Sharing Cost Recovery	02
Alternatives	74
Transitional Sharing	74
FY2016 Questions and Subcommittee Reports	
Federal Access to Non-Federal Bands	
Charla Rath and Audrey Allison	77
Agency in Industry Collaboration	
Thomas Dombrowsky	88
Measurement and Sensing in 5 GHz	
Dennis Roberson	92
Spectrum Access System(SAS)/Spectrum	
Database International Extension	
Kurt Schaubach and Jeffrey Reed	98
5G Exploration	116
Robert Kubik and Mariam Sorond	116
Opportunity for Public Comment	
Co-Chair Mark Gibson	124
Closing Remarks by Co-Chairs	
Mark Gibson and Larry Alder	126
Adjourn	

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

1

(1:06 p.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Hi. Welcome, I think we are ready to get started everyone. I hope everyone had a good travel here, made it through a little bit of the rain. think today, unfortunately, Larry Strickland was, at the last minute, unable to make it. So, we are lucky to have Glenn Reynolds here, who will give us some opening remarks.

11

12

13

14

15

10

Larry does send his MR. REYNOLDS: apologies. Larry got called out to New York at the last minute. So, he asked me to sort of channel him to the degree I can, which is, ultimately a futile exercise.

16

17

18

19

But I do want to start off by acknowledging Wilkinson Barker and their swanky new digs here with the garage door and the whole bit. And thanks Bryan and Wilkinson Barker for hosting us.

20

21

22

I did want to recognize a couple of new players on the NTIA team that are going to be important contributors to the efforts of this group.

It should be on. If the green light is on. Okay.

A couple new contributors that we have brought on since the last CSMAC hearing, Giulia McHenry, who many of you all recognize is a former member of the CSMAC and is now NTIA's chief economist.

Dave Reed, who is sitting behind me, who recently joined our office of Spectrum

Management as Chief of the Spectrum Affairs and

Information Division. You all will be seeing plenty of him because he will be transitioning to the role as managing the day-to-day operations of CSMAC will be one of his primary responsibilities.

And then I haven't seen Keith but
Keith Gremban was going to be here. Keith, some
of you may be familiar with, is our relatively
new head of our institute for telecommunications
studies out in Boulder. We have been very

excited in the work he has done over the six
months he has been there and sort of turning
around and kind of reinvigorating some of the
work that ITS is doing that I think will continue
to be an important contributor to the same goals
that this group is trying to achieve.

It will come to no surprise to anybody in this room that Spectrum has become an increasingly significant focus in telecom policy areas over the last several months. Paige will cover a lot of this in more detail in her readout but I wanted to take note of two specific milestones that have occurred over the last couple of months.

First, enactment of the Spectrum

Pipeline Provisions of the Budget Act, which we,
as NTIA and on behalf of the Administration, view
as a very balanced piece of legislation that will
provide substantial support in our efforts.

Particularly, we applaud the increased
flexibility that was provided for use of SRF

monies that we believe will facilitate better

spectrum planning in R&D by the agencies. We note that it aligns specifically with some recommendations, previous recommendations of the CSMAC. The legislation also provides, as many of you probably know, for making available an additional 30 megahertz of spectrum option by 2024 and identifying 100 additional megahertz of spectrum for possible repurposing for wireless broadband use.

The other major milestone that I wanted to acknowledge was the conclusion of the WRC-15 last week. I know many of the folks around this table had a very major role, both government and non-government folks had a very major role over the last many months in contributing to that effort.

The efforts of WRC-15 set the foundation for innovation and economic opportunities globally, including the priorities such as mobile broadband, unmanned aircraft systems, non-geostationary and geostationary satellite networks, and global flight tracking.

On Larry's behalf, I wanted to express our thanks to everybody who contributed to that effort but a particular thanks to the senior delegation leadership, including Ambassador Anstrom, Julie Zoller, Mindel De La Torre, and, of course, Paige.

These milestones and the increasing focus on spectrum policy simply reinforces the important work that is being done by all of you here at CSMAC. It is essential that the debates that we are all having be informed by facts and to have a forum where the stakeholders can come together to bridge the differences.

Paige will discuss more of the steps that NTIA will be taking with respect to the most recent recommendations from the CSMAC but we are also looking forward anxiously to see the early responses from the next round of questions that have been assigned to folks.

So with that, I will say thanks to all of you for being here and pass it back on to Paige or pass it to back.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Thank you very much, Glenn. Glad to have you here.

So, Bryan is our host today. And do you have want to say a few words about the surroundings and logistics?

MEMBER TRAMONT: The very important restroom issues.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER TRAMONT: If you need to go to the restroom, you can go out either door but it is down the hallway and to the right. So, you will find a number of people who will help you on the way. We do have coffee and cookies and stuff over there and there is a kitchen across the way. So, if you want anything that is not there, you can go get it in the kitchen across the hall.

And any other questions? I think we are all set.

Wi-Fi, there is a sheet out available on -- yes, on the sheet. So, you can just grab that if you want to get the Wi-Fi password if you have any questions about that. Anything else?

Okay.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: All right, thanks, Bryan. It is a great facility. We are really, really happy to be here.

So, I am going to give a few opening remarks on behalf of the co-chairs and then we will do our usual roll call and proceed with the rest of the agenda.

So, I think at a high level where we are is we have wrapped up, last meeting, a number of subcommittees that were kind of our 2014 and 2015 work. And so thanks everyone for finishing that up. And I know Paige is going to give some responses to those recommendations.

And we kicked off, really for the first time at the last meeting, we kicked off five new subcommittees with new chairs, new liaisons, new questions. And each of those committees has met at least once.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: No, all but one. Sorry, that is my bad. I didn't know.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: I thought that all

met at least once so, I stand corrected. But we basically got those kicked off.

Mark here has done a great job. I want to commend him for actually attending all of the kickoff meetings of the first --

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Even one I didn't even know about.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: -- meeting. So, we are really happy to have those committees going with some new chairs, some new ideas, hopefully.

What we wanted to make sure is by the end of this meeting we didn't leave this meeting without ensuring that the questions were locked. Some of the subcommittees have reworded their questions and they have brought the proposals. I think Mark and I and Paige have reviewed that and we believe all the subcommittees have their questions locked and finalized. But let's make that a goal of this meeting, to make sure we don't leave this without that. And the reason is, we are on a pretty short time line.

So, the current plan of record, not

absolutely finalized, is that this convening of the CSMAC will go through August. And so that leaves us roughly three meetings beyond this one. And if you look on the agenda in the back, there is a March, a May, and an August meeting. So, the current target is to have these subcommittees deliver their recommendations no later than the May meeting. And then that gives one final meeting for responses, cleanup, et cetera. So, we are really working on about a six-month time line. If we were all software engineers, we would be in the Agile Methodology; this would be a sprint for this body.

So, one of the tips, I think, is that the goals, although I know a lot of these subcommittees they like to do a lot of outreach, collect data, and that is all welcome and good but, given the time line, it might not be possible. So at a minimum, just collect the collective wisdom of this advisory committee. It is not required to go out and do a lot of extra research. There just may not be time in the six

months that we have to kind of conclude all this work.

Okay, so then I think that is kind of where we are in the big picture. In order to do the August work, we will get an extension on our membership. And Bruce is working on that but the working assumption is that this group will go through until August and be allowed to complete the work.

I guess I had one more comment before we do the membership roll call. We have got a portal available. And I know Bruce sent out some email and I think the idea is we are going to actually use the portal to try and deposit the documents and to be sharing. There were some issues with the portal. Apparently, it is now working. I tried to use it myself. For those of you who haven't gotten your user name and password, you have to go through a training. And if you are not expecting that, that takes on the order of 45 minutes to an hour. So, what you need to do is budget 45 minutes or an hour to sit

down and learn all about cybersecurity. It is a cybersecurity training. After you complete that training, you will get a certificate of completion and you then complete another form that was in your email from Bruce. You sign those forms, send them in, and then you will be able to get a password, a user name and a password.

So, we are asking everyone before the next meeting, I think personally try and make a goal maybe before the new year, to try and complete that training and that way we can use that facility to share the documents.

So, those are the things that I wanted to touch on in the opening remarks. Is there anything else you want to touch on?

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: With respect to the portal, it is Mark Gibson, I went through the training and if you haven't done cybersecurity training, it may take a little longer. But it is what it is. But when you get in -- the documentation shows you how to get into the

portal. You probably could figure this out but it took me a minute. There is an entry point for DoD or Defense Department and an entry point for federal employee. Use the entry point for federal employee. So that way, you won't do what I did and go halfway down the road with the DoD one.

Anyhow, other than what Larry said, I would add to the one point about reaching out for getting other information. I know for some of the work that I have sat in on, some want to get in some other experts, I would encourage that you expedite that process and maybe cut down on the list of experts you feel like you need. But I also wouldn't expedite the work at the expense of getting it done properly, to your and everybody else's comfort level. So, it is kind of trying to maximize both time and content. Thanks.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Okay, with that, let's go ahead and do our membership roll call. Shall we go?

MS. ATKINS: Paige Atkins, NTIA.

Ī		Т6
1	MEMBER RATH: Charla Rath, Verizon.	
2	MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Tom Dombrowsky,	
3	Wiley Rein.	
4	MEMBER REED: Jeff Reed, Virginia	
5	Tech.	
6	MEMBER HATFIELD: Dale Hatfield,	
7	University of Colorado.	
8	MEMBER DONOVAN: David Donovan, New	
9	York Broadcasters.	
10	MEMBER POVELITES: Carl Povelites,	
11	AT&T.	
12	MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Kurt Schaubach,	
13	Federated Wireless.	
14	MEMBER FELD: Harold Feld, Public	
15	Knowledge.	
16	MEMBER CHARTIER: Mike Chartier,	
17	Intel.	
18	MEMBER CROSBY: Mark Crosby, EWA.	
19	MEMBER MCHENRY: Mark McHenry with	
20	Shared Spectrum.	
21	MEMBER REASER: Rick Reaser from	
22	Raytheon.	

1	MEMBER CALABRESE: Michael Calabrese,
2	New America.
3	MEMBER KUBIK: Rob Kubik, Samsung.
4	MEMBER ROBERSON: Dennis Roberson,
5	Illinois Institute of Technology.
6	MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Janice Obuchowski,
7	FTI.
8	MEMBER TRAMONT: Bryan Tramont,
9	Wilkinson Barker Knauer.
10	MR. REYNOLDS: Glenn Reynolds, NTIA on
11	behalf of Larry Strickling.
12	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Mark Gibson,
13	Comsearch.
14	Let's actually get the members on the
15	phone.
16	CO-CHAIR ALDER: Yes, the phone.
17	People on the phone, you want to go ahead and
18	introduce yourself, members?
19	So, do we have is Martin Cooper
20	there?
21	MEMBER COOPER: Yes, Martin is on.
22	(Laughter.)

		18
1	CO-CHAIR ALDER: Martin's not there?	
2	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: He is there.	
3	MEMBER COOPER: Yes, I'm here.	
4	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: It's hard for us to	
5	hear the phone.	
6	MEMBER COOPER: Can you hear me?	
7	CO-CHAIR ALDER: And Mariam?	
8	MEMBER SOROND: Yes, I'm here.	
9	CO-CHAIR ALDER: Jennifer?	
10	MEMBER WARREN: Yes, I'm here.	
11	CO-CHAIR ALDER: And then I think	
12	Robert Pepper.	
13	I guess Robert's not there. Anyone	
14	else we are missing on the phone? All right,	
15	that sounds like it.	
16	Do we want to go around the guests and	
17	introduce themselves? Why not?	
18	MR. GREMBAN: I'm Keith Gremban with	
19	NTIA.	
20	MR. MOLINA: Steve Molina with NTIA.	
21	(Off mic introductions)	
22	CO-CHAIR ALDER: Okay, thank you,	

everyone. Anyone else we missed?

All right, so the next item on the agenda, the next several items on the agenda, so I am going to turn the floor over to Paige and she is going to cover first her Spectrum update.

MS. ATKINS: Good afternoon. Well, there really is no doubt that our work is never done and Spectrum is never boring. So, that is a good thing. We have been busy since the last CSMAC meeting and, as Glenn mentioned, Spectrum remains a high-interest item across the board, particularly on Capitol Hill, while many of us have been focused also on the World Radio Conference for 2015 and many of us around this table.

And at the same time, we are trying to keep the day-to-day work going, making sure the agencies have what they need operationally, as well as they develop systems to accomplish the mission and to stay focused and on track with the 500 megahertz goal.

And I am happy to say that we are

successfully managing this very complex and challenging set of requirements.

And I can't emphasize enough what a critical role CSMAC plays to all of our activities. And it helps us maintain a strategic perspective and to see things through a different lens, which is very important, as we tackle our challenges, as well as our opportunities.

And today, we will talk about the actions that we have identified or at least a subset of the actions we have identified in response to the latest CSMAC recommendations.

And I will do that in a few minutes. And I am excited to be kicking off these new sets of questions.

And as Larry and Mark indicated, we are under a compressed time line. I would ask you to, as they mentioned, not only to smartly reach out to folks but also try to avoid scope creep because we really don't have time for that, and to focus, again, on practical and actionable recommendations so we can grab them and run as

appropriate.

Before we start talking about the new questions or the actions, I wanted to give you my normal update. And I apologize up-front for those that have been involved in the World Radio Conference because that is going to be one of the major elements, particularly for Audrey, Jennifer, and others.

To start off with, I want to make sure that you all realize we haven't forgotten about AWS-3. So, one of our priorities is successful transition and remain focused on that priority. Formal coordination started about a month ago and it is has been pretty quiet so far, though a lot of activity.

Two portals came online to support that formal coordination. The ITS portal, which covers 1695 to 1710 megahertz and the DoD portal covering 1755 to 1780 megahertz.

And I want to remind folks that we would not be where we are today without the support of this Advisory Committee. It was

critical to us being successful in the transition planning process and being able to set up the right mechanisms to be successful in coordination and transition as we move forward.

Now, as we stood up the formal coordination or started formal coordination with AWS-3, in parallel, we kicked off the World Radio Conference 2015 or WRC-15, which concluded last Friday. And I am grateful to see some of the bright and shining faces that must be tired at this point. It was a marathon and a very intense environment from almost the beginning of the conference.

So, I would like to echo Glenn's comments to say thank you to everyone on the U.S. delegation, as well as the other sector members that participated not as part of the U.S. delegation and, in particular, to reiterate my thanks to Ambassador Anstrom and Julie Zoller, in particular, for their steadfast leadership.

This was a very successful conference for the United States. And I will use some words

that Decker Anstrom used earlier this week in a press call that he coined it as a watershed conference that set the agenda for the technology innovations that will largely define the 21st Century and directly benefit lives around the world and I think that is very relevant in terms of what we got out of the conference, not just from the U.S. perspective, from a global perspective. And to remind folks, particularly folks that are not involved in the work, it is held approximately every three to four years; it revises the treaty-level radio regulations, which allocate and govern how we use radio frequencies globally, as well as how we use satellite and orbital slots. So, it is an extremely important item to us.

And though the conference just completed, it has been a four-year study cycle and studies and negotiation including this last Friday on the 27th of November. And in fact, some people are still in Geneva for the kickoff of WRC-19. So, the cycle starts immediately

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

following the conclusion of the conference.

Now, a top priority for the U.S., as well as many other administrations was the identification of additional spectrum for international mobile telecommunications or mobile broadband. And though you can count the numbers in various ways, I will use numbers that have been used previously that, taken as a whole, and you have to understand they are exceptions and different regions and different administrations agreeing to different allocations and footnotes. But as a whole, the conference identified some 250 megahertz of additional effectively globalized, harmonized -- globally harmonized spectrum to meet the near-term need for wireless and mobile broadband. And in some countries, you could count up to over 500 megahertz of spectrum that is now available.

More specifically, there was spectrum identified within the C-band, L-band, and flexible footnotes that will allow for use of the lower UHF band. So, thank the incentive auction

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for next year. Overall, a very successful outcome.

This conference also was interesting in that it was somewhat of an aviation conference and we reached successful conclusion in many of those items as well or all of them, essentially.

The conference approved the use of selected fixed satellite service links for command and control of long-range unmanned aircraft. So, beyond line of site command and control of the vehicles. And that was one of the top U.S. priorities.

This groundbreaking agreement
establishes a regulatory foundation to support an
exploding set of new applications and
capabilities that will literally add billions of
economic benefit, not only to the U.S. but to
other administrations and, in the process, it
will revolutionize aviation across multiple
applications, including disaster relief, cargo
transport, agriculture, meteorology, and a host
of others. And we see the small UAS all the time

as we coordinate within the U.S. but these are for larger platforms and, again, beyond line of sight.

There is still more work to be done, as ICAO, the International Civil Aviation
Organization, develops a related safety standards and practices but now we have a regulatory framework to move forward. It was really pivotal to this growing market.

In another aviation example, the work established a regulatory approach that will enhance global flight tracking mechanisms in the short-term. And it has also established an agenda item for WRC-19 that will comprehensively explore further technological and regulatory needs for flight tracking and management under what is called the Global Aeronautical Distress and Safety System or GADSS, G-A-D-S-S.

And when you think about what a feat this was, this agenda item for the near-term WRC-15 agreement came very early in the conference, the second week of the conference, yet, it was

only added to the conference as an agenda item a year ago. So, it was a very compressed time line. This was directed out of the Plenipot in 2014 as a result of the loss of the Malaysian Airlines Flight 370 and other incidents. So, it was really an amazing feat to get that done and very important to all of us from a safety standpoint.

This work also set a course to identify spectrum that will be needed for IMT, International Mobile Telecom above 6 gigahertz to support particularly 5th Generation or 5G capabilities.

And the conference agreed on a range of 11 bands from 24.25 gigahertz to 86 gigahertz to be studied between now and WRC-19. It is a lot of spectrum. I have all 11 bands, if anybody is interested. It will be a significant effort but think of the benefit that we can reap on the other end, as we look at these higher bands.

And you can see, internationally, we are seeing a shift in terms of this focus in the

higher bands and you could think of it as extending the beachfront from what we traditionally thought of as prime spectrum. And several of these bands are aligned with the FCC NPRM, as well the spectrum frontiers NPRM, which is focused between 28 and 61 gigahertz.

Now, I wanted to note that we understand that 5G is not a one-size-fits-all. It can't totally be done with the higher bands. You still need a mixture of low, mid, and high band spectrum to get the job done. However, it does allow us to take a significant step forward and leverage new spectrum opportunities that wouldn't be available otherwise. So, we are really excited about that as well.

There were many other critical actions supporting the commercial space industry, the space science community, high altitude platforms and many other emerging applications that will have direct positive impacts on people's lives on a day-to-day basis globally.

In summary, we believe that the WRC-15

set a solid foundation for the future and for us to enable federal operations worldwide, support global broadband adoption, enable groundbreaking technologies and spur innovation and economic growth within the U.S., as well as other administrations.

Another key accomplishment since our last meeting was the enactment of the Spectrum Pipeline Act, which Glenn spoke to earlier, and that was enacted as part of the Balanced Budget Act and it is a substantial step forward. We do think it is largely answering the President's call for action on spectrum and doing it through these smart reforms from a Spectrum Relocation Fund perspective and it allows significant additional flexibility to apply the SRF funds to advanced spectrum planning and research and development to help us make additional spectrum available for commercial services.

Included, as Glenn mentioned, is a requirement for identification and auction of 30 megahertz, followed by identification for another

100 all below 6 gigahertz. So, again, that will help with the lower band requirements.

But coupled together, and particularly the SRF reforms, we think this lays the foundation for sustainable process to allow us to have a spectrum pipeline in the future. So, we think there is great benefit from how this was instantiated.

We do believe it is a solid baseline for consideration of additional legislation and we feel it is important that we understand what the impact is of the Spectrum Pipeline Act and see what benefit it provides us over the next year or so in particular. But we are very optimistic that this will have a tremendous impact on our success, as we move forward.

We continue to see a lot of activity on Capitol Hill, with potential additional legislation, which I am sure many of you are following, and we look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with our partners in Congress, as well as the agencies, and other

organizations for exploring ideas to promote efficient and effective use of spectrum.

Last but not least I want to mention
the National Academy of Sciences and their recent
study published on NTIA's Institute for
Telecommunication Sciences and NIST
communications, technology, laboratory. If you
recall, those two organizations have teamed
together to form the Center for Advanced
Communications.

This study, in part, was to analyze the research activities of ITS and make recommendations regarding the extent to which ITS research is addressing future telecommunications and spectrum challenges. And though there were many findings and recommendations, and I would recommend, if you are interested, it is posted on the web. So, you can get to it and read it.

I wanted to summarize and highlight just a couple of key items. Now, this study recognized that ITS has extensive capabilities in public safety radio spectrum sensing propagation

almost more importantly, in my view, they noted that ITS was recognized by government agencies and the private sector for its objectivity, expertise, and physical resources; that it is, historically, a trusted expert, a trusted agent, so to speak, in certain areas of spectrum and communication engineering; and that it is an essential provider of these services to government agencies and, in some cases, to the private sector.

so, the bottom line out of this study is that DOC, Department of Commerce, and NTIA need to ensure that the critical functions that ITS provide remains and is strengthened over time. And that latter part is critically important. And that is especially in the area of spectrum sharing research analysis and test capabilities.

And NTIA is, obviously, committed to making that happen and a key component to our success if bringing onboard our relatively new

ITS director, who Glenn mentioned earlier before,
I think, Keith came into the room. And so if you
have any hard questions on ITS, please talk to
Keith.

Keith joined us a few months ago. I believe it was May time frame, end of May, and he hit the ground running. And we will fold the National Academy of Sciences results into his planning, as we he develops a revised or enhanced strategy for the organization as they move forward.

And when I talk about some of the NTIA actions that we have identified in response to the CSMAC recommendations, though I will not break it out separately whether it is ITS or the Office of Spectrum Management, many of the actions include a partnership with ITS or where ITS is actually a major driver for executing against those actions.

There are many other ongoing efforts that I could highlight, however, I have taken too much time as it is already. And we want to make

sure we get to, after we talk about the NTIA 1 2 response to recommendations, the initial response 3 to the new questions and make sure that, as Larry 4 said, we clarify and lock down any remaining 5 questions or any remaining issues with the questions before we leave today. 6 7 So, as you can see, we have, collectively, been very busy the last three 8 9 months and the momentum continues. We have much 10 work ahead of us and, sincerely, we appreciate 11 the collective wisdom of this group and that is 12 important for our success. 13 And with that, I would like to turn to 14 our responses to some of the CSMAC 15 recommendations from the last set. 16 CO-CHAIR ALDER: You want to ask for 17 questions first? 18 MS. ATKINS: Any questions or Sure. 19 comments? 20 MEMBER FELD: Yes. I may have missed 21 it in the readout from the WRC but I thought that

there was also a recommendation that was made

with regard to harmonization of the DTSC globally. I believe that that was in the I think 76 gigahertz band.

MS. ATKINS: Yes, that was for -- was that the short-range radar? Yes.

And I didn't cover everything that came out of the work. I just covered a couple of the particular high priority items.

MEMBER FELD: All right. I flagged that, though, in particular, given that it may have relevance with regard to the U-NII-4 5 gigahertz and potential supplementary spectrum that may be available to DOT as distinct from the U-NII-4 band.

MS. ATKINS: And that is a good point.

The band was 71 to 76. Was that it? Yes, so

this was a band that was identified for short
range radar particularly focused on automotive

applications and also for some wingtip

applications to make sure planes didn't run into

each other on the runway. So, and Audrey is

diligently trying to look it up.

But yes, that is correct, Harold, and thank you for pointing that out.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Janice.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I would just like to applaud the ITS focus here. As somebody that was in ITS in 1990 and got to observe, and this is the historic point that I think is very topical, got to observe that it was ITS that did the groundbreaking research on millimeter wave frequencies. And at the time, people were saying well, this is a rather obscure set of bands and yes, it is a world famous gentleman doing it but what is this all about. You see an example and Charla remembers this as well, it is an example of how forward-thinking many of the individuals at the lab have been but the fact that it has always been somewhat underfunded and underappreciated. I'm glad that topic has been raised.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: So, the next slide and then, again, Paige, is going to give us an update on the responses to the recommendations

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from the last set of recommendations that came in.

MS. ATKINS: And I hope everybody has a copy.

If you recall, at the last meeting, I gave you a preview, some preliminary feedback on how we were looking at the recommendations and thoughts on actions we would take.

And so if we go to slide 2, there is a summary. We assessed the recommendations and there were many to assess. May of the recommendations were actually related to on-going activities, things we have already started. In some cases, things that had been overcome by events or things that integrate into our normal operating practice. And by that, I mean using our Policy and Plans Steering Group for certain activities, our Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee, et cetera. So, there are many mechanisms that we will use to respond to these recommendations.

What I really want to do today is

really highlight a subset of those and I characterize them as new discrete actions that we have identified and have some target dates associated with them. So, you can see more concretely some of the actions we plan to take over the next couple of years, predominately.

And then once we compile the full set of mapping of ongoing activities that map to some of the recommendations, as well as these discrete actions, we will be publishing that on the CSMAC website as well. And that compilation is not quite done yet. So, you will see that over the next few weeks.

So, if we move to slide 3, I will start with the Spectrum Management via Databases Subcommittee. And we have identified a few actions associated with this subcommittee and I did not reiterate the actual recommendations like I did in the last meeting. So, hopefully, you will remember the essence of the recommendations. However, all of that, obviously, is available on the website.

One of the actions that we will be taking over the next two quarters is to look at the applicability of some web-based coordination mechanisms that we have today, in particular, around the 70, 80, 90 gigahertz band. That permits public coordination, while protecting sensitive information.

And in this case, we use I will call it a government master file or GMF-like So, it allows direct input and construct. feedback to somebody coming in with a request. So, we are going to look at that and see if we can reapply that technique for other bands, other In this case, we will probably start systems. with some fixed systems because you are somewhat restrained by that light construct, in terms of the data fields that you can use for the analysis that needs to be done. But we think it may be applicable to other bands. So, we are going to do that, again, with the conclusion in Q3 of fiscal year '16.

Now, in the next item, there was also

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

a lot of interesting in making sure we are staying up on research and development and the technology. And as most of you probably know, there is a Wireless Spectrum R&D Senior Steering Group, which NTIA co-chairs. And we will work with them to get input on a priority list of research topics focused on advanced sharing and techniques to include database approaches. So, we will work with them and we are targeting getting that list from them in Q2, as well as coupled with our ongoing engagement in that forum with the other agencies, et cetera.

And if anybody has a question as I go along, please feel free to interrupt.

Now, if we move on to, let me see -
I lost my slide number -- slide 4, in terms of a

Spectrum Access System, one of the things that we
talked about at the last meeting is the
subcommittee essentially assumed a federal

Spectrum Access System would be required. And
one of my comments was I'm not sure that is a
valid assumption. So, one of the thing we want

to do is assess the need for a federal Spectrum

Access System and we are going to focus,

initially, on the 3.5 gigahertz activities. And

at the end of the year, we are expecting to be

able to have a recommendation on whether we think

a federal SAS is needed or not, at least a

preliminary recommendation in that regard.

At the same time, we want to frame what we would need to do to establish a federal SAS. So, take a look at that construct in parallel. So, if we determined we do think we need it, we are a little bit ahead of the game.

And then after that, if we determine a federal SAS would be required, we would complete a study in terms of implementation and an associated roadmap on how to get there. And you see the time lines associated with those two actions. So, they are sequential in nature.

And then there was a lot of discussion around access to classified information, how information, spectrum information is classified.

And there has been an action to the White House

Spectrum Policy Team to continue to look at that and we will work with them to look at assessing and implementing the appropriate policies in that regard.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: I have a question.

MS. ATKINS: Sure.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Yes, as a co-chair of that committee, I think these are great responses, particularly the last one where we think the NTIA is really in a unique position to be kind of an advocate for a balanced approach on some of those issues of proprietary data and classified information. So, I think that is great that they are taking an active role there.

Just commenting on the need for the federal SAS, I think a subtle point was the committee, having sat on it, was trying to say you might be able to get more with a federal SAS. There is more you can do. It wasn't like a hard line required or not required. So, I think the committee was very clear that even without a federal SAS we thought there was a lot that could

be done but maybe even more could be done. So, it wasn't requirement/not requirement. It was more of a gradual -- a graduation.

MS. ATKINS: Okay, thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Then let's move to slide 5. And we are going to shift to bi-directional sharing.

And obviously some of this work is being carried into the next set of questions, as well, but we did want to highlight a couple of specific actions that we will be taking over the next few months.

And one is to take a look at the NTIA Manual and specifically a couple of chapters in the NTIA Manual to clarify really the scope of our authorities, in terms of allowing federal users secondary access or even co-primary access to non-federal spectrum. Because I am not sure we are taking full advantage of what we can do today. And that will be a resulting paper that will be, in some sense, educational to the federal agencies, as well, so they understand the

scope of what they can do today. And I think that will help all of us moving forward.

And then we will start looking at potential regulatory changes. And if we needed to, we would file a rulemaking petition with the FCC to enable co-equal use rights for federal users sharing non-federal spectrum. But again, we expect this next set of question to help us continue the dialogue. And particularly, if you remember, the first phase was really focused on short-term intermittent kinds of requirements, somewhat isolated requirements. And then this next phase, we will be looking at, I will call them more pervasive requirements for sharing, federal users sharing non-federal spectrum.

Any questions on the bi-directional sharing?

Okay, now if we move to slide 6, this was the Government and Industry Collaboration
Subcommittee. And again, some of elements of that will be ongoing as well.

And there are two items that I wanted

to highlight. One is there was a listing of potential collaboration topics that we were recommended for areas of focus. And what we want to do is leverage our Policy and Plans Steering Group Spectrum Working Group, specifically, which is an ongoing forum, if you aren't familiar with it, and incudes the agencies, FCC, and White House personnel to identify, assess, and prioritize topics for increased collaboration. And this will be coupled with the next item, which I will describe in a moment.

So, we will be using an ongoing established forum, which we use today for collaboration, coordination, and prioritization across multiple elements to include how we look at bands for potential repurposing to help us shape how we move forward and our areas of focus for government and industry collaboration more broadly.

And then the second element, one of the questions we asked was whether our framework that we envisioned to enhance this collaboration

made sense. And the feedback that we got from the subcommittee was the framework seemed to make sense.

So, what we are doing, and we have already started this process, we are taking that framework and creating a much more detailed implementation plan. And if you recall, the framework included a multi-tiered process that allowed us more public-facing engagement and then more, I will say controlled -- that is not quite the right word but different levels of engagement to allow us to look at different issues and allow us to stay out of trouble from a FACA standpoint. And that framework is posted on the web, if you are interested in going back and looking at it. But we will be or have already started fleshing that out to put meat on the bone. So then we can start implementation by the third quarter of this fiscal year.

And we still are engaging pretty robustly with industry now but this will help put some framework and structure around it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Any questions on these two recommendations?

Okay, so if we can go to the next slide, slide 7, measurement and quantification.

There were several different recommendations and we identified -- well and jut to clarify, part of our assessment here was what we could do with our resources and where we thought the priorities were. So, you are seeing what we have identified as priorities that we think we can accomplish within our current resources.

so, from a measurement and quantification standpoint, there was, I'll call it, a process that was proposed in terms of a tiered way to do measurement, to do it smartly. And what we want to do is exercise the first two tiers and that was the recommendation was around a measurement applicability analysis and we want to do that for one of our quantification assessment bands, 1300 to 1390 megahertz, and perform that this year. And then couple that, and this is one of the tasks that we will be

working very closely with ITS and they will be taking a major role in this effort, to then go to the next level and do some occupancy measurements, based on the applicability analysis. And there are some measurements that exist today in this band. So, we will try to couple that into the assessment as well and, again, exercise those first two tiers. And we should be able to get through that toward the end of fiscal year 17 in total.

Now, the other element that we want to address now is there was an assessment on what was required to try to project or estimate occupancy without additional test information.

And I think I mentioned at the last meeting that NTIA is currently performing or working with the agencies to perform a quantitative assessment and that was based out of the last President's memo and incorporated into I think it was the fifth in-progress report that we published, where we had the quantification assessment plan.

And what we want to do is we are on

the tail end of that effort and we will be 1 2 documenting what we did and that is, again, projecting occupancy based on data, not 3 measurements, to include what our data collection 4 5 and verification requirements were, as well as our methodology in how we analytically quantified 6 7 what that usage looked like. And that quantification includes the frequency, geography, 8 9 and time and actually overlaid on population 10 information. 11 MEMBER CALABRESE: What is the federal 12 usage in that particular band? 13 MS. ATKINS: For this band -- well, 14 this is kind of band agnostic. So, there were 15 five bands included. The last item is not 1300 16 to 1390 specific. 17 MEMBER CALABRESE: Oh, was it not 1300 18 to 1300. 19 MS. ATKINS: Oh, okay, 1300 to 1390, 20 a couple segments. They are in the bottom half,

roughly, 1300 to 1350. There is a lot of long

range radar, air surveillance radars in there.

21

There is other tactical radar systems, 1 2 predominately. In the upper portion of the band, there is a combination of a little bit of radar, 3 as well as tactical radio relay. 4 There is 5 nuclear detection elements in it and other major Airborne, I think. 6 elements. MEMBER TRAMONT: Okay, thanks. 7 So, the third bullet is not 1300 to 1390-specific. 8 9 MS. ATKINS: Correct. 10 MEMBER TRAMONT: Okay. So, just as a general matter, we are going to figure out how to 11 12 do those quantify on those three metrics. 13 that correct? 14 Yes, and so we are, MS. ATKINS: 15 again, wrapping up an effort and we want to 16 document how we did it, so everybody can 17 understand our methodology. 18 MEMBER TRAMONT: I see. 19 MS. ATKINS: And we did it for 20 actually five different bands, including 1300 to 21 1390. And again, you can find the plan in our, I

think it was the fourth in-progress report for

the 500 megahertz of the ten-year plan, which is 1 2 It describes the initial plan construct posted. and then this will be documenting, so to speak, 3 4 how we actually did it and then eventually, we 5 will be documenting some of the actual results of the quantification assessment. 6 These are intended to be public 7 In terms of the actual 8 documents. 9 quantification, we just need to do an assessment 10 to make sure we know what we can publish and what 11 we can't. But we are trying to be as transparent 12 as possible, across the board. 13 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Well, probably a 14 predictable comment from me and I would pose it 15 to Dennis if he were here. Is the TAC pursuing a 16 similar analysis of commercial bands or more 17 sophisticated analytics? 18 MS. ATKINS: From a quantification 19 standpoint? 20 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Yes. 21 MS. ATKINS: Matthew, did you hear the 22 question?

PARTICIPANT: If we are presenting the same commercial band?

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: No, not necessarily the same. I mean this is you know, obviously, much of it -- a lot of debate. Some of it, I would say a bit overheated, as to do with measuring government use and perhaps, at times, assumptions about that use, which this will help verify or not. I am wondering if FCC has been similarly engaged or considering similarly engaging in such analytics that might be made public.

PARTICIPANT: That may be for a task force to answer, maybe that or the TAC. I don't know. So, I would just have them address that.

MEMBER REED: You mentioned that you wanted to try to find usage without measurements.

Could you elaborate? Or maybe I misunderstood you.

MS. ATKINS: One of the questions that was posed to this group was how might you quantify occupancy or usage, I can't remember the

exact words, without additional measurement 1 2 information. Part of what we are trying to or we were trying to also determine is now only how you 3 4 might measure but how you could do it effectively and efficiently and is it useful to us. 5 So, the other portion of that question 6 7 was then, is there a methodology where if you didn't have the measurement data, if it came out 8 9 too expensive, too resource-intensive, is there 10 another way to do it with data versus 11 measurements. 12 MEMBER REED: I'm somewhat 13 pessimistic. 14 MS. ATKINS: Well, that is why we want 15 to document what we did. 16 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Jeff, I would read 17 the report because there was some pretty 18 interesting thoughts on how to do that. 19 MEMBER REED: Okay. 20 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: It is how you 21 quantify occupancy. And the group, the Erstwhile 22 Group did some pretty good work at least on

teasing that out a little bit. So, to the extent you are still dubious, read it and then come back with thoughts. That is your homework.

MS. ATKINS: And I would say, also, that it is not necessarily purely one or the other. We are trying to understand what we should be doing and how we can do it effectively. So, it might be analytically trying to project occupancy that helps us drive the tears of how we measure. So, don't think of it as purely one or the other.

MEMBER MCHENRY: While we are at it, can you explain what the measurement applicability analysis is? What is that?

MS. ATKINS: So, I will describe it best I can because that was the terminology from the recommendation. So, I would encourage anybody from the subcommittee to add.

So, how I would interpret it, and please correct me for the folks that generated the terminology, is to understand how well you could -- how effective measurements could be

within a given band, such as receive only or GPS, et cetera.

MEMBER MCHENRY: If it was a satellite receive band and you walk around with an Omni antenna, you could measure all day. You wouldn't learn much. So, you have got to ask what you learn as you make a measurement.

MS. ATKINS: So, it is really looking at what is in the band, how are they dispersed.

Can you really measure it and measure it to a higher degree of confidence?

Any other questions? Oh, there is

Dennis. We will go back to Dennis's question -
yes, question for Dennis.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Just answer.

MEMBER ROBERSON: The answer is 37.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: There is a lot of good work done on measurement and quantification and NTIA is committing to document following quantitative assessment methodologies. And not surprisingly, my question to the TAC is there is a lot of rhetoric about federal spectrum. Is it

insufficiently used or not? And this should, at least, give some objectivity to the discussion.

Is there similar work being done at the TAC, as it observes commercial spectrum utilization?

MEMBER ROBERSON: Yes.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: And how is that -
I mean are there recommendations being made?

CO-CHAIR ALDER: I think we are not being fair to Dennis because I think Paige's description of what her response is. Maybe it is something we can let Dennis digest.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER ROBERSON: No, this is really the source of spectrum and receiver working group within the TAC. So, it is very much the focus on spectrum efficiency and the metric, really the focus there is on the commercial spectrum, more so than federal use of the spectrum, defining means of improving it. And there have been a whole set of activities that are under that banner going from interference and how do you

dense pack more effectively, how do you share 1 2 more effectively and the like. 3 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: So, are you 4 looking at spectrum usage measurements, current 5 spectrum usage, measurements of current spectrum 6 usage? 7 MEMBER ROBERSON: There have been, in 8 the past, and there are now. 9 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Okay and those are 10 broad-based or band-specific? 11 MEMBER ROBERSON: They have tended to 12 be focused on band-specific. Yes, different 13 bands at different times. 14 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Okay. 15 MEMBER ROBERSON: And actually that is 16 what I did this morning. We were working on the 17 plans next year. So, this is pronouncing but we 18 will likely be doing some things very focused in 19 that are for the next year as well. 20 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: No, I think that 21 is very useful because, frankly, you know the 22 difference between the deliberations at the CSMAC

and the TAC and the rhetoric that is communicated to Capitol Hill is quite different. And there are probably reasons for that. We can all speculate. But it would certainly behoove all of us to take the rhetoric down and the objectivity up.

MS. ATKINS: And I think the point being we just need to have a balanced approach and balanced visibility so as we try to better quantify how the federal government uses spectrum to have corresponding on the non-federal side so we can see the big picture and optimize the best we can across the board.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Because I think that is in everybody's best interest.

MEMBER ROBERSON: Yes, but this is a very expansive subject so, I'll try to balance how much here to share but the use of the spectrum is fit for purpose. There are different purposes, different importance levels assigned. So, you can have a very efficient use of the spectrum by the radios. They are doing very

useless things. Or you can have very inefficient use of the spectrum that do extremely important absolutely critical things for our survival. And balancing those things is really a critical component that is often not built into the conversation.

MS. ATKINS: That's an excellent point.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Can I do one more?

Sorry. Will the spectrum quantitative assessment include an assessment of throughput or is it limited to frequency used, geography, and time?

I'm not sure it should.

MS. ATKINS: Yes, it has no indication of throughput because there are different kinds of systems, for instance, in the 1300 band, air surveillance radar systems. So, it is really the perspective of frequency and bandwidth, geography and time.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Will it be transparent which systems -- well, we don't know yet because we don't know what we can disclose.

But as a general matter, it will be transparent to the public what type of systems are being measured along these metrics. Is that fair to say?

MS. ATKINS: So, I would say I believe so. You just won't have the details of the systems themselves.

MEMBER TRAMONT: I understand.

MS. ATKINS: And I would offer, if you haven't seen it yet, and I think we have discussed it here, we do have the spectrum compendium on our website as well and that gives for below 5 gigahertz and we are starting to extend it. It gives a pretty good snapshot of what systems are in the various bands, high level summaries, numbers of assignments, the agencies that own the assignments. And then in many cases, I will say coverage plots not in the same sense of the quantitative assessment. But there is a lot of good information there that may be helpful as well.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: It's Mark Gibson.

Now, you may have addressed this. So, I will 1 2 just say if you did, okay. Are you going to try to involve 3 4 industry in any of these measurements or at least 5 discussions on your metrology or in what you call measurement applicability analysis? 6 Because it seems that to the extent 7 that there is nothing in there that is FOUR 8 9 classified that will require that type of 10 protection, it would be helpful to have industry 11 involvement sort of a priori so as it works through the process, there is more facility for 12 13 buy-in as it comes through. 14 And I am thinking about that in the 15 terms of the former discussion we had about 16 industry and government collaboration. 17 So, to the extent you can include industry in that, it might be helpful to get 18 19 through. 20 Yes, that is a good MS. ATKINS: 21 recommendation. 22 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Yes, I just wanted to 1 2 make the point that I know the working group did a lot of interesting analysis of what was 3 4 spectrum occupancy and did some clever ideas 5 about what is occupancy, how much you are using the spectrum versus how much you are preventing 6 7 someone else from using the spectrum. So, I am just hopeful you will incorporate some of those 8 9 ideas.

MS. ATKINS: Yes, so this particular effort is on the tail end because we actually started it before the subcommittee ended. But in this case, the contours or the occupancy for the transmitters, federal government transmitters is as it relates to a notional commercial receiver in the environment. So, it is somewhat of a hybrid approach. And that, again, is something that we will be explaining and documenting, if that made sense.

Any other questions on this one?

Okay, let's move to enforcement,

Dale's favorite topic. And so I want to talk

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about the bullet I have here and then I will add a verbal comment.

about in the report that came out of the subcommittee, it is a very complex issue and multi-layered issue and extremely important. And as Janice said, I think at the last meeting, it is really fundamental to us being able to do what we need to do in the future and we agree with that.

So, what we would like to do over the next few months is to study, and this is directly from the recommendation, potential mechanisms for effective enforcement. I think the recommendation actually is the verbiage radio policing or something like that. I would rather use enforcement in this case.

(Laughter.)

MS. ATKINS: But we want to base it on a case study. And the case study is the Terminal Doppler Weather Radar interference that we have been experiencing, have been studying, have been

working with ITS on as well.

And it really covers -- I created a subset of the mechanisms here from the recommendation but it really covers all the mechanisms that were identified. And you can read the mechanisms I have down here. And we think that would be a solid foundation that allows us to really look at a real case that has been occurring for some time and help us address what the issues were, as well as the mitigation for those issues. And that will help us start framing this in a more holistic way.

And in this case, this is unlicensed devices, so it could be considered more of a worst case and how you identify, how do you enforce in that situation.

Now, the second item I wanted to mention, as many of you probably know, we have biannual meeting between the FCC chairman and the Assistant Secretary. And our last biannual meeting, I believe, was in -- it was a few weeks ago, a couple of months ago, October time frame.

And there were many key issues addressed to include spectrum sharing as one. But another area that we did have a discussion around was enforcement. And what we are doing is working together to peel that back, to ensure enforcement of the rules that are put in place and how we do that to facilitate sharing, specifically, between federal and non-federal users. And we have a shared commitment to promptly correct any interference that occurs and we have to ensure we would have that framework in place to do that.

We have not gone to the extent of saying we need an MOU or other mechanisms. And those were in some of the recommendations back from the enforcement subcommittee. But I wanted folks to know that it is an area of priority for ours, obviously for FCC and we are working together on how we move forward together in this capacity.

Any other questions?

MEMBER HATFIELD: Because we are looking in the TAC at the same sort of issues

that Pierre is doing. Anyway, people need to talk to each other because there is, obviously, some overlap and I use that in a good sense. I think the work is very, from my standpoint, is pretty complementary, actually.

MEMBER ROBERSON: No, it is. This is Dennis. There is a lot of complementary work which is really terrific. I think that is one of the nice things that Dale and I sitting on both bodies and now we have the liaisons that Matt has seen, wherever you are Matt, representing the FCC at this body and representing the NTIA at FCC TAC. But I think that there is a considerable complementarity.

So, I think we need to continue to focus on that but it is getting better and better in terms of having things that mesh well together -- staying away from that word. Mesh is a measuring or something.

MS. ATKINS: So, we will make sure that we ensure we know what is being done in the TAC, as well, and as we move forward on this more

detailed study, I think that will be very helpful.

MEMBER ROBERSON: And this is where I wasn't sure why I was being led on this because Dale, in fact, is the one who is authoring the report that is going to be coming out.

MS. ATKINS: Harold?

MEMBER FELD: I want to flag some concerns that I have with regard to using the TDWR interference issues as a case study. reaction of the FCC with regard to operation within the U-NIII band in terms of the enhanced limitations on use of U-NIII that were adopted as part of what was more broadly the U-NI reform order, which I believe went into effect a couple of months ago. The subsequent follow-up with what I think I can politely characterize as a rather over-aggressive response embedded within the E-labeling with regard to what certification of operation, the 5 gigahertz band that open source equipment, that open source middleware, the implication in the language that we used that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

seemed to suggest that open source middleware represented a particular threat of interference and created a suspicion that somehow the use of open source could facilitate interference which caused considerable backlash in the technical community.

The difficulty in ascertaining details for a number of us, particularly those folks who were concerned about the potential for chip lock down and getting more details from either the FCC or from the FAA with regard to the specifics of the incidents that raised concern, frankly, make me worry that this is not an ideal case to study or if we are studying this as a case study, we need to be cognizant of not simply how things worked out from the FAA's perspective but the implications within the private sector and particularly, I think, for the open source community which, being somewhat more distributed, often is not able to lobby as effectively as manufacturers or some of the other interests that are affected.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ATKINS: Thank you, Harold. We will take that into consideration.

MEMBER CROSBY: This is Mark Crosby.

I'm looking at the case study. It is great to do
a case study and I think all of the elements are
there, perhaps, except one. Is there going to be
during the case study an identification of any of
the penalties that might be imposed in those
provoking the interference or the harmful
interference?

I mean it is great to identify it and they are doing it and they shouldn't be doing it but it would be good to also perhaps, during the discussion, what can you do to identify and make sure that they don't do it again.

MS. ATKINS: Yes, I would say we will work with the FCC to determine what makes sense in that regard. And we will take that also into consideration.

MEMBER DONOVAN: This is David

Donovan. Yes, I think that this is, obviously, a

very complex issue and I know you have had

1	discussions with the Chairman regarding
2	coordination between the NTIA and the FCC. Do
3	you view that, particularly in the context of
4	this case study, that that will lead towards a
5	formalization of rules and processes that may
6	come out of this, whether it is an enforcement in
7	the context of unlicensed or enforcement in the
8	context of federal and non-federal sharing? And
9	I raise that only because at the end of the day,
10	sharing, to a large extent, is going to be based
11	on uncertainty from both sides. And do you
12	contemplate on that discussion, at least with
13	respect to enforcement, sort of a path or a guide
14	to how commercial entities and federal entities
15	know what their remedies would be? And to Mark's
16	point, I see the technical aspects of how you
17	define interference and things of that nature,
18	looking at the case study, which are absolutely
19	critical. I mean they are foundational
20	discussions. But what I am trying to get a feel
21	for is where is sort of the next step, if there
22	is one, between looking at sort of the

fundamental jurisdictional issues that exist in enforcement between NTIA and the FCC and whether or not -- how you are approaching that.

MS. ATKINS: So, I think it is a combination of things. So, as you said, this kind of study is foundational, in terms of what we are trying to do. I see our continued discussion in collaboration with the FCC will lead us somewhere, in terms of identifying those other kinds of policy and implementation issues. What it will eventually look like, I won't speculate.

But going back to your earlier comment, it really is largely about I will call it certainty, on both sides, that things will happen in a predictable and consistent way. So, the intent is there. Again, how we will move forward, we are still defining.

MEMBER DONOVAN: If I could just follow-up. Will the discussion of how we move forward be done in the context of this case study or is that sort of Chapter 2 after we look at

these specific questions?

MS. ATKINS: I will say somewhat in parallel.

MEMBER DONOVAN: Okay.

MS. ATKINS: Not necessarily specific to the case study but in the FCC NTIA discussions and collaboration that will occur in parallel to the case study.

MEMBER DONOVAN: Okay, fair enough.
Thank you.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Real quickly, one last question on this topic, then we will move on.

MEMBER FELD: With regard to the definition of harmful interference, and this goes to the question of coordination with the FCC on this, the FCC has, of course, defined harmful interference in its own regulations with regard to the use of commercial services. Granted, it is a somewhat flexible definition, which is one of the things that I know people have had some concerns about but, nevertheless, it is the one

that we employ at the FCC, is the objective here to define a separate definition of harmful interference for federal systems or to examine how the FCC's definition of harmful interference fits within the context of interference with federal systems?

MS. ATKINS: Well, I will answer to the best of my ability. So, I believe it is focused, initially, on how we came to a definition of harmful interference as it relates to the federal systems in this case from the unlicensed devices. But I would want to defer the answer until -- I am speaking somewhat out of ignorance related to what is explicitly being targeted for this case study.

But it is all part of the fundamental mechanisms is understanding what that looks like, whether it be to federal or to non-federal systems as part of that framework for certainty and consistency. But we will get you more information as we drill it back.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Okay, Janice, I am

going to hold the question. I am going to let

Paige finish her briefing in the interest of time

and then we will cover questions at the end.

MS. ATKINS: I honestly didn't think
I was going to need the whole time.

Okay, so spectrum sharing cost recovery. This will be quick. A lot of great information came out of the Spectrum Sharing Cost Recovery team. As you know, there is a lot of discussion on the Hill and among various organizations that are aligned with many of the recommendations out of this subcommittee. And there is so much discussion going on right now, we wanted to defer actually responding with specific actions, at this time, for various reasons. So, we will get back to you on this one in more detail, when the time is right. But great work out of this team.

And then the one that you won't see here is transitional sharing. As you recall, many of those recommendations became overcome by events or were already implemented. So, I did

not have any new actions related to that subcommittee.

So, to wrap up, we will compile, again, all of these recommendations to include some of the ongoing work that is already being done to address the recommendations and create some logical format for that and post it on the website.

And then I wanted to add the caveat that these could change, depending on resource issues or other priorities that pop up, as we move forward. But right now, this is our plan of attack for the discrete actions that we have identified again, in response to the CSMAC approved recommendations for this last cycle.

So, I appreciate your feedback, your questions. If you think of additional questions or inputs that you feel would be helpful to us, please send those our way.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: We are running a little overtime, not majorly overtime, so, if there is one or two questions on the brief. If

not, we will -- Janice? Dale has one.

MEMBER HATFIELD: Just real quickly,

I would comment -- this is Dale Hatfield. I

would quickly comment of course the work on the

Harms Claim Threshold issue that is being done in

the TAC and so forth, obviously, has some

implications here. Because if we don't come up

with that good definition of harmful

interference, you know it is for naught. We have

got to do a better job of quantifying it and I

think that the work that Pierre has been trying

to do.

So, just a comment that I think that fits in with what you are talking about as well.

MS. ATKINS: And I will just add quickly we have talked about increasing the collaboration between the CSMAC and the TAC. And I think on some of these areas, we need to peel that back a little bit more and see how we can more robustly collaborate on certain key topics.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: Okay, thank you,
Paige for both the spectrum overview and the

responses to the recommendations. 1 2 I know for me, it is great to see the recommendations being taken into consideration 3 4 and actual actionable outputs. So, I think that 5 is very fulfilling to everyone who has given their time in putting together the 6 7 recommendations. So, now, I am going to turn the 8 9 meeting over to Mark, who is going to walk us 10 through the new committee work. CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Which I'm sure will 11 12 be a lot more interesting. Right? Just kidding. 13 Let's get right into it. I think we 14 are going to right down the line with what is on 15 the agenda. And I think you are up first, 16 Charla. You were the two co-chairs, Charla and 17 Audrey, right? 18 MEMBER RATH: Yes. 19 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Awesome. 20 MEMBER ALLISON: The one in absentia. 21 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: You're here now. 22 Right?

MEMBER RATH: Right, she is here now and she is going to be up next, I promise you.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay.

MEMBER RATH: Yes, thank you. We just, you should have received already and it was also actually on the sideboard, just a quick rundown of our subcommittee on Federal Access to Non-Federal Bands. And as Paige said earlier, it is really about more pervasive access than the last CSMACs. And actually, I shouldn't just say last CSMAC. You guys were working on that issue for two CSMACs, I think. It is less temporary, more pervasive.

I'm not going to read the question.

The question itself is fairly straightforward.

We actually had some questions about it but felt

like that they would be answered by NTIA

providing use cases, which it has. I have also

got a page with just a list of the members. It

is not necessary to talk through that, unless I

missed somebody, which I don't think I did.

We have had two meetings so far. The

first meeting we held was really just purely organizational because we didn't yet have copies of the use cases. And again, to Paige's earlier statement, the reason that we actually talked about having use cases and you, Paige, you were on top of that right away, was to avoid scope creep. You know the idea being that we would have a clear idea that the agencies would get together and determine really where it is that they thought that they needed that kind of pervasive access.

so, what we did, we did most of the work in the second meeting, although, we did decide, even before we had the use cases in front of us, because we knew from what Rich Orsulak had told us, we had a good idea of where they would be, we decided early on that we could actually split them into two separate areas. One, dealing primarily with the public safety and the second one, which turned out then to be just a single use case from DoD because they were very different. The ones in public safety, once we

actually saw them, we looked at them and the ones that are in public safety are very similar and it was our judgment that they could be dealt with together, which also goes to I think some of the things that our co-chairs and our NTIA fellows have been saying, which is we want to get some recommendation by May. So, it was actually good because there were six use cases. It was good that we were able to split them.

So, what we have is Mark Crosby has -can I say you volunteered Mark? Mark volunteered
to sort of headline the use cases on the public
safety side for obvious reasons. And John
Hunter, who works with Steve Sharkey, is going to
be leading up the DoD use case. But we also
decided, as a group, that what that meant more
than anything is the coordination back with NTIA
on setting up meetings. We, as a group, decided
that we really all needed to be involved in the
discussions as much as possible.

The next steps, we have requested some minor points of clarification, mostly just about

how you want us to go about setting up these meetings. We feel it is critical to sit down with the agencies that put together the use cases and actually get more information from them and help to understand.

Our next steps are in fact for the agencies identify some key stakeholders. On the DoD side, I am mentioning that first because several carriers who actually hold AWS-3 licenses are actually members of the subcommittee. So, we have a fair number of the stakeholders there. We have actually decided, though, that we need to reach out and make sure that we are covering some of the smaller carriers.

So, the more difficult, and it is not really more difficult, it is just more complicated side is public safety because I think there are more entities that would be engaged there. And again, keeping in mind that we don't want to spend a lot of time doing this but, at the same time, we really feel the importance of getting some feedback from the commercial side or

the public, in this case, the public safety side.

The non-federal side is probably the best way to
say it.

We are meeting again in December and that meeting is primarily to go in detail through the use cases and really come up with questions that we want to ask the agencies because we felt it was very important for us to be able to do that in advance to give them advance notice of what we wanted to talk to in order to make the meetings productive.

Given that, the meetings are going to be arranged in the January/February time frame. Hopefully, January, but it could bleed into February. And at this point, in some ways, we haven't gotten to the hardest part. All we are doing is sort of setting out a schedule. But I think if we continue to just keep at it, we will definitely be able to have a preliminary rundown in March and then I'm hopeful that we will be able to then have our preliminary report and recommendations at the May meeting.

1	So, I turn it over first to Audrey to
2	see if she has anything to say and then,
3	obviously, any of the other subcommittee members
4	who might have some comments.
5	And Mark, you were on both calls. So,
6	I don't know whether you have anything to say.
7	But that is it.
8	MEMBER ALLISON: I have nothing to
9	add. Way to go Charla. Thank you.
LO	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Dale are you is
L1	that left over from before, you tent?
L2	MEMBER HATFIELD: Oh, I'm sorry.
L3	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: I figured it was.
L4	MEMBER HATFIELD: Although, I was kind
L5	of curious.
L6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
L7	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: It is not a
L8	precedent to keep your tent up.
L9	MEMBER HATFIELD: Are the use cases
20	public knowledge, at this point, at least, in
21	sort of summary form?
22	MEMBER RATH: I defer to NTIA on when

that would happen but they are not yet. And in fact, one of the key issues we raised is if we are actually going to go to outside stakeholders, we have to have some way of at least telling them what the use case is.

MS. ATKINS: Right. And I think the current version is something that we don't want publicly disseminated but we will fix that and make sure that you have a version that can be made public.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Michael.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Yes, Michael
Calabrese. Just a question about the NTIA
question. And it's probably because I have
missed -- I'm actually on the subcommittee but
missed a meeting due to travel.

It seems implicit but is it intended that we are looking at this both in terms of short-term access and longer term access?

MEMBER RATH: I mean I think we had talked about this really is more pervasive access since the last committee actually really dealt

more with the shorter term issues. 1 2 So, this is anywhere from, I think, longer than six months or more to permanent 3 4 arrangements. MEMBER CALABRESE: Okay, so the short-5 term is resolved. 6 (Laughter.) 7 (Simultaneous speaking.) 8 9 MEMBER RATH: I am not answering that 10 question. Janice? Jennifer? 11 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Michael, I am very 12 happy Charla and Audrey have taken this over and 13 Jennifer, I'm sure, would agree. 14 MS. ATKINS: And so I will just add 15 the actions that we are taking now against the 16 original recommendations are focused more on the 17 short-term requirements that are characterizing 18 the scope of our authorities today, as an example 19 of that action that I discussed. That really is 20 focused on the short-term intermittent 21 requirements that the first cycle addressed. 22 Once the more pervasive requirements

are addressed, we will combine or aggregate the 1 2 information to have a better picture of how we do this kind of sharing across the short, medium, 3 4 and long-term requirements. 5 MEMBER CALABRESE: That is for the potential, like a potential FCC action would come 6 at that point. 7 8 MS. ATKINS: Potentially. 9 MEMBER CALABRESE: Okay, thanks. 10 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Any other questions? 11 MS. ATKINS: I have one question. 12 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Oh, go ahead. 13 MS. ATKINS: So, I know you broke it 14 up into public sector and DoD. And just to 15 clarify for everyone's benefit, public sector 16 here we are talking about federal --17 MEMBER RATH: No, I meant -- I Yes. 18 said public safety. 19 MS. ATKINS: Sorry. No, I meant 20 public safety. But we are talking about federal 21 public safety requirements, which could include 22 law enforcement or other things?

1 MEMBER RATH: Yes. 2 MS. ATKINS: I seem to recall the case studies not all fitting within those two buckets. 3 4 So, we might have an additional discussion, just 5 to make sure everything is covered. I think that is fair. MEMBER RATH: 6 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: 7 Any the questions? I have a question. And that is -- say again? 8 9 No, he's next. 10 Are you comfortable enough, Charla, 11 that you have enough guidance now from NTIA with 12 the last bullet here about arranging meetings 13 with other agencies? I believe there was some 14 question about how to go about doing that. 15 MEMBER RATH: I don't think we have 16 that guidance yet and I am expecting that at our 17 next meeting Rich will be able to talk about 18 that. CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, good. 19 20 The question is why. 21 MEMBER RATH: We actually didn't have

a lot of discussion, except saying you know

trying to understand what share meant in particular circumstances. But because we were dealing with use cases, we could define it that way.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, thanks.
Tom.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Yes, I am representing the Agency to Industry Collaboration Subcommittee. I will get everybody back on schedule because we will have a very short brief, which is why we don't even have a brief.

We had an initial kickoff call. A number of the parties were tied up with work, so we had some participation but I will suffice it to say we had a very focused question, which is really around how can we change traditional regulatory approaches to get better agency to industry collaboration.

Building on our last subcommittee of government industry collaboration, this is more focused. I think our group is going to focus on things from the commercial side of

recommendations to help with that approach. 1 2 our discussion also led to we also should be asking the feds at the same time, sort of get 3 4 some input at least from some of the key federal 5 folks. And since collaboration was in our actual subcommittee name, we actually reached out to the 6 7 bidirectional guys, too, and said you guys are going to be talking to some feds and we are, too. 8 9 So, why don't we do this together to some extent, 10 especially since bidirectional and what we are 11 doing is very much overlapping at some level. 12 So, we have at least initiated outreach to I 13 think three different federal agencies at this 14 point trying to set up either December or January 15 discussions, just to get some input from them. 16 And then from that point, we think we can move 17 forward fairly quickly to put all that 18 information together for at least either an early 19 readout in March and a more finalized readout in 20 And I think that is where we are at at this May. 21 point.

With the schedules being sort of

challenging, I don't see us having another call in December until we sort of have these follow-on meetings. I think the follow-on meetings will be sort of our next meetings.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, thanks,
Tom. That was brief. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: I have a question, though.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Question, Larry.

CO-CHAIR ALDER: So, I know from the last group, this subcommittee, one of the leftover work was around collaboration in small working groups. Is that something that is going to be taken on here or no?

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: It is certainly something we discussed as a group and I think we are trying to be focused. I think what we found last time was getting down that sort of wormhole, didn't really -- wasn't really productive. We tried really hard for several months and it just meandered. So, I think we were going to try and be more focused, according to the question, to

sort of just look at particular things that we 1 2 can actually recommend that will help the process in general. 3 4 MS. ATKINS: So, one of our actions is 5 to, as I characterized, put meat on the bone in terms of that collaboration framework. And as we 6 7 said, that was a multi-layered approach to include smaller groups. And so I think you will 8 9 see some fleshing out of that concept within our 10 implementation plan that we are building as well. 11 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Who is liaison? 12 That's Ed -- no. It's Dave, okay. Were there 13 any questions of NTIA that came out of there? 14 Because I thought I had an action I would be 15 happy to execute right now that NTIA is here. MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: 16 You tried to 17 create a question and we wouldn't let you. 18 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: You wouldn't let me, 19 okay, good. 20 MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: We shouted you 21 down and so there is no question from us back. 22 And our question is locked down at this point as

well.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay. I'm not into mission creep any more than anybody else is.

Okay, going, going. No more questions. Okay, thanks, Tom.

The next one is Measurements and Sensing. Dennis, I think that is you.

MEMBER ROBERSON: It is me. And, unfortunately, we are the group that was referenced as not having met. So, confession is good for the soul. Not very good for your humility but good for the soul. Or maybe it is good for humility, not good for -- anyway.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: I'm not in a position of giving you absolution.

MEMBER ROBERSON: Okay. Paul Kolodzy is the co-chair for this and to be honest, I'm not sure this combination works very well because Paul and I have literally not been able to connect ourselves, much less get the whole group together. So, we are remedying that and we will go ahead and set up the meetings and proceed

forward.

But what I am giving you, therefore, is the input which is my personal input and not the work of the committee. So, if you don't grant absolution, I will grant it for the members of the committee in terms of their contributions here, so they can correct, modify, alter whatever I say because we have not, in fact, met.

But it is a great group.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER ROBERSON: No, it is. I'm serious. This is a terrific group of people.

So, I am delighted that they are together on this one.

The study question, itself, just to remind you all is measurement and sensing. It is broad and narrow. The question focuses on definition of harmful interference and how we move forward looking at, broadly, using spectrum sensing, and using monitoring to analyze, identify, and address trends in the harmful interference area. So, that is the broad.

The narrow is the focus on U-NII-2B and U-NII-4, the two specific bands. So, as we go back and forth on the broad, very broad, in fact, and the somewhat narrow focus, that will be one of our challenges.

The study approach that has been identified thus far is that we will focus on the measurement and sensor approaches that have been already deployed or are being proposed for deployment and then try to understand how those apply to resolving the issue. And this brings in not only the measurement and sensor, at least in my mind, but also brings in what Dale has mentioned earlier, the interference limits policy and Harms Claim Threshold because that is not deployed but certainly proposed as a means of addressing this area. But one of the huge challenges is exactly here. First, we have to define what that threshold is. Then, you need to find the proper mechanism for measuring it. is that broad-based measurement, is that sensors, a combination of the two? So, that is the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

challenge of sorting this through.

The goal, of course, is to come back with, in the words that we use so often in the TAC, actionable recommendations for the NTIA.

And that would come, in my mind, in two forms as well. The first is the local optimization, the current optimization based on what people are doing because there a variety of things that people are doing or proposing to do with some background behind that.

So, out of that mix of options, what is the best current option to proceed forward?

And then try to identify, as a complement to that, since these things are not static, what is the future. Where do we go? Where is research needed to move in this area? Where is investment needed, as well, so that we know lies in the future, beyond what is there now? Because the perspective is this whole notion of measuring and sensing spectrum beyond 5 gigahertz is going to be a very, very important element for our future. And those of you who know my own research would

find that that is something that I am very heavily invested in, personally, which is how Mark sucked me into serving as co-chair in this but I think that that is going to be a key for us.

But it is good that this group is grounded in the 5 gigahertz so we have a foundation rather, rather than trying to look at the global scope as this keeps us grounded and focused.

So, that is where we are and we will be meeting on a regular basis. We have catch-up to be done. Mark pointed out that it is all fine that you are slow to the game but the expectation is still you get it done in May. So, you have to work double time to get from here to there. And I am taking that as a serious input so we will be doing that and, probably as a warning for the group, trying to meet on a weekly basis, rather than a biweekly basis in order to accomplish that.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, thank

Consider that your absolution. 1 2 Any questions? Okay. And have you and Paul had a chance to talk yet? 3 4 MEMBER ROBERSON: No. 5 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay. I'm sure he would like to talk to you. 6 No, it's -- well, I 7 MEMBER ROBERSON: won't go into it. 8 9 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Yes, I understand. 10 MEMBER ROBERSON: He seems to hide in 11 boxes that have no communication features. 12 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Yes, it's not a bad 13 thing. 14 Paige. 15 MS. ATKINS: So, as a reminder, one 16 reason we are focused on 5 gigahertz is that is 17 an important two bands for us, as we move toward 18 our target of 500 megahertz. There is ongoing 19 work, particularly in the 5350 to 5470 band. 20 if you are not familiar with what is going on 21 already in collaboration among FCC, NTIA and

industry, we want to make sure that you have that

set of information as a starting point. 1 2 One of the reasons we wanted to do this specifically was to ensure we weren't 3 4 missing anything. And if there was something 5 else that would help us significantly in the near or mid-term as we study those bands in 6 7 particular. And I would ask if you need any 8 9 further definition or constraints, if you are 10 concerned about the timing, let us know and we 11 can discuss what that might look like. 12 MEMBER ROBERSON: And I am counting on 13 Ed as our representative to bring that to the 14 Although, I am somewhat familiar with it. table. 15 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay, any more 16 questions? 17 All right, Kurt and Jeff, you guys are 18 going to tag team the next one, SAS and 19 databases? 20 MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Sure. I'd be happy 21 to lead. 22 So, the Spectrum Access System

Sensing/Spectrum Database International Extension group met twice. And I think the first couple discussions that the group has had has been very productive, in terms of largely forming and storming around the study item, the study question, which is can evolving database and sensing approaches adopted in the U.S. to facilitate a more dynamic spectrum sharing environment be effectively extended to international spectrum management applications. And if so, how?

I think the early discussion, to try and characterize it, a lot of different facets or aspects of international sharing were brought up in the group from the relative maturity of sensing and database techniques to implications of international standards development, to some perhaps more operational aspects of just what happens when devices that are authorized for use in one region are tried to be used in a separate region.

So, I think through that discussion,

the group really came to a rephrasing and a restatement of the original question, which is, as you can see here, what are the challenges in using database and sensing approaches for international spectrum management, and how can NTIA help address these challenges.

so, really, what the group is going to try and do for its work over the coming months is to focus on very specific case studies. So, in particular, there are already database and sensing approaches employed, for example, the 3.5 gigahertz band, the U-NIII band. And the group will look at those specific scenarios and take them as case studies and identify areas where the case studies could lead to specific take-aways and then ultimately actionable items for NTIA to consider for an international sharing environment or application of these technologies.

The group also discussed the idea or concept of doing key stakeholder interviews, I think largely to expand and enrich the knowledge base that the group has around the technologies

themselves. Maybe, for example, some of the federal stakeholders or federal spectrum community users, in terms of what their specific interests or needs are for international sharing.

I wouldn't say these interviews are necessarily in the critical path for the group to get its work done but would certainly help sort of expand the knowledge base. So, largely, these case studies will form the key content for the deliverable.

As you can see, the group has gone as far as developing a preliminary outline for the report or deliverable. And again, a lot of the focus will be on the specific challenges that are identified through these case studies. What the technical challenges are, what recommendations the group may have for NTIA to the extent there are recommendations, and also looking at some of the institutional or regulator challenges associated with that as well.

So, I think, at this point, the group has good focus. I think we have a well-defined

work scope and good understanding of the question 1 2 and work before us. And I think over the next quarter, we will largely be focused on these 3 4 specific case studies. CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Thanks, Jeff. 5 also get the star award for having your outline. 6 Now, Jeff, did you want to add 7 anything? 8 9 MEMBER REED: Yes, just one more 10 thing. We do plan on conducting some selected 11 interviews. And if you have any suggestions on 12 people who you believe we should interview for 13 that, let us know. Let Kurt or I know. Yes, thanks, Jeff. 14 MEMBER SCHAUBACH: 15 WE have probably a list of about four or five so 16 far but we certainly would like to expand that. 17 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Great. Dennis. 18 MEMBER ROBERSON: A question for you 19 and for the team. Since Winn Forum is doing a 20 lot of work in this space, how will your efforts 21 tie off with the Winn Forum work? Because I know

that you, in particular, have been very actively

in Winn Forum, so I am presuming that there is going to be some connection there.

MEMBER REED: Yes, I think there is going to be some good overlap. In particular, the Winn Forum publishes an annual state of spectrum sharing report. And we plan to incorporate that. We have already discussed it with them and they are fine with this and pulling material.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: I think Dale and then is that Mark down there or Mike? All right, Dale.

MEMBER HATFIELD: I will be very predictable. One of the things, of course, is enforcement of the boundaries. And I'm not sure that it makes it any worse but I think it needs to be someplace in there. Okay, you know, we have to do that in international boundaries and how does that complicate things?

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Can you be sure to push your button? I think I am getting a button push sign. There we go.

1	MEMBER HATFIELD: I'm sorry. My
2	fault.
3	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: That's okay. Just
4	be careful. I would caution that it is a great
5	point but to consider the scope of the question
6	as we have now, maybe enforcement is one of those
7	things, if you guys can address within the six
8	months we have. If you don't remember, the last
9	enforcement went for quite some time. So, it may
10	just be you identified as an action for a next
11	effort but I mean Dale raises a good point.
12	MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Yes, I think that
13	is right. And it did come up as a topic in the
14	early discussion.
15	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Mike and then
16	Janice, are you playing with yours?
17	MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I am questioning
18	myself.
19	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: That's okay. What
20	do they say about examining life? Anyhow, Mike.
21	MEMBER CHARTIER: Thank you. And this
22	relates, actually, to the last presentation and

is a question for Paige. With regards to 1 2 internationalization, did we get at the WRC an agenda item for 5.3 for parlance? 3 4 MS. ATKINS: Yes, and more, actually. 5 So, the agenda item ended up with broader scope in 5 gigahertz but we did get 5350 to 5470. 6 7 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, I see Bryan's and Janice's is now down. 8 9 MEMBER TRAMONT: I was just saying, 10 upon reflection, you declined. 11 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay. 12 MEMBER TRAMONT: I just have a quick 13 question for the co-chairs. How are you thinking 14 about the existing databases? Are you looking at 15 them as successfully implemented regulatory 16 models or are you thinking as potentially 17 successfully regulatory models? How were you 18 thinking about the current state of databases 19 that you are looking at? 20 MEMBER SCHAUBACH: So, Bryan, I don't 21 think we are going to get into necessarily the 22 maturity of a particular technology. But we will

to the extent of how databases themselves could be extended for international use. Some are much more dynamic in nature. Some are less so.

So, I think we will, perhaps, look at specific implementations, like today the TV White Spaces versus say the 3.5 gigahertz band and compare and contrast those in terms of their application elsewhere.

MEMBER TRAMONT: But are we assuming they work? I mean in other words --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER TRAMONT: I don't mean to be dense about it but it is an open question and I did look at David when I asked it because I mean extending it only is a good exercise if it is a useful model that has been successful in widespread deployment and consumer welfare. And it is not yet obvious, I think, that it works in any of those two bands. And that it protects incumbents, by the way, too, as I look at Paige.

MEMBER SCHAUBACH: I think as a threshold measure, yes. We are going to assume

perhaps from a conceptual standpoint they do work.

Now, certainly, there have been implementation issues and those are, perhaps, some of the challenges that need to be addressed. But you know I think the context of the question is to say that, in essence, these are technologies that do exist, do work, and could be extended.

MEMBER TRAMONT: This will be the last comment, I promise. I just think it is important to be explicit about that assumption. And it is probably the right answer because the committee can't examine whether or not the databases work. That is too big of a scope.

MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Right.

MEMBER TRAMONT: So, I think it should just be -- I think it is an important threshold that anybody thinking of adopting these abroad shouldn't just assume that they have work because we don't have the data yet to support that assertion.

1	MEMBER WARREN: Well, can I get in the
2	queue?
3	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Well, hang on a
4	minute. Go ahead, Jennifer.
5	MEMBER WARREN: Thank you. I think
6	there is also the challenge, again, that we have
7	to look at which is not whether they work or not
8	in the United States but what are the
9	differentiators in other markets that could call
LO	into question whether they are exportable. And
L1	that is, I think, the important of the second
L2	bullet under challenges.
L3	You have got the technical and then
L4	you have got the institutional and regulatory.
L5	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: And that is an
L6	excellent point. I was going to make that point.
L7	Your question, Bryan, are they
L8	functional technically. I mean is the concept
L9	adoptable from a technological standpoint or will
20	they work within a regulatory framework. I mean
21	or none of the above.
22	MEMBER TRAMONT: Or both of the above.

I mean Jennifer's point is really important and I 1 2 think that is probably an important focus of the committee. I am making a slightly different 3 4 point, which is that before we think about 5 exporting them, we shouldn't pretend like we know for sure they work. 6 7 And so I agree that presuming eventually they do prove out as concepts, then 8 9 the challenges that Jennifer has identified 10 become the important point for the committee to 11 explore. 12 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Good point. 13 I don't remember order they were in. I think it 14 was Rick, and then Dennis, and then David, if 15 that's okay. So, Rick, go for it. 16 MEMBER REASER: It's Rick Reaser from 17 Raytheon. 18 I was going to make the same point that Jennifer made. The issue is the appeal and 19

whether they can be actually used by some places, like some countries may not be whatever.

The other point I want to make, and

20

21

this is something that I have had my staff look at, is whether we like it or not, people are already doing this overseas anyway. So, now you have this situation where you have we are doing stuff here. They are already starting to do stuff over there and I sent out some surveys of things that are happening out there. So, something is going to happen, regardless.

The other question is how do we influence that? Because they are going to want to bring their database over here. It is not just us taking our ideas and concepts over there but it is going to happen in reverse. And so we need to look at that as well, what that means in a regulatory sense.

Because here is the other thing you get into. If they have a system that works with their TV White Space database over in you know Nigeria, can they just bring that device over here in the overhead and just turn it on and it works here? Because there is going to be that other whole process about how that may work. It

is like people, before they figured out the cell phones, your mobile phone was on a different frequency when you took it overseas.

So, this is just another one of these things that is going to be have to be sorted out. And one of the things is there will have to be some international harmonization. That's why one of the places we really want to talk to is talk to Canada because they are a little more sophisticated. So, what are they thinking about They are probably scared to death of what this? is going on down here sometimes. And so, because I am sure they are thinking about these things as well because they don't use all their TV And they have other issues with the channels. same kinds of bands.

So, I think you have to realize it is not like this was just here. There is a lot of work going on overseas. And then is that exportable? How does it move back and forth? There are some other things that need to be looked at in terms of strategy about how you are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to do that.

And Jennifer makes a very good point. Some places may not be interested in this at all. They just want to have television. You know, whether they have TV White Space, or whatever, they don't have broadcasting there. So, it has no meaning to them.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Well, good. Good.

It's good you are on the committee, too. And I

would just add that I think Canada may be as

sophisticated, perhaps, but not more so.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: So you know, remember where we are. Kurt.

MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Maybe just not so much a response but thank you, Rick, and maybe to build on that comment. You know the charter for the subcommittee is to not look just or only at database approaches but also sensing approaches. So, I just want to be clear that it is not strictly narrowly focused on database approaches.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: And again, we have

six months to get the work done. And this is one 1 2 of those that could go on forever. Maybe it Do you want to put your tent down, Rick, 3 4 or I will call you again? Dennis and then David. 5 MEMBER ROBERSON: I think this whole 6 7 line of questions are very similar but this is maybe rendering this in a more specific way. 8 9 Because there is the TV White Space regime. 10 There is the LSA, LAA. There is the SAS. are proposals for others. So, with the nodding 11 12 of your head, you are all of the above. Okay. 13 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: And David. 14 MEMBER ROBERSON: Hopefully, the right 15 answer, except for the problem that Mark points 16 out that by covering them all, that is a big 17 ocean that you are boiling. I don't know how you 18 would do it without that but it is a big space. 19 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Thanks. And David. 20 MEMBER DONOVAN: The only question I 21 have is if we are taking the construct 22 internationally, in the United States you have

1	your database and you also have it administered
2	by private entities as well that are very much
3	involved. And so the only I question I have is
4	that if you could address that issue, once we are
5	looking internationally, whether we are looking
6	at a government sort of monopoly in the database
7	in the foreign country or they are looking at a
8	regime similar to what we have here. And that
9	may raise some very different questions,
10	particularly if a foreign entity decides to have
11	a private sector entity manage its database or
12	how it goes up.
13	I don't know whether that is getting
14	too much into the weeds but it always was a very
15	delicate question that we spent a lot of time on.
16	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Yes.
17	MEMBER DONOVAN: And so if you could
18	just address it as you go forward, that is fine.
19	Now, Michael, we could have a great
20	discussion about White Spaces later.
21	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: No, no, no. No, we
22	only have an hour. That's fine. You can do that

at like there is a nice restaurant downstairs. 1 2 Because I was in the middle of that one, too, so, 3 I hear what you are saying. 4 Did you want to comment on that, Kurt? 5 Yes, it was a good point. Thank you. Okay, 6 Paige. 7 MS. ATKINS: Are you going to also highlight or address standards issues related to 8 9 this, specifically? 10 MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Thank you, Paige. 11 Go ahead, Jeff. 12 MEMBER REED: I think we probably will 13 to some extent because I see that 5G is going to 14 incorporate some of these ideas. 5G has got to 15 include spectrum sharing. So, just kind of 16 understanding where we are on that should be a 17 subject in the report. 18 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: And Winn Forum has 19 been looking at that, too. So, to the extent 20 that you can sort of co-op some of that or at 21 least borrow some of it, you can get that.

Is everybody fine with

Okay, thanks.

the rephrasing of the question? We really didn't 1 2 vote on the questions or did we, initially? Did we vote on the questions? I can't remember. 3 4 Everybody's good? I take that as a good. 5 Okay, so no more changes to the questions. 6 Cool. 7 And then finally, 5G. And I think Rob, you are here, and then Mariam, I think, is 8 9 on the phone. So you want to go? 10 MEMBER KUBIK: Sure, I'll go and I 11 will let Mariam jump in as she wants. 12 So, we met three times. The second 13 page of the presentation shows the co-chairs, 14 Mariam and myself, our NTIA liaisons and our 15 outstanding group that is participating. 16 Page 3 is the study question. When we 17 first met, the group realized, I think as a 18 whole, this seems to be too narrow, the original 19 question. Because I coined this term now, the 20 question seemed to be focused on high 5G, as 21 opposed to mid-5G or low 5G. So, we rephrase the 22 question as shown here, to try to be sure that we

covered not only the millimeter wave but other bands and other technologies that may be included in the 5G realm. Hopefully, we didn't make the ocean too big that we can't boil it but we did revise the question and we sent this over to NTIA and I think they gave an initial nod to it.

Moving on, page 4 is our work plan. We have met three times and we will continue in regular meetings, about every two weeks.

Hopefully, we will have this skeleton out pretty soon so we can start focusing our discussions on that. We do plan on considering the result of the WRC, as well as other developments in the standards and technology groups, as well as all the various 5G partnership activities that go on around the world. And we plan on delivering a report by May 16th.

The last page, just to kind of give you a framework of some of the activity going on there. Paige did a great job of outlining the results of the WRC-15 and Gen Item 113 that came out and the newly formed Task Group 5-1 that is

going to be focusing on studies but there are
still activities within the other study group 5
group on evaluation criteria requirements and
evaluation and submission of proposals and then
the specifications within the broader study group
5.
Then there is standardization works.
There is a lot of activity going on within the
3GPP forum and activities within planning for
showcases at the Olympics coming up in Korea and
Japan.
So, Mariam, is there anything you
would like to add?
MEMBER SOROND: No.
MEMBER KUBIK: Anything from the
committee membership?
CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Any questions? Just
clarify that the subcommittee is not going to be
working toward the Olympics.
working toward the Olympics. MEMBER KUBIK: I think we should do a

that.

Yes, Kurt.

MEMBER SCHAUBACH: Kurt Schaubach. It would just perhaps be helpful for the workgroup to identify sort of the context of how they are thinking about 5G in terms of the definition of it, what technology options that they are considering.

I know it is still very early days in terms of the standards activity defining 5G but I think that that would be helpful to understand sort of the output of the workgroup.

MEMBER KUBIK: It's a valid point. I think that is probably one of the first actions that we have to do is capture what the various study groups are looking at within 3GPP and the other working group forums. Good point.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Harold. Harold Feld.

MEMBER FELD: I just want to clarify that this is not just limited to sharing with license spectrum, that this includes sharing on

an unlicensed or mixed model basis, as well as sharing exclusive license use with federal spectrum use. Is that correct?

MEMBER KUBIK: Well, I think it covers the scope of not only that within the FCC process because the FCC, themselves, do have both licensed and unlicensed and they do have sharing with federal/non-federal. So, I think all that falls within the scope of the working that we are doing.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Dennis.

MEMBER ROBERSON: Dennis Roberson.

One of the big elements that is hitting with 5G that is outside of what we tend to talk about, including my various talks about 5G, is the move to software to find networks and network virtualization. The whole notion of what 5G is is becoming inherently different than all of our telecommunication systems, historically, because you could go identify a box and say okay that is the switch or that is the whatever. But as we go to the virtualization, it is just computers.

This computer does computation. This computer 1 2 runs the network. And they are all bolted 3 together. With that notion, that notional 4 5 difference, it seems that that would be an important part of what you are considering. 6 it is also a big item. 7 So, how are you thinking about that or 8 9 are you thinking about that one? 10 MEMBER KUBIK: Well we haven't had 11 that level of discussion yet. I think we need to 12 figure out if we want to try to go down that 13 path. I think maybe at a high level, we may just 14 identify that as one of the issues that need to 15 be followed on at some point and really delved 16 into. 17 But I think how these aspects relate 18 to the federal/non-federal spectrum sharing I 19 think is one of the key points here. 20 MEMBER ROBERSON: And I would submit 21 that that will be a big part when it is --22 MEMBER KUBIK: Please join the

1	committee.
2	MEMBER ROBERSON: Yes, that is the
3	challenge.
4	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Thank you. Jeff.
5	MEMBER REED: Yes, actually, I think
6	Dennis really brings up a good point but I'm not
7	sure it is going to directly go into 5G because
8	it is more of an implementation and they try to
9	give as much leeway for implementation variation
10	as possible within these standardization models.
11	But I was contemplating this the other
12	night and you and I were on the PCAS committee.
13	How would we have changed that report if we know
14	today how much some defined networking has
15	progressed? I think it would be different.
16	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Okay, thanks. Any
17	other questions?
18	Paige, did you want to make any more
19	remarks to anything? Anything at all?
20	MS. ATKINS: Anything at all?
21	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Talk about the
22	Redskins or whatever?

MS. ATKINS: We don't have that much 1 2 time. CO-CHAIR GIBSON: 3 No. 4 MS. ATKINS: So, I would like to thank 5 everybody for taking this first cut, understanding one of the subcommittees didn't 6 7 have an opportunity to meet. But I do appreciate you, again, trying 8 9 to stay on scope and stay focused, since we do 10 have a compressed time line. And I think we 11 successfully locked down all of the questions. 12 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Yes. 13 MS. ATKINS: And I think we have 14 successfully agreed that folks know what they are 15 trying to do and trying to answer. If you have 16 questions over the next few weeks that come up 17 that make it muddier, please let us know so we 18 can clarify it and keep you headed toward that 19 toward of May target. 20 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, thanks. 21 Are you done, Jeff? 22 MEMBER REED: Actually, I have one

1	question.					
2	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Oh, okay, sorry.					
3	MEMBER REED: Oh, no. No, actually,					
4	I am kind of like Dale then I remember the					
5	question.					
6	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Oh, you are in good					
7	company.					
8	MEMBER REED: For the WRC, is it					
9	possible for you to circulate something to us					
10	that summarizes in writing some of the key					
11	points?					
12	MS. ATKINS: Specifically from a 5G or					
13	just in the general points that I make?					
14	MEMBER REED: Oh, just in general.					
15	MS. ATKINS: Okay, yes.					
16	MEMBER REED: I'm sure it must be out					
17	there already.					
18	MS. ATKINS: Yes, we can send					
19	something out.					
20	MEMBER REED: Okay.					
21	CO-CHAIR GIBSON: I think that is it.					
22	We are now to the point where there is public					

comments. Would any of the public like to comment? I take that as a no.

Audrey, you are not public but that's okay.

MEMBER ALLISON: Well, this is a shameless cross-promotion but if you are interested in the WRC results, the Ambassador Anstrom and Julie Zoller will be speaking at an event on Tuesday, if you are interested in attending, in D.C. It is the USITUA annual meeting and it will be open to the public and you can see me for more information.

CO-CHAIR GIBSON: That's cool. That's a good plug.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Just one housekeeping announcement. Folks are welcome to stay around as long as they like. If you are here from out of town and you need a conference room or anything like that, just let me know. We are happy to set that up. A cappuccino maker is there, coffee maker is in there. Just do whatever you need.

1 Anyway, so you are welcome to do 2 whatever, if people need to hang around. CO-CHAIR GIBSON: All right, thank 3 4 And is there any comment on the phone? you. 5 should say from the phone. All right, no more public comment. 6 All right, now what? Oh, I get to do 7 closing remarks. Well, I would like to echo what 8 9 Paige said. You know this is a lot of work for 10 just a couple of months working with some questions that are fairly new with a process that 11 12 is fairly new to some. 13 So, thank you for all the hard work. 14 I look forward to the next meeting, whenever that 15 is, in March, when I'm sure there will be a lot 16 more meat on the bones, as Paige says. But until 17 then, good luck with all the work and thanks 18 again. 19 Larry? 20 CO-CHAIR ALDER: Have good holidays. 21 CO-CHAIR GIBSON: Good holidays, safe 22 trip. And thank you all for coming. And thanks

1	again to Bryan and Wilkinson for the space.
2	I like this space except those lights.
3	Not only are they hot, I am now blind when I look
4	on that side.
5	Thanks to everyone.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
7	went off the record at 3:16 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

A ability 73:8 able 14:7 22:2 41:5 42:18 48:9 63:8 68:20 80:9 82:8,19,21 87:17 92:19 above-entitled 127:6 abroad 107:19 absentia 77:20 absolutely 12:1 59:3 70:18
able 14:7 22:2 41:5 42:18 48:9 63:8 68:20 80:9 82:8,19,21 87:17 92:19 above-entitled 127:6 abroad 107:19 absentia 77:20 absolutely 12:1 59:3
above-entitled 127:6 abroad 107:19 absentia 77:20 absolutely 12:1 59:3
11 70518
absolution 92:15 93:5
97:1 Academy 31:4 33:8 access 3:13,16 40:17 40:20 41:2,20 43:17 43:17 78:7,9 79:11
84:19,19,21 98:22 accomplish 19:19 47:10 96:20
accomplishment 29:7 achieve 6:6 acknowledge 7:11 acknowledging 4:17
Act 6:16 29:9,11 30:12 action 29:13 41:22 85:19 86:6 91:14 104:10
actionable 20:21 77:4 95:4 100:16
actions 20:10,11 21:3 28:16 33:13,17,19 37:8 38:2,5,10,17 39:1 41:18 43:11 74:15 75:1,13 85:15 91:4 119:14
active 42:14 actively 102:22 activities 20:5 31:12 37:13,18 38:8 41:3
56:21 117:16 118:2,9 activity 21:15 30:17 117:19 118:8 119:10 actual 38:18 51:5,8
77:4 89:5 add 15:9 25:16 54:18 63:1 75:9 76:15 83:9 85:14 102:7 112:10 118:13
added 27:1 additional 7:6,7 24:4,13 29:16,18 30:10,18 48:14 53:1 75:17 87:4
address 48:12 52:15 64:9 75:6 93:21 100:6 104:7 114:4,18 115:8 addressed 61:1 65:1 85:21 86:1 107:5

addressing 31:14 94:17 Adjourn 3:22 administered 114:1 Administration 1:2 2:18.22 6:17 administrations 24:3 24:10 25:18 29:6 Administrator 2:19 adoptable 108:19 adopted 67:13 99:7 adopting 107:19 adoption 29:3 advance 82:9,9 advanced 29:17 31:9 40:7 advantage 43:19 advisory 1:5,16 12:20 21:22 37:18 advocate 42:11 Aeronautical 26:17 Affairs 5:12 afternoon 19:6 agencies 7:1 19:18 30:22 32:3,10 40:12 43:22 45:7 48:17 60:16 79:8 81:3.7 82:7 87:13 89:13 agency 3:14 88:8,17 agenda 10:8 12:4 19:3 19:3 23:3 26:14,20 27:1 77:15 105:3,5 agent 32:6 aggregate 86:1 **Agile** 12:12 agnostic 49:14 ago 21:13 27:2 33:5 64:22,22 67:16 agree 63:9 85:13 109:7 agreed 27:14 123:14 agreeing 24:11 agreement 25:13 26:21 agriculture 25:21 ahead 15:20 17:17 34:10 41:12 86:12 92:22 108:4 115:11 air 49:22 59:16 Airborne 50:6 aircraft 7:20 25:10 Airlines 27:5 **Alder** 1:19 2:2 3:4,21 4:3 9:1 10:2,22 11:8 15:19 17:16 18:1,7,9 18:11,22 34:16 36:3 36:20 42:5,7 56:9 62:1 72:11 73:22 75:20 76:21 90:7,10 126:20 aligned 28:4 74:11

aligns 7:2 **Allison** 2:3 3:14 77:20 83:8 125:5 allocate 23:13 allocations 24:11 allow 24:21 28:12 30:5 46:12,12 allowed 13:8 46:9 allowing 43:16 allows 29:15 39:10 64:8 **alter** 93:7 Alternatives 3:11 altitude 28:18 amazing 27:6 **Ambassador** 8:4 22:19 125:7 America 17:2 analysis 32:1,18 39:17 47:18 48:5 51:16 54:14 61:6 62:3 analytically 49:6 54:8 analytics 51:17 52:11 analyze 31:11 93:20 announcement 125:16 annual 103:5 125:10 Anstrom 8:5 22:19 23:1 125:8 answer 52:14 55:15,16 73:7,13 107:13 113:15 123:15 answered 78:17 answering 29:12 85:9 antenna 55:5 anxiously 8:17 anybody 6:7 27:17 40:13 54:18 92:3 107:19 anyway 66:1 92:13 110:3 126:1 apologies 4:12 apologize 21:4 Apparently 13:16 appeal 109:19 applaud 6:20 36:5 applicability 39:3 47:18 48:4 54:14 61:6 applicable 39:19 application 100:18 106:8 applications 25:15,20 28:19 35:19,20 99:10 apply 29:16 94:11 appreciate 34:10 75:16 123:8 approach 26:11 42:11 58:8 62:17 89:1 91:7

94:8 99:7 100:4.11 112:19,19,21 approaching 71:3 appropriate 21:1 42:3 approved 25:7 75:15 approximately 23:11 area 32:17 65:3,16 93:22 94:17 95:16 areas 6:10 32:7 45:3.17 76:18 79:18 100:14 arranged 82:13 arrangements 85:4 arranging 87:12 ascertaining 68:7 asked 4:13 45:21 106:14 asking 14:9 89:3 aspects 70:16 99:14,18 121:17 assertion 107:22 **assess** 37:11 41:1 45:8 assessed 37:10 assessing 42:2 assessment 47:7,20 48:7,12,17,21 51:6,9 55:20 59:10.11 60:19 assigned 8:19 58:20 assignments 60:16,17 Assistant 64:20 Associate 2:19 associated 38:4.17 41:16,17 101:20 **assume** 106:22 107:20 **assumed** 40:19 assuming 106:9 **assumption** 13:7 40:22 107:12 assumptions 52:8 AT&T 16:11 **Atkins** 2:19 3:5.7 15:22 15:22 19:6 34:18 35:4 35:15 37:3 42:6 43:4 49:13,19 50:9,14,19 51:18,21 52:20 53:14 54:4,15 55:8 58:7 59:7,14 60:5,9 61:20 62:10 63:19 66:20 67:7 69:1,16 71:4 72:2,5 73:7 74:4 76:15 84:6 85:14 86:8 86:11,13,19 87:2 91:4 97:15 105:4 115:7 122:20 123:1,4,13 124:12,15,18 attack 75:13 attending 11:4 125:10 auction 24:22 29:21 Audrey 2:3 3:14 21:7

approaches 40:8 88:17

becoming 120:18 94:21 35:21 77:17 83:1 85:12 125:3 beginning 22:12 broadband 7:9,20 24:6 August 12:2,5 13:5,8 **behalf** 6:17 8:1 10:6 24:16 29:3 authoring 67:5 17:11 **Broadcasters** 16:9 authorities 43:16 85:18 behoove 58:4 broadcasting 112:6 broader 105:5 118:5 authorized 99:19 **believe** 6:22 11:17 automotive 35:18 28:22 30:9 33:6 35:2 **broadly** 45:19 67:14 available 7:5 9:19 13:12 60:5 64:21 67:15 73:8 93:19 **broke** 86:13 24:18 28:14 29:19 87:13 102:12 35:13 38:21 benefit 23:5 25:17 **brought** 5:6 11:15 aviation 25:4,19 26:5 27:19 30:7,13 86:15 99:14 26:10 best 54:16 58:12,15 **Bruce** 13:6,12 14:5 avoid 20:19 79:6 73:8 82:2 95:12 Bryan 2:12 4:19 9:3 award 102:6 better 6:22 58:9 66:16 10:3 17:8 105:20 **Awesome** 77:19 108:17 127:1 66:16 76:10 86:2 AWS-3 21:11 22:7 81:9 88:17 **Bryan's** 105:8 beyond 12:3 25:10 26:2 buckets 87:3 В 95:18.20 **budget** 6:16 13:22 back 8:21,22 12:4 46:15 bi-directional 3:8 43:7 29:10 44:16 54:2 55:13 65:5,14 **build** 112:17 biannual 64:19,20 71:13 73:21 74:16 **building** 88:19 91:10 bidirectional 89:7,10 76:19 80:17 88:9 **built** 59:5 91:21 94:3 95:2 **big** 13:4 58:12 107:15 bullet 50:8 63:1 87:12 111:20 113:16,18 117:4 108:12 busy 19:9 34:8 background 95:10 120:13 121:7,21 backlash 68:5 billions 25:16 **button** 103:21.21 bad 10:21 97:12 **bit** 4:6.19 41:12 50:3 **buy-in** 61:13 **balance** 58:17 52:6 54:1 76:19 C balanced 6:18 29:10 biweekly 96:20 42:11 58:8.9 bleed 82:14 C-band 24:20 balancing 59:4 **blind** 127:3 Calabrese 2:3 17:1.1 **band** 24:22 28:11 30:2 **board** 19:11 51:12 49:11,17 84:12,13 35:3,14,16,17 39:5 58:13 85:5 86:5,9 48:6 49:12,13,14 50:2 **bodies** 66:10 **call** 10:7 13:11 15:20 52:2 55:1,4,9 59:16 **body** 12:13 66:12 23:2 29:13 39:8 44:13 67:12,20 97:19 **boil** 117:4 47:13 61:5 71:14 100:12,12 106:6 **boiling** 113:17 88:12 90:1 108:9 band-specific 57:10,12 **bolted** 121:2 113:4 bands 3:13 27:15,17,20 bone 46:17 91:5 called 4:12 26:17 28:1,4,9 36:11 39:13 **bones** 126:16 calls 83:5 39:19 45:16 47:20 boring 19:8 Canada 111:9 112:10 borrow 115:21 49:15 50:20 51:16 capabilities 25:16 57:13 60:15 78:8 94:2 **bottom** 32:12 49:20 27:13 31:21 32:19 97:17 98:6 106:19 Boulder 5:22 capacity 65:19 111:16 117:2 **boundaries** 103:15,18 Capitol 19:12 30:18 **box** 120:20 bandwidth 59:18 58:2 **banner** 56:22 **boxes** 97:11 cappuccino 125:20 Barker 1:17 4:17,19 break 33:15 **capture** 119:15 17:9 **bridge** 8:13 careful 104:4 base 63:19 100:22 brief 75:22 88:10,11 cargo 25:20 90:6 **Carl** 2:9 16:10 101:8 based 48:4,18 49:3 briefing 74:2 carried 43:8 **bright** 22:10 70:10 95:7 **carriers** 81:9,14 baseline 30:9 bring 98:13 110:11,19 case 39:8,14 62:13 basically 11:2 bringing 32:22 63:17,20,20 64:8,13 basis 28:21 96:12,19,20 **brings** 94:11,13 122:6 64:15 67:10 68:13,14 **broad** 93:17,22 94:3,3 69:4,5,7 70:4,18 120:1

79:21 80:15 82:1 84:5 87:2 100:9,14,15 101:9,15 102:4 cases 32:10 37:14 60:18 78:18 79:3,5,14 80:8,12 81:3 82:6 83:19 88:3 catch-up 96:12 caused 68:5 caution 104:4 caveat 75:9 cell 111:1 **Center** 31:9 Century 23:5 certain 32:7 37:17 76:20 certainly 58:4 90:15 94:16 101:7 102:16 107:3 certainty 71:15 73:19 certificate 14:3 certification 67:19 cetera 12:9 37:19 40:12 55:2 chairman 64:19 70:1 **chairs** 1:20 10:17 11:10 **challenge** 95:1 108:6 122:3 **challenges** 20:8 31:15 94:5,18 100:3,6 101:14,16,19 107:5 108:12 109:9 challenging 20:2 90:1 **chance** 97:3 change 75:10 88:16 **changed** 122:13 **changes** 44:4 116:5 channel 4:14 **channels** 111:15 **Chapter** 71:22 chapters 43:14 characterize 38:2 67:17 99:13 characterized 91:5 characterizing 85:17 Charla 2:9 3:14 16:1 36:14 77:16,16 83:9 85:12 87:10 **charter** 112:17 **Chartier** 2:4 16:16,16 104:21 chief 2:16 5:9,12 **chip** 68:9 circulate 124:9 circumstances 88:2 **Civil** 26:5 **Claim** 76:5 94:15 clarification 80:22

71:21 72:6,8 73:11,15

broad-based 57:10

beachfront 28:2

clarify 34:4 43:15 47:6 86:15 118:18 119:20 123:18 **classified** 41:20,21 42:13 61:9 cleanup 12:9 clear 42:21 79:8 112:20 clever 62:4 closely 48:1 closing 3:21 126:8 **co-chair** 2:2,2 3:20 4:3 9:1 10:2,20,22 11:6,8 14:17 15:19 17:12,16 18:1,2,4,7,9,11,22 34:16 36:3,20 42:5,7 42:7 53:16,20 56:9 60:22 61:22 62:1 72:11 73:22 75:20 76:21 77:11,19,21 78:3 83:10,13,17 84:11 86:10,12 87:7 87:19 88:5 90:5,7,9 90:10 91:11,18 92:2 92:14,17 96:3,22 97:5 97:9.12 98:15 102:5 102:17 103:10.20 104:3,15,19 105:7,11 108:3,15 109:12 112:8,13,22 113:13 113:19 114:16,21 115:18 118:17.22 119:18 120:11 122:4 122:16,21 123:3,12 123:20 124:2,6,21 125:13 126:3,20,21 co-chairs 3:4,21 10:6 40:5 77:16 80:5 105:13 116:13 co-equal 44:6 co-op 115:20 co-primary 43:17 coffee 9:13 125:21 cognizant 68:15 coined 23:2 116:19 collaborate 76:20 collaboration 3:8,14 44:19 45:2,9,14,18,22 61:16 71:8 72:7 76:17 88:8,18,20 89:5 90:12 91:6 97:21 collaboratively 30:21 collect 12:17,19 collection 49:4 **collective** 12:20 34:11 collectively 34:8 Colorado 16:7 combination 50:3 71:5 92:18 94:22

combine 86:1 come 6:7 8:12 54:2 70:6 76:7 82:6 86:6 95:2,5 104:13 123:16 comes 61:13 **comfort** 15:17 comfortable 87:10 **coming** 39:11 67:6 100:8 118:10 126:22 command 25:9,10 commend 11:4 comment 3:19 13:10 51:14 63:2 71:14 76:3 76:4,13 107:11 112:17 115:4 125:2 126:4,6 commenting 42:15 comments 3:3 22:15 34:19 40:21 43:5 83:4 125:1 **Commerce** 1:1,5 2:18 2:22 32:13 commercial 28:17 29:19 51:16 52:2 56:4 56:18 62:15 70:14 72:19 81:22 88:22 commitment 65:9 committed 32:20 committee 1:5,16 12:20 21:22 37:19 42:8,17 42:21 77:10 84:22 93:4,6 107:13 109:3 109:10 112:9 118:16 122:1.12 committees 10:19 11:9 committing 55:19 communicated 58:1 communication 32:8 97:11 communications 31:7 31:10 community 28:18 68:6 68:19 101:3 company 124:7 compare 106:7 compendium 60:12 compilation 38:11 compile 38:7 75:3 complement 95:13 complementarity 66:14

complementary 66:5,7

complete 13:8 14:2,4

14:12 41:15

completed 23:18

completion 14:4

69:22

complex 20:1 63:5

complicate 103:19

complicated 81:17 **component** 32:21 59:5 comprehensively compressed 20:17 27:2 123:10 computation 121:1 computer 121:1,1 computers 120:22 Comsearch 17:13 concept 91:9 100:20 108:18 concepts 109:8 110:12 conceptual 107:1 **concern** 68:12 concerned 68:9 98:10 concerns 67:9 72:22 conclude 13:1 concluded 22:8 **conclusion** 7:11 24:1 25:5 39:20 concretely 38:5 conducting 102:10 conference 19:14 21:6 22:8,13,21 23:3,7,17 24:1,12 25:3,4,7 26:21,22 27:1,14 125:18 confession 92:10 confidence 55:11 Congress 30:22 **connect** 92:20 connection 103:2 consider 97:1 100:17 104:5 considerable 66:13 68:5 consideration 30:10 69:2,19 77:3 considered 64:14 considering 52:10 117:12 119:8 121:6 consistency 73:20 consistent 71:16 constraints 98:9 construct 39:10,16 41:10 51:2 113:21 consumer 106:17 contemplate 70:12 contemplating 122:11 content 15:18 101:9 **CONTENTS** 3:1 context 70:3,7,8 71:21 73:5 107:6 119:5 continue 6:4 30:17 42:1 44:9 66:15 82:18 117:8

continues 34:9 continuing 30:20 contours 62:13 contrast 106:7 contributed 8:2 contributing 7:16 contributions 93:6 contributor 6:5 contributors 5:1.5 control 25:9,11 controlled 46:10 convening 12:1 conversation 59:6 cookies 9:13 **cool** 116:6 125:13 Cooper 2:4 17:19,21 18:3.6 coordinate 26:1 coordination 21:13,17 22:3,6,6 39:3,6 45:14 70:2 72:16 80:17 **copies** 79:2 copy 37:4 **correct** 36:1 50:9,13 54:20 65:9 93:7 120:3 corrected 11:1 corresponding 58:11 cost 3:10 74:6,8 count 24:6,17 counting 98:12 countries 24:16 109:21 country 114:7 couple 4:21 5:5 6:14 31:20 35:7 38:6 43:10 43:14 47:21 48:7 49:20 64:22 67:15 99:2 126:10 **coupled** 30:3 40:11 45:10 course 8:6 27:9 72:17 76:4 95:2 103:14 cover 6:11 19:5 35:6 74:3 coverage 60:18 covered 35:7 87:5 117:1 covering 21:19 81:13 113:16 covers 21:18 64:2,4 120:4 create 75:6 91:17 created 64:2 68:3 creating 46:6 **creep** 20:20 79:7 92:3 criteria 118:3 critical 20:4 22:1 28:16 32:14 59:3,4 70:19 81:2 101:6

continued 71:7

declined 105:10 critically 32:16 different 20:6 24:10.10 91:16.20 Crosby 2:5 16:18,18 Defense 15:3 24:11 46:11,12 47:5 **Donovan** 2:6 16:8,8 69:20,21 71:19 72:4,9 69:3,3 80:10 defer 73:12 74:14 83:22 50:20 57:12,13 58:2 define 23:4 70:17 73:2 113:20 114:17 cross-promotion 125:6 58:19,20 59:15 79:22 **CSMAC** 1:5 5:6,8,16 7:4 88:3 94:19 89:13 99:13 109:3 door 4:18 9:10 8:10,16 12:2 19:10 defined 72:17 122:14 111:2 114:9 120:18 Doppler 63:21 20:4,12 33:14 34:14 defining 56:19 71:18 122:15 **DOT** 35:13 38:10 57:22 75:14 119:10 differentiators 108:9 double 96:16 definitely 82:19 difficult 81:15,16 doubt 19:7 76:17 78:11 **CSMACs** 78:10,12 **definition** 72:15,20 73:2 difficulty 68:7 downstairs 115:1 **curious** 83:15 73:4,10 76:8 93:18 digest 56:12 drill 73:21 digs 4:18 current 11:22 12:6 98:9 119:6 **drive** 54:9 47:11 57:4,5 84:7 degree 4:14 55:11 diligently 35:22 driver 33:18 95:7,12 105:18 delegation 8:4 22:16,18 direct 28:20 39:10 **DTSC** 35:1 deliberations 57:22 dubious 54:2 currently 48:16 directed 27:3 cut 15:13 123:5 delicate 114:15 directly 23:5 63:12 due 84:16 cybersecurity 14:1,2,19 delighted 93:13 122:7 dynamic 99:8 106:3 director 33:1 **cycle** 23:18,22 75:15 deliver 12:7 Ε deliverable 101:10,13 disaster 25:20 85:21 disclose 59:22 **E** 2:5 delivering 117:17 D discrete 38:2,9 75:13 delved 121:15 E-labeling 67:19 **Dennis** 2:11 3:16 17:4 discuss 8:14 98:11 **D.C** 1:18 125:10 earlier 23:1 29:9 33:1 **Dale** 2:7 16:6 66:9 67:5 51:15 55:13,14 56:10 discussed 60:11 85:19 71:13 78:8 79:3 94:14 56:12 66:7 92:7 90:16 100:19 103:7 early 8:17 26:21 79:17 76:1,3 83:10 94:13 102:17 109:14 113:5 discussion 41:19 56:2 103:10,12 104:11 89:18 99:12 104:14 120:11.12 122:6 61:15 65:3 69:14 124:4 119:9 **Dale's** 62:22 **Dennis's** 55:13 70:12 71:8.20 74:10 echo 22:14 126:8 economic 7:18 25:17 data 12:17 39:17 42:12 dense 57:1 106:13 74:13 87:4,22 89:2 **Department** 1:1 2:18,22 99:12,22 104:14 49:3,4 53:8,10 107:21 29:4 database 3:17 40:8 15:3 32:13 114:20 121:11 economist 5:9 99:1,6,16 100:4,10 depending 75:10 **discussions** 61:5 70:1 **Ed** 91:12 98:13 110:11,18 112:19,21 **deployed** 94:9,16 70:20 72:6 80:20 educational 43:21 89:15 99:3 117:12 114:1,6,11 deployment 94:10 **effect** 67:15 **databases** 3:7 38:15 106:17 dispersed 55:9 **effective** 31:2 54:22 98:19 105:14,18 deposit 13:14 disseminated 84:8 63:14 106:1 107:14 **Deputy** 2:19 distinct 35:13 **effectively** 24:13 53:4 **describe** 45:11 54:15 dates 38:3 Distress 26:17 54:7 57:1,2 68:20 distributed 68:19 **Dave** 5:10 91:12 describes 51:2 99:9 David 2:6 16:8 69:20 description 56:11 Division 5:13 efficiency 56:17 106:14 109:14 113:5 detail 6:11 74:17 82:5 **DOC** 32:13 efficient 31:2 58:21 113:13,19 detailed 46:6 67:1 document 50:16 53:15 efficiently 53:5 details 60:6 68:7,10 effort 7:16 8:3 27:18 day 55:5 70:9 55:19 day-to-day 5:15 19:17 detection 50:5 documentation 14:22 48:2 49:1 50:15 62:11 determine 41:13 53:3 **documenting** 49:2 51:3 104:11 28:21 days 119:9 69:17 79:9 51:5 62:18 efforts 5:1 6:19 7:17 determined 41:11 documents 13:15 14:13 **De** 8:5 33:20 102:20 develop 19:19 dealing 79:18 88:3 51:8 either 9:10 68:10 89:14 dealt 80:3 84:22 developing 101:12 **DoD** 15:3,6 21:18 79:21 89:18 development 29:18 death 111:11 80:15 81:8 86:14 elaborate 52:18 40:2 99:17 debate 52:5 doing 6:4 29:13 36:12 element 45:20 48:11 developments 117:14 46:4 54:7 57:18 58:22 debates 8:10 95:21 **December** 1:12 82:4 **develops** 26:6 33:9 65:4 66:1 69:12,12 **elements** 21:7 44:20 device 110:19 81:20 82:17 87:14 89:14 90:2 45:15 50:5,6 69:5 devices 64:14 73:12 89:11 95:8,9 96:18 120:13 **decide** 79:14 99:19 100:20 102:19 110:3 decided 79:17 80:16,18 else's 15:17 dialogue 44:9 81:12 110:4 120:10 **email** 13:13 14:5 decides 114:10 difference 57:22 121:5 **Dombrowsky** 2:5 3:15 embedded 67:18

16:2,2 88:7 90:15

differences 8:13

Decker 23:1

emerging 28:19

EWA 16:18 fifth 48:19 emphasize 20:3 F **employ** 73:1 **exact** 53:1 figure 15:1 50:11 **FAA** 68:11 employed 100:11 **exactly** 94:18 121:12 FAA's 68:16 examine 73:3 107:14 figured 83:13 111:1 **employee** 15:4,5 **FACA** 46:13 **enable** 29:2,3 44:6 examining 104:20 file 39:9 44:5 faces 22:10 enacted 29:10 **example** 26:10 36:13 final 12:8 facets 99:13 **enactment** 6:15 29:8 36:14 85:18 100:11 finalized 11:18 12:1 facilitate 6:22 65:7 68:4 encourage 15:12 54:17 101:1 89:19 99:8 ended 62:12 105:5 excellent 59:7 108:16 **finally** 116:7 facility 10:3 14:13 **enforce** 64:16 exceptions 24:9 find 9:12 50:21 52:17 61:12 excited 6:1 20:14 28:15 enforcement 3:10 94:20 96:1 120:16 fact 23:20 36:16 67:5 62:21 63:3,14,17 65:4 exclusive 120:2 **findings** 31:16 81:6 84:2 93:8 94:4 65:5,15 70:6,7,13 **execute** 91:15 fine 96:13 103:8 114:18 facts 8:11 71:2 86:22 103:15 executing 33:18 114:22 115:22 fair 56:10 60:3 72:9 **exercise** 4:15 47:16 **finish** 74:2 104:6,9 81:11 87:6 engaged 52:10 81:18 48:8 106:15 finishing 10:12 fairly 78:15 89:17 **engagement** 40:11 46:9 exist 48:6 71:1 107:8 first 6:15 10:16 11:5 126:11,12 46:11 existing 105:14 19:5 34:17 44:10 falls 120:9 engaging 46:20 52:11 expand 100:21 101:8 47:16 48:8 77:15 79:1 familiar 5:20 45:6 97:20 engineering 32:8 102:16 81:8 83:1 85:21 94:18 98:14 engineers 12:11 expansive 58:17 95:6 99:2 116:17 famous 36:12 **enhance** 26:12 45:22 expect 44:8 119:14 123:5 far 21:14 78:22 94:7 **enhanced** 33:9 67:12 expectation 96:14 fiscal 39:21 46:19 48:10 101:12 102:16 enrich 100:21 **expecting** 13:20 41:4 fit 58:19 fault 104:2 **ensure** 32:14 65:5,10 fits 73:5 76:14 87:16 favorite 62:22 66:21 98:3 **expedite** 15:13.15 fittina 87:3 FCC 28:4 44:6 45:7 ensuring 11:13 **expense** 15:15 five 10:17 49:15 50:20 52:9 64:19 65:17 entities 70:14,14 81:18 expensive 53:9 102:15 66:11,12 67:11 68:10 experiencing 63:22 fix 84:8 114:2 69:17 70:2 71:2,8 entity 114:10,11 expert 32:6 fixed 25:8 39:15 72:6,16,17 73:1 86:6 entry 15:2,3,4 expertise 32:5 flaq 67:8 97:21 120:5,6 environment 22:12 experts 15:12,14 flagged 35:9 **FCC's** 73:4 62:16 99:9 100:17 explain 54:13 fleshing 46:16 91:9 feat 26:19 27:6 envisioned 45:22 explaining 62:18 flexibility 6:21 29:16 features 97:11 equipment 67:21 explicit 107:12 flexible 24:21 72:20 February 82:15 Erstwhile 53:21 explicitly 73:14 flight 7:22 26:12,16 federal 3:9,13 15:4,5 **especially** 32:17 89:10 exploding 25:15 27:5 29:2 40:19 41:1,6,9 **essence** 38:20 107:7 Exploration 3:18 **floor** 19:4 41:14 42:16,18,22 essential 8:10 32:9 **explore** 26:15 109:11 focus 6:9 8:8 20:21 43:16,22 44:6,15 essentially 25:6 40:19 exploring 31:1 27:22 36:5 41:2 45:3 49:11 55:22 56:19 establish 41:9 exportable 108:10 45:17 56:16,18 66:16 58:10 62:14 65:8 70:8 established 26:11,13 111:20 88:21 94:1,4,7 100:9 70:14 73:3,6,11,18 45:13 exporting 109:5 101:14,22 109:2 78:7 86:16,20 89:4,13 establishes 25:14 focused 19:13.20 21:12 express 8:1 101:2,2 120:2 estimate 48:13 **extend** 60:14 28:6 35:18 40:7 44:10 federal/non-federal et 12:9 37:19 40:12 55:2 extended 99:9 106:2 57:12,18 73:9 85:16 120:8 121:18 evaluation 118:3,4 107:9 85:20 88:15,21 90:17 Federated 16:13 event 125:9 extending 28:2 106:15 90:22 96:10 97:16 feds 89:3.8 **extension** 3:17 13:5 events 37:15 74:22 102:3 112:21 116:20 feedback 37:6 39:11 99:1 123:9 eventually 51:4 71:11 46:1 75:16 81:22 extensive 31:21 **focuses** 93:17 109:8 **feel** 15:14 30:11 40:14 everybody 8:2 15:16 extent 31:13 54:1 61:7 focusing 117:11 118:1 70:20 75:18 81:2,21 37:3 50:16 88:9 61:17 65:12 70:10 fold 33:7 Feld 2:6 16:14,14 34:20 115:22 123:5 89:9 101:17 106:1 folks 7:12,14 8:19 35:9 67:8 72:14 everybody's 58:15 115:13,19 20:19 21:20 23:9,10 119:19,20 116:4 extra 12:21 54:20 65:16 68:8 89:5 fellows 80:5 everyone's 86:15 **extremely** 23:15 59:2 123:14 125:16 felt 78:16 82:7 evolving 99:6 follow-on 90:2,3 63:6 fields 39:17

follow-up 67:16 71:20 followed 29:22 121:15 following 24:1 30:20 55:19 footnotes 24:11,21 force 52:14 foreign 114:7,10 forever 113:2 forgotten 21:10 form 14:4 31:9 83:21 101:9 formal 21:13,17 22:5,6 formalization 70:5 format 75:7 formed 117:22 former 5:8 61:15 forming 99:4 forms 14:6 95:5 forth 76:6 94:3 111:20 forum 8:12 40:11 45:6 45:13 102:19,21 103:1,5 115:18 118:9 forums 119:17 forward 8:17 22:4 26:8 28:12 29:11 30:16,20 33:11 44:2 45:17 65:18 66:22 71:18.21 75:12 89:17 93:1,19 95:12 114:18 126:14 forward-thinking 36:15 found 90:17 **foundation** 7:18 25:14 29:1 30:5 64:7 96:8 foundational 70:19 71:6 four 23:11 61:8 102:15 four-year 23:18 fourth 50:22 frame 33:6 41:8 64:22 82:13 framework 26:8 45:21 46:2,6,8,14,22 65:11 73:19 91:6 108:20 117:19 framing 64:12 frankly 57:21 68:12 free 40:14 frequencies 23:13 36:10 frequency 49:8 59:12 59:18 111:3 Friday 22:9 23:20 front 79:14 frontiers 28:5 **FTI** 17:7 fulfilling 77:5 full 38:7 43:19 functional 108:18

functions 32:14 **Fund** 29:15 fundamental 63:8 71:1 73:16 **funds** 29:16 further 26:15 98:9 **futile** 4:15 future 29:1 30:6 31:14 63:9 95:15,18,21 **FY** 3.6 **FY2016** 3:12

G **G-A-D-S-S** 26:18 **GADSS** 26:18 game 41:12 96:14 garage 4:18 Gen 117:21 general 3:9 50:11 60:1 91:3 124:13,14 generated 54:20 Generation 27:12 Geneva 23:21 gentleman 36:12 **geography** 49:8 59:12 59:18 geostationary 7:21 getting 15:10,16 40:10 66:16 68:10 81:22 90:18 103:21 114:13 **GHz** 3:15 **Gibson** 1:19 2:2 3:4,20 3:21 10:20 11:6 14:17 14:18 17:12,12 18:2,4 53:16,20 60:22,22 61:22 77:11,19,21 78:3 83:10,13,17 84:11 86:10,12 87:7 87:19 88:5 90:5,9 91:11,18 92:2,14 96:22 97:5,9,12 98:15 102:5,17 103:10,20 104:3,15,19 105:7,11 108:3,15 109:12 112:8,13,22 113:13 113:19 114:16,21 115:18 118:17,22 119:18 120:11 122:4 122:16,21 123:3,12 123:20 124:2,6,21 125:13 126:3,21 gigahertz 27:11,15,15 28:6 30:1 35:3,12 39:5 41:3 60:13 67:20 95:20 96:7 97:16 100:12 105:6 106:6 Giulia 5:6

give 4:10 10:5,13 21:3

36:21 56:2 82:9 117:18 122:9 given 12:18 35:10 55:1 77:5 82:12 gives 12:8 60:12,14 giving 92:15 93:2 glad 9:2 36:18 Glenn 2:16 3:2 4:9 9:2 17:10 19:10 29:9.20 33.1 Glenn's 22:14 global 7:22 23:8 26:12 26:17 29:3 96:9 globalized 24:14 globally 7:19 23:14 24:14 28:21 35:2 GMF-like 39:9 go 9:9,10,16 12:2,21 13:7,19 15:6,20,21 17:17 18:16 37:9 40:13 47:3 48:2 55:13 81:1 82:5 83:9 84:3 86:12 87:14 92:22 94:3 95:15 97:8 103:22 108:4 109:15 113:2 114:18 115:11 116:9.10 117:16 120:20,21 121:12 122:7 **goal** 11:19 14:11 19:21 95:2 **goals** 6:5 12:15 goes 72:15 80:4 114:12 going 4:22 5:19 10:5,13 11:9 13:13 19:4,5,17 21:6 36:21 39:12,19 41:2 43:7 46:15 50:11 56:22 61:3 67:6 69:6 70:10 71:13 74:1,1,5 74:13 77:8,9,14 78:2 78:14 80:14 82:12 84:3 88:21 89:8 90:13 90:21 92:4,4 95:20 96:4 97:20 98:18 100:7 103:2,4 105:21 106:22 108:16 109:18

110:8,10,13,21 111:5

111:12,19 112:1

115:7,13 117:19

118:1,8,18 122:7

good 4:5 12:17 19:6,9

35:15 53:22 55:18

80:8 87:19 91:19

92:11,11,12,13,13

96:6 101:22 102:1

103:4 104:11 106:15

60:14,20 61:20 66:3

69:13 76:8 79:16 80:7

109:12 112:2,8,8,9 115:5 116:4,4 119:17 122:6 124:6 125:14 126:17,20,21 gotten 13:18 82:16 **govern** 23:13 government 3:8 7:14 32:3,10 39:9 44:19 45:18 52:7 58:10 61:16 62:14 88:20 114:6 **GPS** 55:1 grab 9:20 20:22 gradual 43:3 graduation 43:3 **grant** 93:5,5 **Granted** 72:19 grateful 22:9 great 10:3 11:3 30:7 42:8,14 69:4,11 74:7 74:18 77:2 93:9 102:17 104:4 114:19 117:20 green 5:3 Gremban 5:19 18:18,18 ground 33:7 groundbreaking 25:13 29:3 36:9 **grounded** 96:7.9 group 5:2 6:6 13:7 34:11 37:17 40:5 45:5 45:5 52:21 53:21,22 56:15 62:2 80:16,18 88:21 90:11,16 92:9 92:20 93:9,12 96:6,19 99:2,3,15 100:1,7,12 100:19,22 101:6,11 101:17,21 116:15,17 117:22 118:2,3,5 119:17 groups 90:13 91:8 117:15 119:16 growing 26:9 growth 29:5 guess 13:10 18:13 **guests** 18:16 guidance 87:11,16 **guide** 70:13

Н

guys 78:11 89:7,7

98:17 104:7

H 1:19 2:2,10 half 49:20 halfway 15:6 hall 9:16 hallway 9:11 hang 108:3 126:2

happen 32:21 71:16 84:1 110:8,13 happening 110:7 **happens** 99:19 **happy** 10:4 11:9 19:22 85:12 91:15 98:20 125:20 hard 18:4 33:3 42:19 90:20 126:13 hardest 82:16 harmful 69:9 72:15,17 73:2,4,10 76:8 93:18 harmonization 35:1 111:7 **harmonized** 24:14,14 Harms 76:5 94:15 Harold 2:6 16:14 36:1 67:7 69:1 119:18,18 **Hatfield** 2:7 16:6,6 65:21 76:2,3 83:12,14 83:19 103:13 104:1 head 5:21 113:12 headed 123:18 headline 80:12 hear 18:5.6 51:21 115:3 hearing 5:6 heavily 96:2 held 23:11 79:1 help 9:12 29:18 30:2 44:2.8 45:16 46:21 52:9 64:9,11 81:5 89:1 91:2 98:5 100:6 101:7 helpful 60:21 61:10,18 67:2 75:18 119:4,11 helps 20:5 54:9 **Hi** 4:3 **hide** 97:10 high 10:9 28:10,18 35:8 60:15 116:20 121:13 high-interest 19:11 higher 27:20 28:1,9 55:11 highlight 31:19 33:21 38:1 43:10 45:1 115:8 Hill 19:12 30:18 58:2 74:10 historic 36:7 historically 32:6 120:19 hit 33:7 **hitting** 120:13 hold 74:1 81:9 holidays 126:20,21 holistic 64:12 homework 54:3 honest 92:17 honestly 74:4

hope 4:5 37:3 hopeful 62:8 82:20 hopefully 11:10 38:19 82:14 113:14 117:3 117:10 host 9:3 25:21 hosting 4:20 hot 127:3 hour 13:21,22 114:22 House 41:22 45:8 housekeeping 125:15 huge 94:17 humility 92:12,13 Hunter 80:14 hybrid 62:17

ICAO 26:5 idea 13:13 79:7,8,16 100:19 ideal 68:13 ideas 11:10 31:1 62:4.9 110:12 115:14 identification 24:4 29:21,22 69:7 identified 20:10.11 24:12,20 33:13 35:17 38:3,16 47:6,9 64:5 75:14 94:7 101:15 104:10 109:9 identify 27:10 45:8 64:15 69:11,14 81:7 93:21 95:13 100:14 119:5 120:20 121:14 identifying 7:7 71:9 ignorance 73:14 **Illinois** 17:5 immediately 23:22 impact 30:12,16 **impacts** 28:20 implementation 41:15 46:7,18 71:10 91:10 107:4 122:8,9 implementations 106:5 implemented 74:22 105:15 implementing 42:3 implication 67:22 implications 68:17 76:7 99:16 implicit 84:17 importance 58:20 81:21 important 5:1 6:5 8:9

9:6 20:7 23:15 27:7

59:2 63:6 82:8 95:21

30:11 32:17 34:12

97:17 107:11,18

108:11 109:1,2,10 121:6 importantly 32:2 imposed 69:8 improving 56:20 **IMT** 27:10 in-progress 48:20 50:22 incentive 24:22 incidents 27:5 68:12 include 33:17 40:8 45:15 49:4 59:11 61:17 65:2 75:4 86:21 91:8 115:15 included 29:20 46:8 49:15 117:2 includes 49:8 119:22 **including** 7:19 8:4 23:19 25:20 50:20 120:15 incorporate 62:8 103:7 115:14 incorporated 48:19 increased 6:20 45:9 **increasing** 8:7 76:16 increasingly 6:9 incudes 45:7 incumbents 106:20 indicated 20:16 indication 59:14 individuals 36:15 industry 3:8,14 28:17 44:19 45:18 46:21 61:4,10,16,18 88:8,18 88:20 97:22 inefficient 59:1 influence 110:10 information 1:2 2:17,21 5:13 15:10 39:7 41:20 41:21,21 42:13 48:14 49:10 53:2 60:20 73:21 74:8 81:4 86:2 89:18 98:1 125:12 informed 8:11 inherently 120:18 initial 34:2 51:2 88:12 117:6 initially 41:3 73:9 116:2 initiated 89:12 innovation 7:18 29:4 innovations 23:4 input 39:10 40:6 89:4 89:15 93:3,3 96:17 **inputs** 75:18 instance 59:16 instantiated 30:8 institute 5:21 17:5 31:5

108:14 insufficiently 56:1 integrate 37:15 Intel 16:17 intended 51:7 84:17 **intense** 22:11 intent 71:17 Interdepartment 37:18 interest 58:15 74:2 interested 27:18 31:17 46:15 112:3 125:7,9 interesting 25:3 40:1 53:18 62:3 77:12 interests 68:21 101:4 **interference** 32:1 56:22 63:21 65:10 67:10 68:2,4 69:9,10 70:17 72:15,18 73:3,4,5,10 76:9 93:18,22 94:14 intermittent 44:11 85:20 international 3:17 24:5 26:5 27:11 99:1,10,14 99:17 100:5,17 101:4 103:18 106:2 111:7 internationalization 105:2 internationally 27:21 113:22 114:5 interpret 54:19 interrupt 40:14 interview 102:12 interviews 100:20 101:5 102:11 introduce 17:18 18:17 introductions 3:3 18:21 invested 96:2 investment 95:16 involve 61:3 involved 21:5 23:10 80:19 114:3 involvement 61:11 isolated 44:12 issue 63:5,6 69:22 76:5 78:11 94:11 109:19 114:4 issues 9:7 13:16 34:5 42:12 46:12 64:10,11 65:1,22 67:10 71:1,10 75:11 84:2 85:1 107:4 111:15 115:8 121:14 item 19:2,11 23:16 26:14,20 27:1 39:22 45:10 49:15 64:17 99:5 105:3,5 117:21 121:7 items 19:3 25:6 31:20

institutional 101:19

35:8 44:22 100:16

J Janice 2:8 17:6 36:3 63:7 73:22 76:1 85:10 104:16 Janice's 105:8 **January** 82:14 89:14 January/February 82:13 **Japan** 118:11 **Jeff** 16:4 53:16 98:17 102:5,7,14 115:11 122:4 123:21 Jeffrey 2:10 3:17 **Jennifer** 2:13 18:9 21:8 85:10,13 108:4 109:9 109:19 112:2 Jennifer's 109:1 **job** 11:3 28:11 76:10 117:20 John 80:13 join 121:22 joined 5:11 33:5 **JR** 2:5,10 judgment 80:3 Julie 8:5 22:19 125:8 jump 116:11 jurisdictional 71:1

K

jut 47:6

keep 19:17 82:18 83:18 123:18 **keeping** 81:19 **keeps** 96:9 **Keith** 5:18,19,19 18:18 33:2,4,5 key 29:7 31:20 32:21 65:1 76:20 81:7 84:2 89:4 96:4 100:20 101:9 121:19 124:10 kicked 10:15,16 11:2 22:7 kicking 20:14 kickoff 11:5 23:21 88:12 kidding 77:12 **kind** 6:3 10:11 13:1,3 15:17 42:11 49:14 71:6 79:10 83:14 86:3 115:15 117:18 124:4 kinds 44:11 59:15 71:10 111:16 kitchen 9:14,16 **Knauer** 1:17 17:9 knew 79:15 know 7:5,12 10:13,21 11:7 12:15 13:12

52:15 57:21 59:21,22 62:2 64:18 65:16 66:21 69:22 70:15 72:21 74:9 76:9 77:2 79:7 83:6 86:13 87:22 90:10 95:17,22 98:10 102:13,13,21 103:17 107:6 109:5 110:18 112:4,13,17 113:17 114:13 119:9 122:13 123:14,17 125:19 126:9 knowledge 16:15 83:20

100:21 101:8

Kolodzy 92:16

Korea 118:10

Kubik 2:7 3:18 17:3,3
 116:10 118:15,20
 119:13 120:4 121:10
 121:22

Kurt 2:11 3:17 16:12

L

98:17 102:13 112:14

115:4 119:2,3

L 2:6,10

L-band 24:20

La 8:5 **LAA** 113:10 lab 36:16 laboratory 31:7 language 67:22 large 70:10 largely 23:4 29:12 71:14 99:4 100:21 101:8 102:3 larger 26:2 **Larry** 1:19 2:2 3:2,21 4:7,11,12 15:8 17:11 20:16 34:3 90:9 126:19 Larry's 8:1 latest 20:12 Laughter 9:8 17:22 63:18 85:7 93:10 106:11 112:12 law 86:22 lavs 30:4 lead 70:4 71:9 98:21 100:15 **leadership** 8:4 22:20 leading 80:15 learn 14:1 55:6,7 **leave** 11:12,20 34:6 **leaves** 12:3 **led** 67:4 89:2

leeway 122:9

left 83:11

30:10,19 lens 20:7 let's 11:18 15:20 17:14 43:6 62:21 77:13 level 10:9 15:17 48:3 60:15 89:11 121:11 121:13 levels 46:11 58:20 leverage 28:13 45:4 **liaison** 91:11 liaisons 10:18 66:10 116:14 license 119:22 120:2 licensed 120:7 licenses 81:9 lies 95:17 life 104:20 light 5:3 39:16 **lights** 127:2 limitations 67:13 limited 59:12 119:21 **limits** 94:14 line 11:21 12:11.18 20:17 25:10 26:2 27:3 32:12 42:20 77:14 113:7 123:10 lines 41:17 links 25:8 list 15:14 40:6,10 78:19 102:15 listing 45:1 literally 25:16 92:19 little 4:6 14:20 41:12 50:3 54:1 75:21 76:19 111:9 lives 23:5 28:20 **LLP** 1:17 lobby 68:20 **local** 95:6 lock 34:4 68:9 locked 11:13,18 91:22 123:11 logical 75:7 logistics 9:5 long 49:21 125:17

long-range 25:9

longer 14:20 84:19 85:3

35:22 39:2,12 41:10

46:12 64:8 71:11,22

100:13 106:4,14,20

112:18 126:14 127:3

91:1 96:8 98:11

108:7 110:1,14

42:1,2 43:13 45:15

look 12:4 27:20 30:20

long-term 86:4

leftover 90:12

legislation 6:18 7:4

looked 49:7 80:1 111:22 looking 8:17 37:7 44:3 44:13 46:15 55:8 57:4 65:22 69:4 70:18,22 84:18 93:19 101:18 105:14,19 114:5,5,7 115:19 119:16 looks 73:17 loss 27:4 lost 40:16 **lot** 6:11 12:15,16,21 21:14 27:17 30:17 40:1 41:19 42:22 49:21 52:5 55:17,22 60:20 62:3 66:7 74:7 74:9 77:12 81:20 87:22 99:13 101:13 102:20 111:18 114:15 118:8 126:9,15 low 28:10 116:21 lower 24:22 30:2 **LSA** 113:10 luck 126:17 **lucky** 4:9

M

M 1:18 maintain 20:5 major 7:10.13.15 21:7 33:18 48:2 50:5 majorly 75:21 maker 125:20,21 making 7:5 19:17 32:21 40:1 109:3 Malaysian 27:4 manage 114:11 management 1:3,5 3:7 5:12 26:16 33:16 38:15 99:10 100:5 managing 5:15 20:1 **Manual** 43:14,15 manufacturers 68:21 map 38:8 mapping 38:8 marathon 22:11 March 12:5 82:20 89:19 126:15 Mariam 2:12 3:18 18:7 116:8,11,14 118:12 Mark 1:19 2:2,5,8 3:20 3:21 11:3,16 14:18 16:18,19 17:12 20:16 60:22 69:3 77:9 80:10 80:11,11 83:5 96:3,13 103:11 113:15 Mark's 70:15

15:10 40:3 51:10 52:4

market 26:9

markets 108:9 Martin 2:4 17:19,21 **Martin's** 18:1 **master** 39:9 material 103:9 Matt 66:10,11 matter 50:11 60:1 127:6 **Matthew** 51:21 maturity 99:15 105:22 maximize 15:18 **McHENRY** 2:8 5:7 16:19,19 54:12 55:3 mean 37:16 52:4 56:8 69:11 70:19 84:20 104:11 106:10,12,14 108:18,20 109:1 meandered 90:21 meaning 112:7 means 56:20 94:16 110:14 meant 80:16 86:17,19 88:1 measure 53:4 54:10 55:5,10,10 106:22 measured 60:3 measurement 3:15 47:4,12,15,18 53:1,8 54:13 55:7,18 61:6 93:16 94:8,12,21 measurements 48:4,5 49:4 52:17 53:11 54:22 57:4,5 61:4 92:6 Measurements/Quan measuring 52:7 66:19 94:20 95:19 meat 46:17 91:5 126:16 mechanism 94:20 mechanisms 22:3 26:12 37:20 39:4 63:13 64:3,5,6 65:13 73:17 medium 86:3 meet 24:15 96:19 123:7 meeting 1:7 10:10,16 11:8,12,12,19 12:5,8 12:9 14:10 19:10 29:8 37:5 38:19 40:18 48:15 63:7 64:19,21 77:9 79:1,13 82:4,5 82:22 84:16 87:17 96:12 125:11 126:14 meetings 11:5 12:3 78:22 80:18 81:2 82:11,12 87:12 90:3,3 90:4 92:22 117:9 megahertz 7:6,7 19:21

21:18.19 24:13.17 29:22 47:20 51:1 97:18 member 2:3,3,4,4,5,5,6 2:6,7,7,8,8,9,9,10,10 2:11,11,12,12,13 5:8 9:6,9 16:1,2,4,6,8,10 16:12,14,16,18,19,21 17:1,3,4,6,8,21 18:3,6 18:8,10 34:20 35:9 36:4 49:11,17 50:7,10 50:18 51:13,20 52:3 52:16 53:12,19 54:12 55:3,15,16,17 56:6,7 56:14 57:3,7,9,11,14 57:15,20 58:14,16 59:9,20 60:8 65:21 66:6 67:3,8 69:3,20 71:19 72:4,9,14 76:2 77:18,20 78:1,4 83:8 83:12,14,19,22 84:12 84:20 85:5,9,11 86:5 86:9,17 87:1,6,15,21 88:7 90:15 91:16,20 92:8,16 93:11 97:4,7 97:10 98:12.20 102:9 102:14.18 103:3.13 104:1,12,17,21 105:9 105:12,20 106:9,12 106:21 107:10,16,17 108:1,5,22 109:16 112:15 113:6,14,20 114:17 115:10,12 116:10 118:14,15,20 119:3,13,20 120:4,12 121:10,20,22 122:2,5 123:22 124:3,8,14,16 124:20 125:5,15 members 17:14,18 22:16 78:19 81:10 83:3 93:5 membership 13:6,11 15:20 118:16 memo 48:18 mention 31:3 64:18 mentioned 19:10 20:18 29:20 33:1 48:15 52:16 94:14 mentioning 81:8 mesh 66:17,18 met 1:16 10:19 11:1 92:10 93:8 99:2 116:12,17 117:8

meteorology 25:21

methodology 12:12

49:6 50:17 53:7

metric 56:17

methodologies 55:20

metrology 61:5 mic 18:21 Michael 2:3,4 17:1 84:11,12 85:11 114:19 mid 28:10 mid-5G 116:21 mid-term 98:6 middle 115:2 middleware 67:21 68:1 Mike 16:16 103:11 104:15,20 milestone 7:10 milestones 6:13 8:7 millimeter 36:9 117:1 mind 81:19 94:13 95:5 Mindel 8:5 **minimum** 12:19 minor 80:22 minute 4:8,13 15:2 108:4 minutes 13:21,22 20:13 **missed** 19:1 34:20 78:21 84:15,16 missina 18:14 98:4 mission 19:20 92:3 misunderstood 52:18 mitigation 64:10 mix 95:11 mixed 120:1 **mixture** 28:10 mobile 7:20 24:5,5,16 27:11 111:2 model 106:16 120:1 modeling 32:1 models 105:16,17 122:10 modify 93:7 Molina 18:20,20 **moment** 45:11 momentum 34:9 **monies** 6:22 monitoring 93:20 monopoly 114:6 month 21:13 months 6:2,10,14 7:15 13:1 33:5 34:9 43:12 63:12 64:22 67:16 85:3 90:20 100:8 104:8 113:1 126:10 morning 57:16 **MOU** 65:13 move 22:4 26:8 30:16 33:10 38:14 40:15 43:6 44:18 45:17 62:21 65:18 66:22 71:17,20 72:12 75:12

metrics 50:12 60:3

89:16 93:19 95:16 97:17 111:20 120:15 moving 44:2 117:7 muddier 123:17 multi-layered 63:6 91:7 multi-tiered 46:8 multiple 25:19 45:15

Ν

N 2:7

name 13:18 14:7 89:6 narrow 93:17 94:1,4 116:18 narrowly 112:21 National 1:2 2:16,20 31:4 33:8 nature 41:18 70:17 106:3 naught 76:9 near 98:5 near-term 24:15 26:20 **necessarily** 52:4 54:5 72:5 101:6 105:21 necessary 78:20 need 9:9 13:22 15:14 19:18 24:15 28:10 32:14 41:1,9,12 42:15 51:9 58:8 63:9 65:13 66:1.15 68:15 74:5 76:18 81:12 94:19 98:8 107:5 110:14 111:21 121:11,14 125:18,22 126:2 needed 27:10 41:6 44:4 79:10 80:19 95:16,17 needs 26:16 39:18 101:4 103:16 negotiation 23:19 network 120:16 121:2 networking 122:14 networks 7:22 120:16 **never** 19:7,8 nevertheless 72:22 new 4:12,18,22 5:5,21 10:17,17,17,18 11:10 11:10 14:11 16:8 17:2 20:14 21:2 25:15 28:13 32:22 34:3 38:2 75:1 77:10 126:11,12 newly 117:22 nice 66:9 115:1 **Nigeria** 110:19 night 122:12 **NIST** 31:6 **nod** 117:6 **nodding** 113:11 non-federal 3:13 43:18 44:7,15 58:11 65:8

70:8 73:18 78:8 82:2 non-geostationary 7:21 non-government 7:14 normal 21:4 37:15 note 6:12 7:2 28:7 **noted** 32:2 **notice** 82:9 notion 95:19 120:17 121:4 notional 62:15 121:4 November 23:20 **NPRM** 28:5,5 NTIA 4:22 6:17 8:15 15:22 17:10 18:19,20 32:13,20 33:12 34:1 40:5 42:10 43:13,15 48:16 55:19 66:12 70:2 71:2 72:6 78:17 80:5,17 83:22 84:13 87:11 91:13,15 95:4 97:21 100:6,16 101:17 116:14 117:5 NTIA's 5:8 31:5 **NTIA/OSM** 3:7 nuclear 50:5 number 9:12 10:10 40:16 68:8 81:11 88:13 numbers 24:6,7 60:16 **NW** 1:18 0

objective 73:1 objectivity 32:4 56:2 58:5 obscure 36:11 **observe** 36:6,8 observes 56:4 Obuchowski 2:8 17:6,6 36:4 51:13,20 52:3 55:15,17 56:7 57:3,9 57:14,20 58:14 85:11 104:17 **obvious** 80:13 106:18 obviously 32:20 38:21 43:8 52:5 65:17 66:2 69:21 76:6 83:3 occupancy 3:9 48:3,14 49:3 52:22 53:21 54:9 62:4,5,13 occur 72:7 occurred 6:13 occurring 64:9 occurs 65:10 ocean 113:17 117:4 **October** 64:22 **offer** 60:9 office 1:3 5:11 33:16

offices 1:17 **Oh** 49:17,19 55:12 83:12 86:12 124:2,3,6 124:14 126:7 okay 5:4 10:1 13:3 15:19 18:22 43:4 44:18 47:3 49:19 50:7 50:10 53:19 57:9,14 61:2,22 62:21 72:4,9 73:22 74:6 76:21 78:3 85:5 86:9 91:12,19 92:2,4,5,16 97:2,5 98:15 103:17 104:3 104:19 105:11 109:12 109:15 113:12 115:5 115:22 116:5 120:20 122:16 124:2,15,20 125:4 **Olympics** 118:10,19 Omni 55:4 on-going 37:12 onboard 32:22 once 10:19 11:1 38:7 79:22 85:22 114:4 one-size-fits-all 28:8 ones 79:22 80:1 ongoing 33:20 38:8 40:11 44:21 45:6,12 75:5 97:18 online 21:16 open 67:20,21 68:1,4 68:18 106:13 125:11 opening 3:2,3 4:10 10:5 14:15 operating 37:16 **operation** 67:11,20 operational 99:18 operationally 19:18 **operations** 5:15 29:2 opportunities 7:19 20:8 28:13 **opportunity** 3:19 123:7 opposed 116:21 optimistic 30:15 optimization 95:6,7 optimize 58:12

option 7:6 95:12

orbital 23:15

33:10

74:11

116:18

options 95:11 119:7

order 13:4,21 67:15

organization 26:6

organizational 79:2

organizations 31:1,8

original 85:16 100:2

82:10 96:20 109:13

outreach 12:16 89:12 outside 84:3 120:14 outstanding 116:15 over-aggressive 67:18 Overall 25:1 overcome 37:14 74:21 overhead 110:20 overheated 52:6 overlaid 49:9 overlap 66:3 103:4 overlapping 89:11 overseas 110:3 111:3 111:19 overtime 75:21,21 overview 76:22 Р P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S **p.m** 1:19 4:2 127:7 **pack** 57:1 page 78:19 116:13,16 117:7,18 Paige 2:19 3:5,7 6:10 8:6,14,22 10:13 11:16 15:22 19:4 36:21 74:2 76:22 78:8 79:5 97:14 105:1 106:20 115:6 115:10 117:20 122:18 126:9,16 Paige's 56:10 79:3 paper 43:20 parallel 22:7 41:11 72:3 72:7 parlance 105:3 part 22:17 29:10 31:11 32:16 47:6 53:2 67:14 73:16,19 82:16 121:6 121:21 PARTICIPANT 52:1,13 participated 22:17 participating 116:15 participation 88:14 particular 8:3 22:18,20 30:14 35:8,10 39:4 49:12 62:10 68:2 88:2 91:1 98:7 100:10 102:22 103:4 105:22 particularly 6:20 19:12 21:7 23:9 27:12 30:3 35:18 42:9 44:9 68:8 68:18 70:3 97:19

Orsulak 79:15

outcome 25:2

output 119:12

outputs 77:4

outlining 117:20

outline 101:12 102:6

114:10 **parties** 88:13 partners 30:21 partnership 33:17 117:15 pass 8:21,22 password 9:21 13:19 14:7.8 path 70:13 101:6 121:13 **Paul** 92:16,19 97:3 **PCAS** 122:12 peel 65:5 76:18 penalties 69:8 **people** 9:12 17:17 23:21 36:10 66:1 72:21 93:12 95:7,9 102:12 110:2 111:1 126:2 people's 28:20 **Pepper** 18:12 perform 47:21 48:17 performing 48:16 permanent 85:3 permits 39:6 personal 93:3 personally 14:10 96:2 personnel 45:8 **perspective** 20:6 23:8,9 29:15 59:18 68:16 95:19 pervasive 44:14 78:9 78:13 79:11 84:21 85:22 pessimistic 53:13 petition 44:5 **phase** 44:10,13 phone 17:15,16,17 18:5 18:14 111:2 116:9 126:4.5 **phones** 111:2 physical 32:5 picture 13:4 58:12 86:2 **piece** 6:18 Pierre 66:1 76:11 pipeline 6:16 29:9 30:6 30:12 pivotal 26:8 **place** 65:6,11 places 109:20 111:8 112:3 plan 11:22 38:5 46:7 48:21 50:21 51:1,2 75:12 91:10 102:10 103:6 117:7,12,17 **planes** 35:20 planning 2:20 7:1 22:2 29:17 33:9 118:9

plans 37:17 45:4 57:17 predominately 38:6 118:4 87:8,14,20 88:15 90:7 proposed 47:14 94:9 **platforms** 26:2 28:18 50:2 90:9,22 91:17,21,22 players 4:22 preliminary 37:6 41:7 94:16 93:15,17 99:6 100:2 102:1,18 104:5 105:1 **playing** 104:16 82:19,21 101:12 proposing 95:9 **plays** 20:4 **PRESENT** 2:1,14 proprietary 42:12 105:13 106:13 107:6 presentation 104:22 please 33:3 40:14 54:20 protecting 39:6 108:10,17 110:9 75:19 121:22 123:17 113:20 114:3,15 116:13 protection 61:10 Plenipot 27:3 presenting 52:1 **protects** 106:19 116:1,16,19,20,22 plenty 5:14 President's 29:12 48:18 117:5 124:1,5 **prove** 109:8 plots 60:18 provide 6:19 32:15 presiding 1:20 questioning 104:17 plug 125:14 press 23:2 provided 6:21 questions 3:12 8:18 point 15:2,3,4,9 22:11 presuming 103:1 109:7 provider 32:9 9:17,22 10:18 11:13 35:15 36:7 42:16 58:7 pretend 109:5 **provides** 7:4 30:13 11:15,18 20:15 21:3 59:8 62:2 70:16 82:15 pretty 11:21 21:14 providing 78:18 33:3 34:3,5,6,17,18 83:20 86:7 89:14,16 46:20 53:17,22 60:14 Provisions 6:16 43:5,9 44:16 45:21 89:21 91:22 98:1 66:5 117:11 provoking 69:9 47:1 52:20 55:12 101:21 104:5,11 preventing 62:6 **public** 3:19 16:14 31:22 62:20 65:20 72:1 74:3 108:16,16 109:1,4,10 preview 37:6 39:6 51:7 52:12 60:2 75:17,17,22 78:16 109:12,18,22 112:2 previous 7:3 79:19,22 80:2,12 82:6 86:10 87:7 91:13 115:5 119:13,17 previously 24:8 81:17 82:1,1 83:20 92:5 97:2 98:16 113:7 121:15 122:6 124:22 primarily 79:19 82:5 84:10 86:14,15,18,20 114:9 116:2,3,6 86:21 124:22 125:1,3 118:17 122:17 123:11 **pointed** 96:13 primary 5:16 pointing 36:2 **prime** 28:3 125:11 126:6 123:16 126:11 points 80:22 113:15 **priori** 61:11 public-facing 46:9 queue 108:2 121:19 124:11,13 **priorities** 7:19 21:11 quick 74:7 78:6 105:12 publicly 84:8 policies 42:3 25:12 47:8.10 75:11 **publish** 51:10 quickly 72:11 76:2,4,16 policing 63:16 prioritization 45:14 published 31:5 48:20 89:17 policy 2:20 6:9 8:8 prioritize 45:9 publishes 103:5 quiet 21:14 37:17 42:1 45:4 71:10 priority 21:12 24:2 35:8 publishing 38:10 quite 38:12 46:10 58:2 94:14 40:6 65:16 **pulling** 103:8 104:9 politely 67:17 **private** 32:4,11 68:17 purely 54:5,10 79:1 R **pop** 75:11 114:2.11 **purpose** 58:19 population 49:9 probably 7:5 15:1 39:14 purposes 58:20 **R** 3:5,7 portal 13:12,14,16 40:3 51:13 58:3 64:18 **pursuing** 51:15 **R&D** 7:1 40:4 14:18 15:1 21:17,18 82:2 84:14 96:18 **push** 103:21.22 radar 35:5,18 49:22 portals 21:16 102:15 107:13 109:2 put 46:17,21 65:6 81:3 50:1,3 59:17 63:21 89:17 91:5 113:3 portion 50:2 53:6 111:11 115:12 119:14 radars 49:22 **pose** 51:14 **problem** 113:15 putting 77:6 radio 19:13 21:5 22:7 posed 52:21 proceed 10:7 92:22 23:12,13 31:22 37:18 Q **position** 42:10 92:15 95:12 50:4 63:15 positive 28:20 process 15:13 22:2 **Q2** 40:10 radios 58:22 possible 7:8 12:19 25:18 30:5 46:5,8 **Q3** 39:20 rain 4:6 raise 70:9 114:9 51:12 80:20 122:10 47:14 61:12 91:2 quantification 47:4,13 110:22 120:5 126:11 47:19 48:21 49:8 51:6 raised 36:19 68:12 84:2 124:9 post 75:7 processes 70:5 51:9,18 55:18 raises 104:11 posted 31:17 46:14 productive 82:11 90:19 quantified 49:6 range 27:14 35:18 51:2 99:4 quantify 50:12 52:22 49:22 potential 30:18 35:12 progressed 122:15 53:21 58:10 Rath 2:9 3:14 16:1,1 44:4 45:2,16 63:13 project 48:13 54:8 quantifying 76:10 77:18 78:1,4 83:22 68:9 86:6,6 projecting 49:3 84:20 85:9 86:17 87:1 quantitative 48:17 potentially 86:8 105:16 **promise** 78:2 107:11 55:20 59:10 60:19 87:6,15,21 **Povelites** 2:9 16:10,10 promote 31:1 quarter 46:18 102:3 Raytheon 16:22 109:17 practical 20:21 promptly 65:9 quarters 39:2 reach 20:19 81:13 practice 37:16 pronouncing 57:17 question 40:13 42:5 reached 25:5 89:6 practices 26:7 propagation 31:22 44:8 51:22 53:6 55:13 reaching 15:9 precedent 83:18 **proper** 94:20 55:14,21 72:12,16 reaction 67:11 predictable 51:14 71:16 74:1 78:14,15 84:13 read 31:18 53:16 54:2 properly 15:16 103:14 **proposals** 11:15 113:11 84:14 85:10 86:11 64:6 78:14

Rich 79:15 87:17 readout 6:11 34:21 124:14,16,20 101:13 103:6 115:17 89:19.19 referenced 92:10 117:17 122:13 RICHARD 2:10 ready 4:4 reflection 105:10 Reports 3:12 Rick 16:21 109:14,15 real 64:8 72:11 76:2 **reform** 67:14 representative 98:13 109:16 112:16 113:3 realize 21:10 111:17 reforms 29:14 30:4 represented 68:2 right 9:11 10:2 18:14 19:2 22:3 35:9 46:11 realized 116:17 regard 35:1,11 41:7 representing 66:11,12 really 10:3,4,15 11:9 42:4 67:9,11,19 68:11 88:88 74:13,17 75:12 77:12 12:10 19:7 20:20 26:8 69:18 72:14,18 **repurposing** 7:8 45:16 77:13,14,17,22 78:1 27:6 28:15 32:1 37:22 regarding 31:13 70:1 request 39:11 79:6 84:6 87:19 88:5 38:1 42:10 43:15 regardless 110:8 90:5 91:15 96:22 requested 80:21 44:10 55:8,10 56:14 regards 105:1 require 61:9 98:17 103:11 104:13 required 12:21 40:20 56:17 59:4,17 63:8 regime 113:9 114:8 105:7 107:13,16 64:2,4,8 66:8 71:14 region 99:20,21 41:14 42:20,20 48:13 113:14 123:20 126:3 78:9 79:1,9 80:19 regions 24:10 requirement 29:21 43:2 126:6,7 81:16,21 82:6 84:21 regular 96:12 117:9 requirement/not 43:2 rights 44:6 requirements 20:2 30:2 84:22 85:19 88:16 regulations 23:12 **road** 15:6 90:19,19,20 100:1,7 72:18 44:11,12,14 49:5 roadmap 41:16 **Rob** 17:3 116:8 109:1 111:8 116:1 regulator 101:19 85:17,21,22 86:4,21 regulatory 25:14 26:7 **Roberson** 2:11 3:16 121:15 122:6 118:3 realm 117:3 26:11,15 44:4 88:17 research 12:22 29:17 17:4,4 55:16 56:6,14 **reap** 27:19 105:15,17 108:14,20 31:12,14 32:18 36:9 57:7,11,15 58:16 66:6 40:2,7 95:15,22 reapply 39:13 110:15 67:3 92:8,16 93:11 Reaser 2:10 16:21,21 **Rein** 16:3 resolved 85:6 97:4,7,10 98:12 109:16,16 reinforces 8:8 resolving 94:11 102:18 113:6,14 reason 11:20 79:4 resource 75:10 120:12.12 121:20 reinvigorating 6:3 97:16 reiterate 22:18 38:18 resource-intensive 122:2 reasons 58:3 74:16 relate 121:17 53:9 Robert 2:7 3:18 18:12 80:13 98:2 related 26:6 37:12 resources 32:5 47:8,11 **Robert's** 18:13 recall 31:8 37:5 46:7 73:14 75:1 115:8 respect 8:15 14:17 robustly 46:21 76:20 74:20 87:2 relates 62:15 73:10 70:13 role 5:15 7:13,15 20:4 receive 55:1.4 104:22 **respond** 37:20 42:14 48:2 received 78:5 relative 99:15 responding 74:14 **roll** 10:7 13:11 15:20 receiver 56:15 62:15 relatively 5:20 32:22 response 20:12 33:13 room 6:8 33:2 125:18 **recognize** 4:21 5:7 relay 50:4 34:2,2 56:11 67:18 roughly 12:3 49:21 recognized 31:21 32:3 relevance 35:11 75:14 112:16 round 8:18 recommend 31:17 91:2 relevant 23:6 responses 8:18 10:14 rulemaking 44:5 rules 65:6 70:5 relief 25:20 12:9 34:14 36:22 42:9 recommendation 34:22 41:5,7 47:17 54:17 Relocation 29:14 77:1 run 20:22 35:20 61:21 63:13,15 64:4 remain 21:12 responsibilities 5:17 rundown 78:7 82:19 80:7 remaining 34:4,5 rest 10:8 running 33:7 75:20 recommendations 3:6 remains 19:11 32:15 restatement 100:2 runs 121:2 7:3,3 8:16 10:14 12:7 remarks 3:2,21 4:10 restaurant 115:1 runway 35:21 20:12,22 31:13,16 10:6 14:15 122:19 restrained 39:16 S 33:14 34:2,15 36:22 126:8 **restroom** 9:7.10 37:1,7,10,12,21 38:9 remedies 70:15 result 27:4 117:13 **S** 2:4,5 38:18,20 47:2,5 56:8 remedying 92:21 resulting 43:20 **safe** 126:21 65:14 74:12,21 75:4,6 remember 38:20 44:10 results 33:8 51:5 safety 26:6,18 27:7 75:15 77:1,3,7 82:22 52:22 104:8 109:13 117:21 125:7 31:22 79:19,22 80:2 85:16 89:1 95:4 112:14 116:3 124:4 reverse 110:13 80:13 81:17 82:1 101:16,18 remembers 36:14 reviewed 11:16 86:18,20,21 recommended 45:3 remind 21:20 23:9 **revise** 117:5 **Samsung** 17:3 record 11:22 127:7 93:16 revised 33:9 **SAS** 41:6,10,14 42:16 reminder 97:15 **revises** 23:12 **recovery** 3:10 74:7,9 42:18,22 98:18 Redskins 122:22 rendering 113:8 revolutionize 25:19 113:10 Reed 2:10 3:17 5:10 **rephrase** 116:21 reworded 11:14 sat 15:11 42:17 rephrasing 100:1 116:1 **Reynolds** 2:16 3:2 4:9 16:4,4 52:16 53:12,19 satellite 7:22 23:14 102:9 103:3 115:12 report 3:6 48:20 50:22 4:11 17:10,10 25:8 55:3 122:5 123:22 124:3,8 53:17 63:4 67:6 82:21 rhetoric 55:22 58:1,5 saw 80:1

saying 36:10 65:13 separately 33:15 sincerely 34:10 80:6 87:22 105:9 sequential 41:18 **single** 79:20 115:3 serious 93:12 96:17 sit 13:22 81:2 says 126:16 service 25:8 site 25:10 118:21 scared 111:11 services 29:19 32:9 sitting 5:10 66:9 scenarios 100:13 72:19 **situation** 64:16 110:4 **Schaubach** 2:11 3:17 serving 96:3 **six** 6:1 12:22 80:8 85:3 set 7:17 9:18 20:2 22:2 104:7 113:1 16:12,12 98:20 102:14 104:12 105:20 23:3 25:15 27:9 29:1 six-month 12:10 skeleton 117:10 106:21 107:16 112:15 34:15 36:11 37:1 38:7 115:10 119:3,3 43:9 44:8 56:21 89:14 slide 36:20 37:9 38:14 92:22 98:1 125:20 schedule 82:17 88:10 40:16,16 43:6 44:18 schedules 89:22 sets 20:14 47:4,4 science 28:18 setting 80:18 81:1 slightly 109:3 **Sciences** 31:4,6 33:8 82:17 **slots** 23:15 scope 20:19 43:15 44:1 shameless 125:6 slow 96:14 79:6 85:18 96:9 102:1 **shape** 45:17 **small** 25:22 90:12 share 14:13 57:1 58:18 104:5 105:5 107:15 **smaller** 81:14 91:8 120:5,9 123:9 88:1 **smart** 29:14 second 26:22 45:20 **shared** 16:20 65:9 **smartly** 20:18 47:15 64:17 79:13,19 **sharing** 3:8,10,11 13:15 snapshot 60:14 108:11 116:12 32:18 40:7 43:7 44:7 software 12:11 120:16 secondary 43:17 44:14,15,17 65:2,7 solid 29:1 30:9 64:7 Secretary 64:20 70:8,10 74:6,8,20 **somebody** 36:5 39:11 sector 22:16 32:4,11 86:3 99:8.14 100:17 78:21 68:17 86:14.15 101:4 103:6 115:15 someplace 103:17 114:11 119:21,22 120:2,7 somewhat 25:4 36:17 see 8:17 20:6 22:9 121:18 39:15 44:12 53:12 25:22 27:21 30:13,17 **Sharkey** 80:14 62:16 68:19 72:2,20 34:7 36:13 38:4,12 **sheet** 9:19,20 73:13 94:4 98:14 39:12 40:15 41:17 shift 27:22 43:7 soon 117:11 50:18 58:12 70:16 shining 22:10 sophisticated 51:17 71:7 74:19 76:19 77:2 **short** 11:21 35:17 85:5 111:10 112:11 83:2 90:1 91:9 100:3 86:3 88:10 Sorond 2:12 3:18 18:8 101:11 105:7 115:13 short-range 35:5 118:14 125:12 short-term 26:13 44:11 **sorry** 10:21 59:10 83:12 **seeing** 5:13 27:22 47:9 84:19 85:17,20 86:19 104:1 124:2 seen 5:18 60:10 66:11 shorter 85:1 **sort** 4:13 6:2 61:11 segments 49:20 shouted 91:20 65:22 70:13,21,22 selected 25:8 102:10 showcases 118:10 71:22 80:12 82:17 send 4:11 14:6 75:19 shown 116:22 83:21 89:3,22 90:2,4 **shows** 14:22 116:13 124:18 90:18 91:1 101:7 senior 8:3 40:4 side 58:11 80:13 81:8 114:6 115:20 119:5 sense 43:21 46:1.3 81:17,22 82:1,2 88:22 119:12 60:19 62:19 66:3 127:4 **sorted** 111:5 69:17 110:15 sideboard 78:6 sorting 95:1 sensing 3:15 31:22 sides 70:11 71:15 **soul** 92:11,12 92:7 93:16,20 95:20 sounds 18:15 **sight** 26:3 99:7,16 100:4,11 sign 14:5 103:22 source 56:15 67:21,21 112:19 significant 6:9 27:18 68:1,4,18 Sensing/Spectrum 28:12 29:15 **space** 28:17,18 102:20 99:1 significantly 98:5 110:18 112:5 113:9 sensitive 39:7 similar 51:16 56:3 80:2 113:18 127:1,2 sensor 94:8,12 113:7 114:8 **Spaces** 106:6 114:20 similarly 52:10,11 sensors 94:21 **speak** 32:7 51:3 sent 13:12 110:6 117:5 **simply** 8:8 68:15 **speaking** 56:13 73:13 separate 73:2 79:18 Simultaneous 56:13 83:16 85:8 125:8 99:20 83:16 85:8 specific 6:12 43:10

49:16 72:1,5 74:15 94:2 100:9,13,15 101:3,14 102:4 106:5 specifically 7:2 24:19 43:14 45:5 65:7 98:3 115:9 124:12 specifications 118:5 specifics 68:11 **spectrum** 1:3,5 2:20 3:5 3:7,9,10,16 5:11,12 6:8,15 7:1,6,8 8:8 16:20 19:5,8,10 24:4 24:15,17,19 27:10,17 28:3,5,11,13 29:8,13 29:14,17,18 30:6,12 31:2,15,22 32:7,18 33:16 35:12 38:15 40:4,17,20 41:1,21 42:1 43:18 44:7,15 45:5 55:22 56:4,15,17 56:18,19 57:4,5,5 58:10,19,22 59:2,10 60:11 62:4,6,7 65:2 74:6,8 76:22 93:19 95:20 98:22 99:8.10 100:5 101:2 103:6 115:15 119:22 120:3 121:18 **speculate** 58:4 71:12 spend 81:20 spent 114:15 split 79:18 80:9 **spoke** 29:9 **sprint** 12:13 **spur** 29:4 **SRF** 6:21 29:16 30:4 staff 2:16 110:1 stakeholder 100:20 stakeholders 8:12 81:7 81:11 84:3 101:2 stand 11:1 standardization 118:7 122:10 standards 26:6 99:17 115:8 117:14 119:10 **standpoint** 27:8 46:13 47:13 51:19 66:4 107:1 108:19 star 102:6 start 4:16 21:2,9 38:15 39:14 44:3 46:18 64:11 117:11 started 4:4 21:13 22:6 37:13 46:5,16 62:12 starting 60:13 98:1 110:5 **starts** 23:22

state 103:5 105:18 successful 21:11 22:1 tag 98:18 tend 120:14 statement 79:4 22:3,21 25:1,5 106:16 tail 49:1 62:11 tended 57:11 **States** 1:1 22:22 108:8 successfully 20:1 take 6:12 14:20 28:12 tent 83:11,18 113:3 113.22 105:15,17 123:11,14 37:8 38:5 41:10 43:13 term 84:19 85:1,6 **static** 95:14 sucked 96:3 58:5 69:2,18 100:13 116:19 stay 19:20 46:13 123:9 suffice 88:14 116:4 125:2 Terminal 63:20 123:9 125:16 **take-aways** 100:15 terminology 54:16,21 suggest 68:1 staying 40:2 66:18 suggestions 102:11 taken 24:8 33:21 77:3 terms 23:6 27:22 39:16 **Suite** 1:18 40:16 41:15 43:16 steadfast 22:20 85:12 90:14 **Steering** 37:17 40:4 summaries 60:16 47:14 51:8 61:15 takes 13:20 45:4 summarize 31:19 talk 20:9 33:3,12 34:1 66:17 67:12 71:6,9 84:18 91:6 93:6 99:4 **step** 28:12 29:11 70:21 summarizes 124:10 62:22 66:2 78:20 steps 8:14 80:21 81:6 **summary** 3:6 28:22 82:10 87:17 97:3,6 101:3 106:7 111:22 **Steve** 18:20 80:14 37:10 83:21 111:8,8 120:14 119:6,10 terrific 66:8 93:12 stood 22:5 supplementary 35:12 122:21 talked 40:18 63:3 76:16 support 6:19 21:16,22 test 32:18 48:14 storming 99:5 straightforward 78:15 25:14 27:12 29:2 79:4 84:21 thank 9:1 18:22 22:15 strategic 20:5 107:21 talking 21:2 76:14 24:22 36:2 43:4 69:1 86:16,20 89:8 **strategy** 33:10 111:22 supporting 28:17 72:10 76:21 78:4 83:9 **Street** 1:18 sure 11:11,19 19:17 **talks** 120:15 90:6 96:22 104:21 target 12:6 38:3 97:18 strengthened 32:15 21:9 30:19 34:1,3,18 108:5 112:16 115:5 Strickland 4:7 35:20 40:1,21 42:6 123:19 115:10 122:4 123:4 **Strickling** 3:2 17:11 43:18 51:10 59:13 targeted 73:15 126:3,13,22 strictly 112:21 66:20 67:4 69:15 thanks 4:19 8:2,3,20 targeting 40:9 structure 46:22 77:11 81:13 84:9 task 52:13 117:22 10:2,12 15:18 22:19 studied 27:16 85:13 87:5 92:18 97:5 tasks 47:22 50:7 86:9 88:5 90:5 studies 5:22 23:19 87:3 97:22 98:20 103:15 **TDWR** 67:10 92:5 102:5,14 113:19 100:9,14,15 101:9,15 103:20 109:6 111:13 team 4:22 42:1 74:9,18 115:22 122:16 123:20 116:10,22 122:7 98:18 102:19 126:17,22 127:5 102:4 118:1 study 23:18 31:5,11,20 124:16 126:15 **teamed** 31:8 thing 19:9 40:22 97:13 32:12 41:15 63:12.20 surprise 6:7 **tears** 54:9 102:10 110:16 63:20 67:1,10 68:13 surprisingly 55:21 teasing 54:1 things 14:14 20:6 37:13 68:14 69:4,5,7 70:4 surroundings 9:5 **Tech** 16:5 37:14,15 40:17 57:18 70:18 71:6,21 72:6,8 surveillance 49:22 technical 68:5 70:16 59:1,3,4 66:9,17 73:15 93:15 94:6 98:6 59:17 101:16 108:13 68:15 70:17 71:5,15 99:5,5 116:16 118:2,5 **surveys** 110:6 technically 108:18 72:21 80:5 86:22 119:16 survival 59:3 technique 39:13 88:22 91:1 95:8,14 techniques 40:8 99:16 studying 63:22 68:14 suspicion 68:3 103:14,19 104:7 stuff 9:13 110:5,6 sustainable 30:5 technological 26:15 110:7 111:5,6,13,21 subcommittee 3:12 swanky 4:17 108:19 think 4:4,7 6:4 9:17 38:16,17 40:19 44:20 switch 120:21 technologies 29:4 10:9 11:16 12:14 13:3 46:2 54:18 62:12 63:5 **system** 26:18 40:17,20 100:18,22 107:8 13:13 14:10 18:11 65:15 74:12 75:2 78:7 41:2 98:22 110:17 117:2 23:6 26:19 27:19 28:1 technology 17:5 23:3 81:10 83:3 84:15 88:9 29:12 30:4.7 33:2 System(SAS)/Spectr... 88:19 89:6 90:11 31:7 40:3 105:22 35:2 36:7 39:18 41:5 3:16 117:14 119:7 112:18 118:18 systems 7:21 19:19 41:11 42:8,10,13,16 subcommittees 10:11 39:14,15 50:1 59:16 telecom 6:9 27:11 42:20 44:1 47:10 10:17 11:14,17 12:6 59:17,21 60:2,7,15 telecommunication 48:15,19 50:6,22 12:16 123:6 73:3,6,11,19 120:19 31:6 120:19 54:10 56:9,10 57:20 **subject** 58:17 115:17 telecommunications 58:7,14 60:10 63:7,14 Т 1:2 2:17,21 5:21 24:5 submission 118:4 64:7 66:4,8,13,15 **submit** 121:20 table 3:1 7:13 19:15 31:14 67:1,17 68:18 69:5,21 telephone 2:4,10,11,12 71:4 74:4 75:17 76:11 subsequent 67:16 98:14 subset 20:11 38:1 64:3 2:13 76:13,18 77:4,13,15 **TAC** 51:15 52:14 55:21 **substantial** 6:19 29:11 television 112:4 78:12,21 80:4 81:17 56:4,16 58:1 65:22 **subtle** 42:16 66:13,22 76:6,17 95:4 telling 84:4 82:18 84:6,20 85:2 87:6,15 88:21 89:13 **success** 30:16 32:22 temporary 78:12 tackle 20:7 34:12 tactical 50:1,4 ten-year 51:1 89:16,20 90:3,16,17

90:21 91:8 92:7 96:4
99:2,12,22 100:21
101:21,22 102:2
103:3,10,16,21
103.3,10,10,21
104:12 105:21 106:4
106:18,21 107:6,11
107:17,18 108:5,11
109:2,4,13 111:17
112:10 113:6 115:12
116:7,8,17 117:6
118:20 119:11,14
120:4,8 121:11,13,17
121:19 122:5,15
123:10,13 124:21
thinking 61:14 105:13
105:16,18 107:19
111:10,13 119:6
121:8,9
third 46:18 50:8
Thomas 2:5 3:15
thought 10:22 28:3
34:21 42:22 47:8
79:10 91:14
thoughts 37:8 53:18
54:3
threat 68:2
three 12:3 23:11 34:8
50:12 89:13 116:12
117:8
threshold 76:5 94:15
94:19 106:22 107:18
94:19 106:22 107:18 throughput 59:11,15
throughput 59:11,15
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9 21:21 34:6 37:22 39:4
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9 21:21 34:6 37:22 39:4 43:20 44:1 45:13 48:6
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9 21:21 34:6 37:22 39:4 43:20 44:1 45:13 48:6 85:18 106:5 122:14
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9 21:21 34:6 37:22 39:4 43:20 44:1 45:13 48:6 85:18 106:5 122:14 told 79:16
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9 21:21 34:6 37:22 39:4 43:20 44:1 45:13 48:6 85:18 106:5 122:14
throughput 59:11,15 tie 102:21 tied 88:13 tiered 47:15 tiers 47:17 48:8 tification 3:9 time 10:16 11:21 12:10 12:18,22 15:18 19:16 20:17,20 25:22 27:2 32:16 33:6,22 36:10 41:8,17 49:9 59:12,19 64:9,22 74:2,5,15,17 77:6 81:20,21 82:13 89:3 90:18 96:16 104:9 114:15 123:2 123:10 times 52:8 57:13 116:12 117:8 timing 98:10 tips 12:14 tired 22:10 today 4:7 9:3 20:9 21:21 34:6 37:22 39:4 43:20 44:1 45:13 48:6 85:18 106:5 122:14 told 79:16

92:5 top 24:2 25:12 79:6 topic 36:18 62:22 72:12 104:13 topical 36:8 topics 40:7 45:2,9 76:20 **Torre** 8:5 total 48:10 totally 28:9 touch 14:15,16 town 125:18 track 19:20 tracking 7:22 26:12,16 traditional 88:16 traditionally 28:3 training 13:19 14:2,3,12 14:19,20 **Tramont** 2:12 9:6,9 17:8,8 50:7,10,18 59:9,20 60:8 105:9,12 106:9,12 107:10,17 108:22 125:15 transition 21:12 22:1,4 transitional 3:11 74:20 transitioning 5:14 transmitters 62:14,14 transparent 51:11 59:21 60:1 transport 25:21 travel 4:5 84:16 treaty-level 23:12 tremendous 30:15 trends 93:21 tried 13:17 90:20 91:16 99:20 trip 126:22 **trouble** 46:13 trusted 32:6,6 try 13:14 14:10,11 20:19 48:6,13 52:17 58:9,17 61:3 90:21 94:10 95:13 99:12 100:8 116:22 121:12 122:8 trying 6:6 15:17 19:16 35:22 42:17 51:11 53:2,3 54:6,8 70:20 71:7 76:11 88:1 89:14 90:17 96:8,19 123:8 123:15,15 **Tuesday** 125:9 turn 19:4 34:13 77:8 83:1 110:20 turned 79:20 turning 6:2 **TV** 106:5 110:18 111:14 112:5 113:9

twice 99:2 two 6:12 21:16 31:8 39:2 41:17 44:22 47:1 47:16 48:8 75:22 77:16 78:12,22 79:18 87:3 94:2,22 95:5 97:17 106:19 117:9 type 60:2 61:9 **U-NI** 67:14 **U-NII-2B** 94:1 **U-NII-4** 35:11.14 94:2 **U-NIII** 67:12,13 100:12 **U.S** 2:18,22 22:15,17 23:8 24:2 25:12,17 26:1 29:5 99:7 **UAS** 25:22 **UHF** 24:22 ultimately 4:15 100:16 unable 4:8 uncertainty 70:11 underappreciated 36:18 underfunded 36:17 understand 24:9 28:8 30:11 43:22 50:17 54:6,21 60:8 81:5 88:1 94:10 97:9 119:11 understanding 73:17 unique 42:10 113:22 University 16:7

102:1 115:16 123:6 unfortunately 4:7 92:9 United 1:1 22:22 108:8 unlicensed 64:13 70:7 73:12 120:1,7 unmanned 7:20 25:9 up-front 21:4 **update** 3:5 19:5 21:4 36:22 **upper** 50:2 usage 49:7,12 52:17,22 57:4,5,6 use 3:9 6:21 7:9 13:14 13:17 14:12 15:4 22:22 23:13,14 24:7 24:21 25:7 31:2 37:20 39:8,17 44:6 45:13 52:7,8 56:19 58:18,21 59:2 63:17 66:3 67:13 68:3 72:19 78:18 79:3 79:5,14,21 80:8,12,15 81:3 82:6 83:19 84:5 88:3 95:3 99:19 106:2 111:14 120:2,3

useful 53:5 57:21 106:16 useless 59:1 user 13:18 14:7 users 43:17 44:7,15 65:8 101:3 uses 58:10 USITUA 125:10 usual 10:7 utilization 56:5

valid 40:22 119:13 variation 122:9 variety 95:8 various 24:7 60:15 74:10,15 117:15 119:15 120:15 vehicles 25:11 verbal 63:2 verbiage 63:15 verification 49:5 verify 52:9 Verizon 16:1 version 84:7,9 versus 53:10 62:6 106:6 view 6:17 32:2 70:3 Virginia 16:4 virtualization 120:17,22 visibility 58:9 visit 118:21 volunteered 80:11,11 vote 116:2,3

W walk 55:4 77:9 want 4:16,21 9:4,15,21 11:4 14:16 15:11 17:17 18:16 21:9,20 31:3 33:22 34:16 37:22 40:22 41:8 43:10 45:3 47:16,18 48:11,22 50:15 53:14 62:22 63:19 67:8 73:12 80:6 81:1,20 82:7 84:7 97:22 102:7 109:22 110:10 111:8 112:4,20 113:3 115:4 116:9 119:20 121:12 122:18 wanted 6:12 7:11 8:1 11:11 14:14 21:3 28:7 31:19 44:22 52:17 62:1 64:17 65:15 74:14 75:9 82:10 98:2 wants 116:11 warning 96:18

1	1	1	,
WARREN 2:13 18:10	96:16 97:19 100:8	116 3:18	97:18
108:1,5	101:7 102:1,2,20,21	124 3:20	5350 97:19 105:6
Washington 1:18	106:10 107:2,8,14,20	126 3:21	5470 97:19 105:6
wasn't 42:19 43:2 67:4	108:7,20 109:6	1300 47:20 49:15,17,18	5G 3:18 27:12 28:8
90:19	110:22 111:19 113:1	49:19,21 50:8,20	115:13,14 116:7,20
watershed 23:2	117:7 126:9,13,17	59:16	116:21 117:3,15
wave 36:9 117:1	worked 68:16	1350 49:21	119:6,10 120:13,15
way 9:13,14 14:12 15:5	workgroup 119:4,12	1390 47:20 49:16,19	120:17 122:7 124:12
47:15 53:10 64:12	working 12:10 13:6,7	50:21	5th 27:12
71:16 75:19 82:2 83:9	13:17 45:5 48:1,16	1390-specific 50:8	30127.12
84:4 88:4 106:20	56:15 57:16 62:2 64:1	15 26:21	6
113:8	65:4,17 78:11 90:13	16 39:21	6 27:11 30:1 44:18
	118:19 119:17 120:9	1639 .21 1695 21:18	
ways 24:7 82:15			61 28:6
Weather 63:21	126:10	16th 117:17	62 3:10
web 31:18 46:14	works 61:11 80:14	17 48:10	7
web-based 39:3	92:18 106:18 110:17	1710 21:18	
website 38:11,22 60:12	110:21 118:7	1755 21:19	7 47:4
75:8	world 19:13 21:5 22:7	1780 21:19	70 39:5
WEDNESDAY 1:11	23:6 36:12 117:16	1800 1:18	71 35:16
weeds 114:14	worldwide 29:2	19 3:5	74 3:11,11
week 7:12 23:1 26:22	wormhole 90:18	1990 36:6	76 35:3,16
weekly 96:19	worry 68:13		77 3:14
weeks 38:13 64:21	worse 103:16	2	
117:9 123:16	worst 64:15	2 1:12 37:9 71:22	8
welcome 3:2 4:3 12:17	wouldn't 15:15 28:14	2014 10:11 27:4	80 39:5
125:16 126:1	55:5 91:17,18 101:5	2015 1:12 3:6 10:12	800N 1:18
welfare 106:17	wrap 75:3	19:14 22:8	86 27:15
well-defined 101:22	wrapped 10:10	2024 7:7	88 3:15
went 14:18 67:15 104:9	wrapping 50:15	21st 23:4	
127:7	WRC 26:20 34:21 105:2	24.25 27:15	9
weren't 98:3	117:13 124:8 125:7	250 24:13	
White 41:22 45:7 106:5	WRC-15 7:12,17 22:8	27th 23:20	
110:18 112:5 113:9	28:22 117:21	28 28:6	
114:20	WRC-19 23:22 26:14		
Wi-Fi 9:19,21	27:16	3	
widespread 106:17	writing 124:10	3 38:14 116:16	
Wiley 16:3		3.5 41:3 100:11 106:6	
Wilkinson 1:17 4:17,19	X	3:16 127:7	
17:9 127:1		30 7:6 29:21	
wingtip 35:19	Y	37 55:16	
Winn 102:19,21 103:1,5	year 14:11 25:1 27:2	370 27:5	
115:18	30:14 39:21 41:4	38 3:7	
wireless 7:8 16:13	46:19 47:21 48:10	3GPP 118:9 119:16	
24:15 40:4	57:17,19		
wisdom 12:20 34:11	years 23:11 38:6	4	
wondering 52:9	York 4:12 16:9	4 3:2 40:16 117:7	
word 46:11 66:18		43 3:8	
words 9:4 22:22 53:1		44 3:8	
95:3 106:10	Zoller 8:5 22:19 125:8	45 13:21,22	
work 6:1,4 8:9 10:12	20.00 0.0 22.10 120.0	47 3:9	
13:2,5,9 15:11,15	0	5.5	
19:7,17 23:10 26:4,10		5	
27:9 30:21 34:10 35:7	1	5 3:15 35:11 43:6 60:13	
40:5,9 42:2 43:8	1:00 1:19	67:20 95:20 96:7	
53:22 55:18 56:3 66:4	1:06 4:2		
66:7 69:17 74:18 75:5		97:16 105:6 118:2,6 5-1 117:22	
76:4,11 77:10 79:13	100 7:7 30:1		
88:13 90:12 93:4	11 27:15,17	5.3 105:3 500 19:21 24:17 51:1	
00.10 90.12 93.4	113 117:21	500 19.21 24.17 51.1	
I	ı	ļ	'

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Meeting of the Commerce

Spectrum Advisory Committee

Before: USDOC/NTIA

Date: 12-02-15

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &