# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 

 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE$$
\begin{gathered}
+++++ \\
\text { COMMERCE SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT } \\
\text { ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CSMAC) }
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
+++++
$$

## MEETING

$+++++$
TUESDAY, JULY 24, 2012

$$
+++++
$$

The Advisory Committee met in Conference Room 1107, Building 1, at the Institute for Telecommunications Sciences, 325 Broadway, Boulder, C0, at 1:30 p.m. Brian Fontes and Gregory Rosston, Co-Chairs, presiding.
MEMBERS PRESENT

DR. BRIAN FONTES, Chief Executive Officer, National Emergency Number Association, Co-Chair
DR. GREGORY ROSSTON, Deputy Director of the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research and Deputy Director of the Public Policy program at Stanford

University, Co-Chair
LARRY ALDER, Google, Business Operations Project Manager
DR. DAVID E. BORTH, Independent Consultant* MICHAEL C. CALABRESE, Vice President and Director, Wireless Future Program, The New America Foundation

MARTIN COOPER, Chairman and Co-Founder of DYNA, LLC, and Co-Founder of ArrayComm, LLC

MARK E. CROSBY, President/CEO of the Enterprise Wireless Alliance (EWA)*
THOMAS S. DOMBROWSKY, JR., Engineering Consultant, Wiley Rein, LLP
DAVID L. DONOVAN, President, Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc.*
MARGARET (MOLLY) FELDMAN, Vice President of Business Development, Verizon Wireless
DR. HAROLD FURCHTGOTT-ROTH, President Furchtgott-Roth Enterprises*
H. MARK GIBSON, Director, Business Development, Comsearch
DALE N. HATFIELD, Executive Director, Center for Law Technology and Entrepreneurship, University of Colorado
DR. KEVIN C. KAHN, Technology Policy Consultant, Intel
DOUG McGINNIS, IT Manager of Communication Infrastructure Strategy, Exelon Corporation
DR. MARK A. McHENRY, President, Shared Spectrum Company
JANICE OBUCHOWSKI, Founder and President, Freedom Technologies, Inc.
DR. ROBERT PEPPER, Senior Managing Director of Global Advanced Technology Policy at Cisco Systems Inc.
CARL POVELITES, Assistant Vice President of Public Policy, AT\&T
RICHARD (RICK) REASER, JR., Head, Spectrum Management Department, Raytheon Space \& Airborne Systems
DENNIS A. ROBERSON, Illinois Institute of
Technology
DR. DANIEL DEAN STANCIL, Head, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University*
BRYAN TRAMONT, ESQ., Managing Partner, Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP
JENNIFER WARREN, Vice President, Technology
Policy \& Regulation, Lockheed Martin Corporation*

## ALSO PRESENT

KARL NEBBIA, Associate Administrator for the Office of Spectrum Management

TOM POWER, White House Office of Science
and Technology Policy
LAWRENCE (LARRY) STRICKLING, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information

PETER TENHULA, Vice President and General Counsel for Shared Spectrum Company

BRUCE M. WASHINGTON, Designated Federal

Officer

* Present via telephone

Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
Page 4

$$
\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{S}
$$

$$
\text { Welcome and Opening Remarks . . . . . . . . . . } 5
$$

$$
\text { Opening Comments from Co-Chairs . . . . . . . . } 6
$$

Spectrum Management Improvements. ..... 12
Subcommittee's Report
Unlicensed Spectrum Subcommittee's Report . . 48
Spectrum Sharing Subcommittee's Report ..... 113
Progress Report - CSMAC Working Groups ..... 134
NTIA Evaluation of CSMAC Recommendations. ..... 149
Regarding Interference and Dynamic
Access Subcommittee
Office of Spectrum Management Hot Topics. ..... 157
Committee Questions and Discussion. ..... 167
Opportunity for Public Comment. ..... 172
Schedule of Next Meetings;
Miscellaneous Items ..... 179
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

## ASST. SEC. STRICKLING: Good

 afternoon. Welcome to Boulder for those who are just getting here. Once again, just a few admin notes, we have a few visitors and that's always good, but a few things, if you have a cell phone, please silence your cell phone. We're currently webcasting and we're on a telephone bridge. For those who are on the bridge, please be reminded the bridge is for the CSMAC members who are not present. So you do not need to acknowledge that you're on the bridge unless you're a CSMAC member.We do have Wi-Fi passwords we use on these are for the members. Anyone who needs one, please raise your hand and we'll make our way to you. Okay. We're going to attempt to get one of the documents we believe that is missing. I think we've covered most. So we're up on the webcast and we're up on the bridge.

I have one more announcement in the push-top mics, so you push to talk, state your name and talk, and then once you finish, please take the mic off. Once again, we'd like you to speak loud. We have the house mic phone at this time and there is a lot of engineering going on.

TOM POWER: Good afternoon. I am not Larry Strickling. I am Tom Power from the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the White House sitting in to do, I guess, the welcoming for Larry.

And I am not going to say much other than to thank you all for -- for being here and for your continued work. It is a really interesting time to be involved in spectrum issues. Just in the last few days, we've had the release of the PCAST report.

I understand yesterday the DoD presented their list of facilities that could be subject to testing under the STA request that T-Mobile filed on behalf of the FCC which
all ties into the -- the working group -working groups that -- that you folks have been overseeing.

This morning, I've met some of you. I attended the meeting of the NITRD WSRD folks who are doing some good work. I know you've got 5 GHz under your belt as well and a bunch of issues on the agenda today.

So there is a lot to be done and a lot of opportunities in front of us as well as a lot of challenges, but I just want to say welcome and thanks for your good efforts.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Great. For those of you on the phone, this is Greg Rosston and welcome to Boulder and to the CSMAC meeting.

One of the things that I think we'd like to do first is to have the people who are members of the committee on the phone just to check in and say who's here so that we have an accurate record of that. Maybe what I'll do is I'll go through the names of the


CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Harold Furchtgott-Roth?

Dan Stancil?
Jennifer Warren?
Okay. So if you all could figure out -- well, maybe just have people e-mail you at the end if they were on the phone or not. So, anyway, welcome, and we are looking forward to doing two things in this meeting is going through our different subcommittee reports that we have, and we have some issues on which we will vote today, and then also to talk about our work going forward in the -- that is the -- not only -- not only the entire evaluations of some of our recommendations but how we're going to move forward to work on the technical --

CO-CHAIR FONTES: For those who are on the call, I think it'd be helpful as we speak around the table here to say your name, folks, for the record here, and in the event there is anyone on the call that would be


MEMBER FELDMAN: Molly Feldman, Verizon Wireless.

MEMBER ROBERSON: Dennis Roberson, Illinois Institute of Technology.

MEMBER MCGINNIS: Doug McGinnis, Exelon.

MEMBER KAHN: Kevin Kahn, Intel.
MEMBER PEPPER: Robert Pepper, Cisco.

MEMBER HATFIELD: Dale Hatfield, University of Colorado.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. So now we've -- now that we've done the roll, why don't we -- we're ahead of schedule which is nice to start at least.

So we want to move onto the Subcommittee Enforcement unless there was anything you wanted to add, Brian.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: I don't. Karl, do you have any opening comments?

MR. NEBBIA: Just to thank everybody for coming all the way out here.

Dale, you especially.
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: And we're -- we're glad to be in Boulder and looking forward to working today.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Thanks, Karl.
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Great. So
Bryan and Mark, you guys are up first with the Spectrum Management Improvement Subcommittee Report.

MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Thanks, Greg. This is the report on the recommendation -- this is Mark Gibson by the way. This is the report on the recommendations that -- NTIA's comments on the recommendations that the subcommittee made to make that clear. It's -- it's in the title.

And so what the subcommittee did was based on the comments and the recommendations that Karl talked about at the last meeting in Stanford, the working group went back and tried to address the questions
that the NTIA felt were left un -- unaddressed or open. So what we did is we just went through the various questions that were there and tried to address them. I assume that people have read this so I'm not going to read this in detail, and Bryan and I are going to tag team -- so -- but we'll go down through here and try to address the questions that Karl has -- as long as I'm not exiting, I think we're good.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: You just have to keep people's attention.

MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, okay. (Laughter).

MEMBER GIBSON: -- At 1:30 in
Boulder
so --
(Off microphone comments.)
MEMBER GIBSON: That's for my next act.

The recommendation that the working group had made was that the NTIA
should do a one-time system-wide activity check on the GMF, and the response from the NTIA was they agreed but they wanted a greater understanding -- a greater clarity to understand what we meant, and given that there's lots of records in the GMF and it would take a lot of time for an individual at the NTIA to go through it.

So what we did is we broke that down and suggested that the effort could begin on the bands that are the interest.

Primarily, obviously, the bands that were part of the -- of the fast track report which were the 1675 to 1710, 1755 to 1850, and so on and so forth. So those are the bands that are really in a sweet spot of the interest and in -- and efforts could be focused on those bands initially, get them cleaned up, and then move on to whatever other low-hanging fruit are identified, maybe at a PCAST report or whatever.

And also we recommended that there Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
-- there is a fair amount of effort that can be undertaken to automate that process using scripts, smart approaches, and whatnot, and also concentrate only on the records -- or on the fields that we reported on are necessary to build a database for doing Spectrum Management according to the administration. So there's a lot of administrative records that may not need to be addressed.

And we referred in -- by reference, I think, in the footnotes to the list of variables that the working group felt were necessary for doing Spectrum Administration. So we suggested that that -that that was what you do.

As far as paying for it, we felt like there were monies in the CSEA Spectrum Release -- Spectrum Relocation Fund that we felt like the Office of Special Counsel might need to figure out how to get after. Nonetheless, we suggested that there may be monies there to -- to address that.

Am I missing anything?
MEMBER TRAMONT: What we suggested we do is essentially take the Office of General Counsel's view -- what CSEA funds could be used for this purpose, and we cited some language that we thought suggested that was possible. We wanted to -- but in the spirit of getting NTIA something that they can execute on, we simply said just seek the opinion of the General Counsel's office. Thanks.

MEMBER GIBSON: On the next -- so are there any questions on that comment and recommendation? Yeah, Karl.

MR. NEBBIA: Just -- just so you know the Chief Counsel, the General Counsel, the Special Counsel are all three different people --

MEMBER GIBSON: Yeah, I know, I know. And --

MR. NEBBIA: -- and as long as I
never see a Special Counsel in my life, I'll
Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
be very happy so --
MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NEBBIA: One thing to note here, right now, the 4200-4400 ranges that you've cited, there is no data on that band. There's no data to check. There's no licensing --

MEMBER GIBSON: Right.
MR. NEBBIA: -- that goes on in that band so that one -- that one's probably not one that will be -- that will be critical.

I think ultimately, at least from my experience, the decision about what will get paid and what will not get paid will probably come out of OMB. We're hoping under the new scheme to get updated guidance, and I know that they're working on that guidance that links to the new rules and so on. So it probably will not be a call that we can make inside of NTIA, but one certainly that they can give this guidance.

And I think also as we head toward Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
any future activity under the CSEA and the -the Spectrum Relocation Fund, there does come a time in the process where the agencies have to come back and update their information in terms of transition plans and costs. And that is the point at which on these it's just very logical that that would be the point that they're actually answering up for the systems that are in this band a opposed to trying to schedule a separate review in advance of that. Now, you might say, well that -that may be a little way off and it would be helpful in the work that we're doing now to have better data, but I think certainly in the process of ensuring that it gets paid for, I think the likely time is in that period where the agencies are actually providing specific transition plans and information about their systems.
MEMBER TRAMONT: Just -- yeah, I
think our -- overall, our recommendation, obviously, is to have a comprehensive view of
all Spectrum holdings not just the priority bands that have been identified for relocation. So I think it's important and discussions go on being if Mr. Priman*** (00:14:01 ph) wants to weigh in now and allow us to use the money, I think that would be fine.

MR. NEBBIA: Because we have it to do up here, but if we --

MEMBER TRAMONT: It's important that it's not just focused on these particular bands but it is in the long-term interests -it's this committee's belief that's in the long-term interests of NTIA to have a comprehensive record and so, hopefully, those funds can use -- can be used not just for these short-term issues, maybe three to five years, but even five to ten years out and get some other bands identified as well.

MEMBER GIBSON: Is that it, Karl?
MR. NEBBIA: Yes, sir.
MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Good.

Thank you.
The next recommendation was to establish goals and metrics for data accuracy and milestones for achieving. And, essentially, what we did was you were asking for further guidance regarding, essentially, sampling techniques, what industry uses and what the commission uses.

So in our reply, we specify -- we identified several areas that come out of some of the committee members' experience with the commission, and their -- their company's experience with managing commercial data bases and/or licensing procedures, and so what you see here is things like specified license terms, performance and build-out requirements.

Some of this may or may not be applicable, but it's offered up more or less in terms of examples of the way that some commercial Spectrum Management techniques are used to deal with data issues: construction notification, secondary market rights, all the
stuff that's in there.
So you read through that and you find a litany of tools that would be available for spectrum relocators and spectrum managers to institute in the Spectrum Management and regulatory -- or licensing process that can help inform and make sure the data are accurate.

And I don't need to go through it.
Did you have anything you want to add?

Okay.
MEMBER TRAMONT: Yeah, we're aware that FSMS is obviously a big part of this equation, and we hope at some point to be able to pick up this work after this iteration of -- of CSMAC is concluded, that is the working groups 1755 to 1850, and pick back up on FSMS and what we'll work on going forward. So that's a little bit of an outstanding issue. You had asked for our evaluation of that and I think we need to probably sit down with the
staff and figure that out, but we haven't had a chance to -- we weren't able to get that done before --

MEMBER GIBSON: Right.
MEMBER TRAMONT: -- we submitted this last meeting.

PARTICIPANT: And that's Bryan and Mark that were talking.

MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, yes.
MEMBER TRAMONT: We'll keep identifying ourselves.

MEMBER GIBSON: I'm Mark and the other one's Bryan. And, yes, so Bryan's point of an FSMS, I will say that we did get some feedback from NTIA and the offer of having a briefing on FSMS. Well, that occurred right at the time CSMAC pivoted toward working on the five working groups, and we felt like we just didn't have the bandwidth to go there.

We did a scheme up that was fairly detailed as well as the data dictionary, and those of us that understand that are going
through trying to figure out what it means. The rest of us are hoping that those that understand it can tell them what it means. So we -- we will continue with that work and follow back up with the powers that be at NTIA to get the briefing on FSMS we've been looking for it.

I don't think we're looking at that as a panacea, but we also know that the GAO report referred to that several times, it's come up in several discussions, and we're eager to find out to what extent that is going to address some of the things we've been raising.

MR. NEBBIA: Just a -- a few thoughts. I -- I'm not exactly sure of -- I'm sorry -- of the time requirements and staffing requirements to pull these kind of things off. I realize that the commission has them, for instance, on the billed out requirements that apply to some specific types of users, but I assume they don't apply across the board to
all FCC users. I also am not quite clear as to even where they exist, how they're or where they're applied in terms of, you know, build out of cell systems.

I think people are constantly asking questions about, well, where are people implemented where -- where they haven't? So one of our challenges, of course, is -- and certainly in the frequency of assignment area, I have eight people, and those eight people are spending day in, day out, reviewing incoming frequency assignment requests, trying to make sure the data is correct as possible. We do have some automated processes that back that up, and we will have more as part of -as part of FSMS.

But I think it's certainly a challenge as we look at what it would require in terms of staffing to follow up on all this stuff because it's one thing to set up a process where people have build-out requirements, it's another thing to go hunt
them down when, you know, somebody, you know, blows the dust off the book and says, oh, yeah, these people were supposed to have done this back in this and this date. And it's not like we're talking about small numbers either. There are a lot of people to chase down in -in doing that.

Also, at least from my -- my perspective of -- of my time in Spectrum Management, it seems to me that there has been an emphasis probably for 20 or 30 years on minimizing the burden on most of the users of the spectrum and, in fact, as -- as we've talked about the increased data requirements under FSMS and had some conversations with the FCC about having those same data requirements so that we can actually do EMC calculations and so on, run them between us, their -- their feedback to us is, we could never go out and ask all of our users to provide all of that data.

So we continually seem to end up -
Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.

- even though we've got a line of requirements here, we -- you know, we're -- we're concerned about ending up in a place where a lot of these things are expectations that come of the government and not -- not -- not other people. But as I was saying, it's certainly been my experience that we have gone out of our way in the past to provide maximum flexibility to minimum regulatory burden, and so on, all along the way for both federal and non-federal users. So we're talking about a significant change in direction to require all these things. But, you know, build-out information, construction notification, these types of things $I$ think are fairly significant in terms of the number of people -- and capabilities that would be required. So I think it's not that we -- we disagree with the idea and that these things would be useful, the challenge for me as somebody that's managing a group of, you know, federal
employees is that these things do take
people's time and so on. So just figuring out how we would do that in a way that uses their resources well, I think, is a significant challenge for us.

The issue of data certification, of course, we have picked up. That was one of the items clearly stated in the GAO report, and we've now implemented rules requiring somebody from the agency that's actually going to put their name on the dotted line affirming that the data's correct, that the system is necessary, and that sort of thing. We're still working on actually the IT
implementation of that because it requires changes to the software, and so on, to make a place in the data field. But, so, each of these things I think are good items to do. The question just gets to be the resource implications of getting into it. And, ultimately, I don't mean just the resource implications on -- on NTIA and our small assignment group but on the agencies to be
tracking and reporting, and so on.
Then we get on the last item was going out and -- and audits which, I assume -would have assumed meant going out and checking what they were doing, but then you referred to the FCC's license audit software, which I'm not quite familiar with what that does so maybe you could give me a hint as to how they perform their audits through software just --

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, okay. Are you --

MR. NEBBIA: Yup.
MEMBER GIBSON: All points well
taken. I -- you know, I think that the working group was studying this from the standpoint of what practices can be suggested to improve the value of the data that is contained in the GMF and associated related databases through, you know, standard practices, procedures, regulation, rules and whatnot.

The issue of -- of -- of the number of FTE's or -- or work -- you know, manpower is attended to the discussion, but I -- I don't think a working group wanted to be constrained by that. I think we wanted to look at what -- what should be done, suggest approaches to take, and then work through, either collaboratively or you can work through off-line, what it would take to address these so, all those points are well taken and in -and, you know, we heard loud and clear the first time that, you know, this is a -- a resource issue, but nonetheless, at some point, resources are going to have to be put on -- on some of this, and so maybe there's a point at which we discuss what type of resources or something like that.

As far as the commission's audit software, their -- and Mark Crosby actually provided some of this -- so, Mark, if you're still on, I'll turn that to you in just a second.

But since this is a licensing system, licensees are responsible on a regular basis, depending upon the type of license they have for the service class they're using, to go in and update the license records to -- as a -- as a product of their license renewal, and most services are supposed to do it. It's kind of finding rules as it relates to the specific service so, for example, .95, it addresses, say, medical whatnot, they have to update it, and . 101 that addresses microwave, they have to do it on a regular basis, and so on and so forth. So that's part of the process. And so that's part of the auditing you're talking about.

Mark, what other auditing software is out there that you were thinking about when you put this in?

MEMBER CROSBY: Mark. I'm at a -it's a little noisy in the background. I'm at an airport in Reno. The commission has, you know, the capability to draw up from ULS
certain groups or segments of licensees, whether they are for construction, and there's notification sent to the construction automatically. There's also -- we offer capabilities to -- for renewals, construction permits, and those type of things, and that's all done automatically, and the licensee's to receive those directly from the commission.

MEMBER GIBSON: And I would add to that, there are commercial entities, such as Comsearch, that endeavor to inform licensees of their time -- of their -- the time frame for renewal was happening.

MEMBER CROSBY: That's certainly -
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER GIBSON: Yes. Well, many -

- many people out there do it as a service to customers and clientele so, you know, there's -- there's a process that goes on. And as we were saying earlier, some of this might be able to be overlaid into FSMS, maybe not in
the current release structure but in future release structures to the extent it resonates with the need. So, you know.

This is Rick Reaser from Raytheon, and $I$ just want to add that one of the things that we've sort of suggested is, you know, many of these licenses in terms of -- of the federal licenses are actually defense or FAA contractor facilities, and we would be happy to be a part of that process for renewal, but there's like a wall between us. Because we know of a number of instances where there are licenses for our company locations and plants, and so forth, that may not be accurate one way or the other, in both directions by the way, and, you know, I think you could sort of tap into the industry as a -- as a -- as a part of this thing to help review that. We'd be happy to do that, and then I have some proposals that I'm going to make to this and others about that because we'd like to keep all of our stuff straight and
understand when things are expiring or not. He's right, on the FCC stuff, we get notices, we -- we can keep on top of that very well, but we have lots of things with -with some of the federal government contracts, and not just military but DHS and others, where things come due and people aren't really tracking it because there isn't a thing, and then there's other things like, well, maybe there's a new emissions designated so we don't need this or we're just doing CW antenna testing.

> We can modify those particular
licenses to be more appropriate to the activities that it's taking on whether than just renewal after renewal after renewal for something that we may not even need at a location.

Because the tendency is just to renew the damn thing because you don't know whether you really need it or not, so what happens is some bureaucrat will just renew it,
and that certainly was going on at our company on all the FCC licenses until we started going through them one by one because some central office just renewed every one whether it needed it or not.

I took the attitude on some of these things, I'm -- I don't know what this is for, I'm just going to not renew it and see if anybody calls me.
(Laughter.)
MEMBER REASER: and I -- I did that on two -- two lady assistants by the way, and I believe that they were long gone, but they -- those licenses had been around since the 90's at locations where the plant -- where the company had no longer had facilities, and they -- they were continuing to be renewed.

So I think that the analog of maybe looking at some of the good practices that the FCC has and try to maybe export those into the federal side might be a good thing, and let the guys -- it's an issue of who's
really the license for. Yes, it's for the military service or part of them, but at the end of the day, it's some, you know, contractor that's turned -- flipping the switch on the radio and testing it. It's not a -- not some federal guy in Washington who's processing the license, so maybe those people ought to have a little bit of a -- of a -part of the process.

MEMBER CROSBY: Yeah, Karl, this is Mark again. I -- I -- I don't think it's -- it was sophisticated so all that administrative software that every person of every month, whatever, the people that are due for renewal or you haven't heard from them for awhile, the computer generates a nice letter saying, hey, what's going on with the system? Are you still using it? Things like that. It not a technical software, more of an administrative practice software to keep track of licensees and their use of the spectrum. That's all.

MR. NEBBIA: Okay. I did have just a couple other short questions here about right at the end of the text from this section, there's a part that says
"establishing similar goals and metrics for data accuracy in other bands," which I -- I understand, as Bryan was talking about, the fact that you're not looking for it to end with the four primary bands. And I'm not sure -- once again, originally, the two to four million estimate, I'm not quite sure what that was for because, once again, 1 -- it was doubtful, at least in my mind, that that cost was based on going through the entire database.

As we looked at how many that would be monthly, just didn't seem possible that the two to four million was probably a realistic number for doing an entire, you know, database update. But, nonetheless, it says that we should look at the other bands.
And then it adds, "other than
perhaps those established for unlicensed uses," which we don't actually have any bands established for unlicensed use, certainly not on the federal side. I think it's questionable whether they formally exist under non-federal. So that may be an aspect you just wanted to strike out on the last because I don't -- I don't know what it means. You guys may know what that was intended to refer to.

But, I think, ultimately, we -- we appreciate the -- the inputs and we realize that you're trying to give us inputs that go beyond the specific boundary of current date budgets, structures, and so on.

The one -- the biggest challenge for me in -- in dealing with those kinds of recommendations is that people tend to expect that they can be done once you put them on paper and, you know, we -- we know that we've had at least some CSMAC recommendations find their way into legislation. And so that's --
you know, people do respect the outcome of the thinking that's going on in this group. And my challenge is finding myself, then, the expectation is that we will, in fact, fulfill everything that's on these lists, and that's -- that's one that I think may be a bridge too far, certainly for, you know, someone as young as me so --
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: Anyway, so, I just wanted to mention that. So I don't want to prevent people from making recommendations that they realize are probably beyond the -the bounds of the current economy, but I think we have to also recognize the fact that they -- the recommendations in that sense can create a -- an expectation without something that goes with it. They -- they have to --

MEMBER TRAMONT: I was just going to add that I think the useful part of this process that we're continuing today, issuing out recommendations, receiving questions from
you and then coming back, and then having the resource question explicitly teed up, hopefully, will prevent sort of the unfunded mandate problem going forward. But I think the key is to get -- if we could at least all agree on a general direction of what an idealized state looks like for the management of the federal spectrum resource from the database management perspective, then at least we have a common set of goals that we're working towards and then we can try and talk about what the resource demands are. But I don't think anybody realistically thinks that the current resources at NTIA or at the agencies are adequate to get us from where we are to where we need to be from a database management perspective.

MEMBER GIBSON: That was Bryan.
And this is Mark. And, again, your points are well taken.

First of all, with respect to the monies that we suggested, again, those are
realms and more maybe swags, maybe not even swags but wags, and whatever acronym you want to find out, but the point is that there was some, you know, spreadsheet analysis that went into trying to find those numbers, notwithstanding, you know, their accuracy. I would suggest that we -- we discussed in the paper that there are automated processes that can be undertaken that would streamline the effort, which we had thought would be used as part of that -- that monies.

The other thing is I don't think we're suggesting anything that isn't already in practice some place. Maybe not in the federal government, but within commercial work or within the FCC. So we're not trying to blaze new ground here. We may be trying to blaze new ground for NTIA, and we appreciate that, but we try to be considerate of the recommendations we're making as to their applicability and their implementation ability or "implement-ability" or whatever.

I hope whoever's putting this in paper can figure out what $I$ just said.

But having said all that, I think that, you know, we want to charge ahead and come up with a list of recommendations that we can discuss and it -- you know, in the end, if you find that they are not appropriate, then -- then that's fine, but we didn't want to leave any stone unturned as it relates to the task at hand.

As far as the last recommendation which was, you know, go to Congress and get money, you agreed with that one, and I -- it's no accident I mention that on the heels of the 2.2 -- two million dollar -- two to four million dollars. We suggested that, you know, again, go back and look at the CSEA, talk to the Office of Counsel -- I forget which counsel it is -- and so, you know, find ways to possibly go out and -- and -- get, you know, get monies to address the task at hand.

I would add on a point you made
earlier was the 4200 to 4400 meg band. We were looking at that band as it relates to issues associated with -- those were the radar altimeters and other things. That -- that work got put on the back burner for the new working group work we're doing so we'll try to pick that up, you know, whenever the type is right and address that. But if we do redo this, we'll pull that out of the discussion because we understand that there's not much in the database related to that. However, there may be stuff in equipment databases, and that's what we were finding out when we were doing the work that we're not talking about so - -

MR. NEBBIA: Okay. One last point in your -- in your -- I'm sorry, this is Karl Nebbia again, sorry.

The last point in your final
recommendation, at this point, we don't have the freedom to change the approach we have on agency fees, and that's -- I think some might
argue that we have the freedom to re-shift -or to shift some of the priorities or weightings, and so on. I'm not sure there's general legal agreement on that, but the one thing we don't have the ability to change is the fact that it is that the funds that we receive are an amount, at this point, 80 percent of basically offices, spectrum managements, cost to operate, so those costs to operate are actually determined within the budgetary process and work back down to us through -- NTIA's given a budget, NTIA then -so it's -- it's not as if we've got the ability to just change that budget amount and then recharge that to the agency. So there are some limitations.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Excuse me, sir, this is the conference coordinator. Are you having some issues in your conference? We were told that you were.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Yes, we are
having issues. There are people who are
joining the call and, apparently, either they cannot hear us or, for whatever reasons, they're exiting the call, and so there are several attempts to join the call, exit the call, and we just wanted to make sure that folks who do, in fact, call in are capable of hearing the conference.

PARTICIPANT: Let's see, there was an e-mail sent in from Marty saying that he and -- that he couldn't -- we couldn't hear them.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. If there's somebody on the conference that is having -- still having issues hearing what's being said, they can "star zero" and we'll pull their line.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Right. They're able to hear, they're just not able to speak back.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. And they've verified that their line -- their line on their end is not muted?

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Well --
CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. So if they're having --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. So
everything is okay then?
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Do you
know what phone number he would be coming from?

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Don't know.
CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay.
They'd have to *0 in order for us to pull his line, but again, I believe line -- it's not muted on our end so it might be self-muted, and that might be why you're not hearing anything from -- from their end.

PARTICIPANT: Okay. We have
Jennifer Warren, we have Mark Crosby, are there any other members on the call?

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay, you have eight parties who have joined.

PARTICIPANT: That's fine. I'm asking you specifically if there's any members of the Spectrum Management Advisory Committee on the call. Jennifer and Mark Crosby. That's it? Thank you.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. So do you need me any further then, sir, or --

CO-CHAIR FONTES: I think we're -I think we'll go on.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay.
I'll go ahead and leave your call then.
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Sorry. Madam Chairman -- or madam -- sorry.

MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan Tramont. So I believe we need to move for adoption of these recommendations with the striking of the sentence of the clause -dependent clause on page 7 but other than perhaps just establish for unlicensed uses, so we'd strike that but then if we could have a motion to adopt the recommendations of the Spectrum Management improvements working

you very much.
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Did Marty just join the call?

PARTICIPANT: Can you still hear us?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Yes, we can.
Okay. Next on the agenda is the report from the Unlicensed Spectrum Subcommittee, and so I'll turn this over to Janice and Michael. And why don't -- why don't you kind of walk us through the documents because some were circulated.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Okay. Thank you very much. And in terms of walking through the documents, we have hard copies of sort of an overview piece. Do we have that circulated now?
(Chorus of yeses.)
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I think
probably that will cover the heart of the matter. I will be beginning, and Michael will continue.

Part of what concludes this authority is the unfinished business. So it seems as though with PCAST and sharing work underway, the unfinished business as it pertains to unlicensed almost, you know, grows as we try to knock off the specific issues that -- that was, I think, addressed as best we can.

So, basically, many of the issues before our committee pertain to enforcement. And of course, the unlicensed environment, we have a technical non-status, enforcement becomes a political matter as well as a regulatory matter, because whereas people may not have status, they -- they certainly have expectations.

So there were four questions posed to us as -- as part of that: How should federal agencies deal with complaints of interference? How should they deal with interference, particularly when many of these unlicensed users and devices are in the hands
of servicemen who don't honestly understand the rules? They've bought a product and they have a set of expectations that normally accompany the purchase of a product. How should we prevent software modifications that alter the compatibility characteristics of the device and with widened distributor products? What's the best approach to enforcing the rules?

We made a set of enforcement recommendations in the preceding round of CSMAC, so one of -- one recommendation that will come at the conclusion of this report is to, again, incorporate by reference those enforcement recommendations. And then in addressing as creatively and productively as we could these questions, the committee reached a strong conclusion that in an environment where it's really very, very difficult to enforce, one must append to the extent maximum possible on technology solutions and, basically, in an environment
with smart devices are capable of contacting databases, being updated, being alerted, being turned off.

So we have made the very strong recommendation in the service throughout this report that, prospectively, the government must rely to the maximum extent possible on enforcement by technology; making sure that built into the device is the ability to be updated, cataloged, turned off, et cetera.

The tougher question -- well, not the tougher question, but the remaining question, however, if you have this whole category of cheap, dumb devices, most of which -- many of which are historic, or close, there aren't any perfect answers to those -- how to address interference from those devices, but we would strongly recommend that the band from which they operate be circumscribed, closed out, in essence, to historic bands, and that going forward, in those instances, we try to minimize the problem by minimizing the
existence of these devices.
In the past, I think there was a stronger argument to be made for the economics of these devices, but, in essence, even the more intelligent devices now are at a price point that we think enforcement through technology is the better course.

So I think that covers slides three and four.

Michael, do you have anything you'd like to add on those points?

MEMBER CALABRESE: No, except, you know, what -- I guess, you know, where it mentions then --

Oh, yeah, right. This is Michael Calabrese.

What it mentions at the bottom, you know, you see that -- that distinction just by way of example in comparing, for example, the garage door opener -- the classic garage door opener situation, a -- which we'd call, I guess, an untethered or so-called dumb
device, compared to what we anticipate with the unlicensed devices that will operate in the TV white space subject to, you know, having GPS, knowing their location, checking the database for permission, to use channels which can be changed at any time and that can be even pushed further.

So -- so the place that the path is clear, although as Janice said, and we'll talk more about the -- what to do about what's the legacy of these garage door opener, perhaps baby monitor type devices that are already out there, is -- you know, we weren't able to add a whole lot to the -- to the repertoire.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: The reduced lines on post-hoch regulatory enforcement, it really kind of recognizes the inevitable, that it's very hard in an environment where you have myriad consumers with devices, the regulatory status of which they'll never reasonably be expected to fully understand,
post-hoch enforcement is just a bad idea. If at all possible, avoid it.

But we do have, and we've
incorporated by reference -- this is on page 7 -- a set of past enforcement recommendations, and these are designed to put PC nodes that do exist. Part of this is pretty more than onerous on manufacturers. I mean, if there are devices that can be tampered with, and this was a problem in the 5 GHz band, some of the devices, per se, weren't interfering, but people could figure out pretty quickly how to create powered-up devices and then interfere with them.

If it's possible to avoid that, to lock those down better, we should expect that as manufacturers, we should expect manufacturers to do their best and probably be more specific about what their best is to advise consumers about what their limitations are. I think the oldest ones on the FCC, as it increasingly relies on unlicensed in
certain areas, put a shock clock in place.
It's absolutely useless to have a problem -- an interference problem and, you know, wait for weeks, if not months, to get that resolved if somebody kind of cranks through the process.

People have suggested a tool called the temporary restraint of interference. If there's a problem, and nobody can quite resolve that problem, perhaps those should just be required to shut down until the problem gets itself ironed out.

There's also, basically, almost uniform beliefs that the FCC is going to have to upgrade its monitoring capabilities. Some of these problems, no matter -- no matter how -- you know, how we try to address the desirability of pinging back to databases, or whatever, it's going to be an increasingly complicated electromagnetic environment.

At times, it's not going to be a simple fix or a simple understanding even of
where this is coming from. There is no amount of reporting, first off, that's even realistic, but second off is going to preclude this from happening. And, frankly, license users ought to be reasonably comforted that the FCC has taken upon itself where there is a problem at times to go out and do the sophisticated monitoring, come up with a recommendation, and then enforce it.

That -- that is -- you know, I think going all the way back to my day at the FCC, over 20 years ago, people almost, you know, just shut down the possibility of, you know, real -- real monitoring capability. And it's hard to understand how to even deal with an increasingly sophisticated electromagnetic environment and not step up to that expectation by licensed users in some context.

I think that would be my summary. The basic objective here would be, number one, rely on smart devices rather than dumb devices, have the network monitor itself if
possible, and solve problems proactively. Where there's a need to react, that reaction should be more efficiently applied.

Michael?
MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah. Just I'd like to -- if I could just roll back one minute to recommendations one and two, so on slide five.

Because this really shows the distinction, I think, between the way we were thinking of the untethered and then going forward. So in recommendation number one, although we want to -- you know, we need to reduce the reliance on post-hoch regulatory enforcement, with respect to the legacy and untethered devices, what we end up concluding that really the best -- perhaps the only thing that really can be done, and we hope it could be more effective, is for NTIA with the FCC to more proactively educate policymakers concerning this secondary status of unlicensed devices in federal bands.

And that means that when the calls -- you know, from the garage door opener people, when they start coming in to congressional offices, that shouldn't be the first time that those telecom allays are hearing that garage door openers actually work on federal bands, right? They should be -there should be some -- I think some proactive education on that, and it's probably the best thing we can do is just -- is hold a hard line and make sure people are aware of it. It's just simply the rules of the road.

Whereas going forward, and this is the most important recommendation, is that the FCC should require then in all new unlicensed bands or on shared federal bands designated from licensed access, the devices should be connected devices that are required to -- I guess we use the phrase "call home", which could mean a variety of things which would be the -- the terms of access band by band depending on the federal system.

So that could mean to -- such as with TV white space to renew the authorization to operate in the band, which TV white space happens every 24 hours maximum. That could be less or more. Obtain a firmware update to be remotely disabled in a particular frequency or to receive direction to switch frequencies.

So implicit in this recommendation also is that devices not only be connected but that they be multi-band so that they're not dependent on any one federal band so that that way consumer expectations are not, you know, defied to the point that manufacturers or consumers raise hell.

PARTICIPANT: Is that a technical term?

## MEMBER CALABRESE: Janice covers

 three very, very well, and then four -recommendation four -- this is on slide eight -- again, it's to just try to push specifically for manufacturers to increase consumer education efforts about the nature ofunlicensed and their responsibilities as a -as an important counter port -- counterpart or backstop to enforcement and avoidance through technology. Because even with enforcement through technology, it's important for manufacturers to be on board as partners, that their consumers have the right expectations.

That means perhaps the FCC would have labeling -- different labeling requirements than they do now. I know, personally, when I look at the wireless microphone packaging and instruction booklet in a TV band, if anything, it was almost the opposite of warning people that they had no rights. Recommendations number 5, and this is another one that is potentially controversial, that there should be further study of the regulatory framework for socalled cheap dumb devices or untethered devices. The committee recommends that in the future -- generally recommends that in the future, unconnected devices should be
restricted to legacy bands where they are already prevalent, which would be primarily 900 MHZ in 2.4, and policymakers should consider whether devices should even be further restricted in the future phasing out their access to very high quality bands over some appropriate time period. And that's just accepting that, you know, not everything should be assumed to -- to live forever.

So those are the -- I guess one last thing is just to call attention to because Janice didn't get any possible questions for further study, I believe -- I think we had agreed this subcommittee, like a couple others, would go on a bit of a hiatus for the remainder of this calendar year to focus on the five working groups for 1755, but what we think is important to continue on, perhaps early in the new year, and these are some of the questions, you know, that have been raised.

So, for example, one is how to pay
for -- how to reimburse federal agencies for the cost of facilitating shared access for unlicensees in particular, because, by definition, there wouldn't be clear -- where there's not clearly an option, there is not currently revenue under CSEA. And, you know, that was taken up a bit by the incentive committee. PCAST addressed that to some degree but probably more work needs to be done.

I know Karl encouraged us to
figure out how, you know, in the context of an inventory, how could we get a better handle on where unlicensed devices are operating; for example, you know, perhaps the quantities in a particular band or their concentrations geographically which could affect the noise level overall. And we didn't really come up with anything satisfying on that yet, so that deserves further study.

There's also the question -- the last meeting we talked about several pros and
several cons of setting aside new spectrum exclusively for unlicensed or whether unlicensed should simply be the -- in a sense, the fallback state for available capacity on federal bands that are not being fully utilized, which is more or less what the PCAST recommended last week, so-called authorized shared access to all the bands that are open for sharing because they're under-utilized to a considerable degree.

So that needs further study, as well as probably a -- if we want to look at authorized shared access across a much wider range of bands, what would be the nature of that of being authorized and being connected? Those would be good questions.

Also, and the final thing here is the -- which was proposed, and we discussed a bit, was the establishment of a voluntary interference clearinghouse that could crowdsource experience with interference on federal bands, whether it be federal users and/or
private parties could report -- self-report and that could be aggregated and viewed and may provide some -- some visibility into where problems are developing, not only in terms of band, but in terms of type and terms of geography.

So those are all interesting future questions.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: So to
summarize, Karl did give us a few follow-up questions, and we didn't fully answer them, and I have to say we probably concluded that perhaps there's not going to be a perfect answer, particularly on the topic of inventory.

I suppose when you get into an environment where people are going to be interacting with the database, that will yield a form of inventory. But the reality is unlicensed and sharing is going to be -- has become, is going to become a far more context and multi-faceted endeavor. And, you know, I,
for one, don't think it's almost possible to inventory in a classic way that -- how that happens.

You will get data back from manufacturers, you'll get data again from people contacting databases. I think some of the responsibility will also fall on the government, at least to do spot checks and that sort of thing.

Dan Stencil did put forth a good crowd-sourcing paper which I hope is on the website. We'll make sure it's on the website. That kind of voluntary approach might be helpful in some bands of great interest. In other circumstances, I think the government is going to have to depend on the reality that information is going to be pretty limited in a sort of forthcoming way.

I'd like to close by saying that during this hiatus, this committee ought to be watching the FCC because this is an area where we've been asked to make recommendations about
government and sharing more with unlicensed, so I think there's an implicit understanding that is a thread here that that will be a growing phenomena, but it's a very interesting world where the -- you know, the interference will be becoming out of commercial regulated entities, and this is just a paper product so we can't really make a recommendation to the NTIA to enforce.

This is really a recommendation that says if this is going to work, the FCC is going to have to look at these more complicated and probably far more promising sharing of scenarios with unlicensed, but do some hard work on conducting enforcement as well as the sort of characteristics of equipment that will be treated as unlicensed.

That completes our report. And, Dan, you didn't hear the plug for your report but we are going to double-check that it is now on the website and that everybody studies your concept of crowd surfing.

We have some very involved members of the committee on the table. I want to add, for example, Kevin. Kevin was sort of the godfather of the intelligent device recommendation which is really a very strong thread.

Does anybody from the committee want to report before I make a motion that these recommendations be adopted -- or Michael and I do?

Dr. Pepper?
MEMBER PEPPER: Robert Pepper, Cisco.

Picking up on your last point, I think there's echo -- echo because both of your microphones, which are next to each other.

About the complexity going
forward, if we go back to recommendation two and then also look at that in the context of the next report, which is the sharing report, one of the conclusions, which goes to, I
think, your point also about the complexity, is on the sharing report, it says that -- it concludes that we shouldn't select one particular technical approach to work through the sharing issues because we don't yet know what those are, right?

MEMBER KAHN: This report's not about sharing.

MEMBER PEPPER: But it is.
MEMBER KAHN: Not this one. This one is not about sharing. This is simply about how you get your hands around a device that passes certification but it turned out to have a post-book, things of that sort, which are --

MEMBER PEPPER: No, but -
MEMBER KAHN: It's not about sharing. I mean, the sharing rules are independent of that is all I'm saying.

MEMBER PEPPER: Well, except for the --

> MEMBER KAHN: Oh, sorry, Kevin, go

|  | Page 69 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | on. |
| 2 | MEMBER PEPPER: Except for the |
| 3 | fact, Kevin, that here there's a particular |
| 4 | approach selected which is the database |
| 5 | approach. There are multiple different |
| 6 | approach -- technical approaches is the point, |
| 7 | is that it doesn't have to be a single one -- |
| 8 | MEMBER KAHN: No, no, no, listen |
| 9 | - |
| 10 | MEMBER PEPPER: -- and |
| 11 | recommendation two appears to -- to focus on |
| 12 | one approach in particular which is the |
| 13 | database approach, which seems to be |
| 14 | inconsistent with some of the other |
| 15 | conversations we've had and, in fact, the |
| 16 | complexity of the issue. So |
| 17 | MEMBER KAHN: We didn't take a |
| 18 | position on the appropriate way to decide how |
| 19 | a band should be shared. All I'm saying is |
| 20 | this report does not take a position on an |
| 21 | appropriate means for deciding if a band was |
| 22 | open at any given moment in time. |

MEMBER PEPPER: No, I understand that but -- but the -- one of the conclusion -- and what I'm looking at here is a different report. This is -- this is the sharing report, right? This is what's going to be presented next.

MEMBER KAHN: Oh, I'm not part of that. I don't know.
(Laughter.)
MEMBER PEPPER: I know. So what I'm saying is we're going to get a report from the next subcommittee. One of the recommendations from the next subcommittee is not to select a certain spectrum sharing approach at this time, because it's likely the multiple spectrum sharing approaches will be used in a band most economically to accommodate the incumbent interest. So the next committee's conclusion is that there are multiple approaches. We're not yet ready to pick one. Recommendation two appears to be selecting --

MEMBER KAHN: No, that's what I said, if it -

MEMBER PEPPER: -- if it does not
-- fine. If it doesn't, then I think we need to make that absolutely clear.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER PEPPER: Excuse me -(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER KAHN: Recommendation two here is not about -- this is Kevin. Recommendation two is not about sharing or how you decide to share a band. It's simply not about that. For example, recommendation two would apply perfectly fine in a band that uses DFS. Recommendation two is about a problem that we saw in its first instance in things like the garage door opener problem, which is how do you make an entity that owns the band -- say a federal agency -- comfortable that if they aren't going to be party to sharing, that they're not ultimately going to be screwed, not by the rules, but rather by simple
mistakes; that people put a device out and the firmware in the device is faulty, and you can't get consumers to do an update.

So this is about solving that problem. It is not about -- so this works fine with -- for example, this would work with the existing 5 gig DFS. It has nothing to do with the DFS mechanism, it has to do with whether the mechanism works in a specific class of devices.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Can I answer the question? So, yeah, there was no one -and, you know, if many others are reading it this way, we can try to tweak the language, but there was no intention to preclude any other -- any method of sharing -- of band sharing, but simply saying the devices that are operating on an unlicensed basis should be connected devices, whether they're using sensing, or not, or whether they're using DFS or any other -- any other method.

And, in effect, that's -- as it
turns out, that's actually completely consistent with what, for example, the PCAST report last Friday said that, you know, all of the -- you know, all of the authorized shared access devices should be connected even if permission to transmit could be accomplished strictly through sharing -- strictly through sensing, that the devices should still be connected devices in order to accomplish these other enforcement functions. So we're only concerned about the enforcement function.

MEMBER PEPPER: No, I understand that. And that actually -- this is Pepper again. Specifically going to number three which is receive direction from, you know -receiving direction can also mean, and if it does, then I think we're just going to be, you know, putting -- making it explicit, that receiving direction also could be because of sensing and there -- thereby actually switching frequencies, but it's not sending, you know, direction from a third-party to the
device.
There are multiple ways that you can do that so it's not clear what, number one, receive is or receive from whom --

MEMBER KAHN: Yeah, I think -- to answer that, $I$ think what that -- I can tell you what that really was aimed at was much more -- yeah, I'm sorry, this is Kevin -- was much more -- if you had a band in which part of the band turned out that more study was needed, you know, interference was discovered post-hoch, you know, and people weren't quite sure how to -- you know, it was more a case of, gosh, we didn't think that kind of interference was going to be an issue, let's go off and study it for a few months and see if we can figure out how to tell people to do better firmware so that it won't be a problem.

In the meantime, we want to get people out of that part of the band while we work the problem. So it wasn't a -- it wasn't a DFS kind of call. Maybe it was still -- it
was still addressing, essentially, problems discovered with classes of devices coached -so the worrying, perhaps, could be better in that regard -- but this is not aimed at dynamic assignment of frequency. That was really not what this was about. This was about this enforcement problem.

PARTICIPANT: Okay, now we're going to go to Mark McHenry and then to Dale Hatfield.

MEMBER MCHENRY: Bob, you said this is inconsistent with the next panel, and we agree with him that -- we call it management in control, they call it enforcement, but that should be database. And for the frequency select -- just what Kevin was saying, you can get any access that you want, so I think the two groups are consistent, and you were saying they were inconsistent, $I$ don't agree.

I see the recommendations as use
any sharer approach that's appropriate, but
for the command and control, you need a database and a connection. If you need to use something, you're going to want a database to back that up. Even if it's in the licensed band, you would want that.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you. Dale?
MEMBER HATFIELD: Sorry, I was going to change the subject just slightly, and I didn't want to interrupt before. Karl?

MR. NEBBIA: Sorry, Dale. I'm just calling rank.
(Laughter.)
MEMBER HATFIELD: I used to -- I used to be able to but I --
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: Yeah, well, I was a little worried earlier. We don't have the FCC people here but the language is starting to get a little bit risky around here, and I thought there might be some censorship that would happen.
(Laughter).

MR. NEBBIA: But, anyway, I do think -- I do think there are some issues here that we're not exactly connecting on, and it seems to me that the heart of the recommendation was to say, regardless of whether you're sensing, you're doing database type stuff, regardless of how you go about it, if there's a problem, there needs to be some way of connecting to the network to get new instructions as to -- for instance, on the DFS, it may be to change your receiver bandwidth or it might be to change something else about what you're doing, but the heart of it was you've got to have some way of connecting back.

Now, Mark then interjected the database back into his last statement, and I think that's not the heart of the recommendation here. I think it may be database is part of what's controlling it, but I don't think that's necessarily the whole. I just think that the key here is if we're
going to fix problems after they occur, you have to have some way of people are connected and you get them new instructions as to how -how to do it so --

PARTICIPANT SPEAKER: Janice, did you have a comment that tied into that? And then we'll go to Dale.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I just -- I just had an interlude.
(Laughter.)
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I have late breaking news from the New London, Connecticut, Daily, July 23rd, local resident --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: -- so this is
a real time issue where, once again, some upgrade at the sub-base has shut down a whole bunch of garage doors in my part of Connecticut so --
(Laughter.)
MEMBER HATFIELD: Well, I'm going
to change a little bit here. I wanted to associate myself with Janice's comments regarding the future where things are changing so dynamically and there's so many different emitter sources. There's so much opportunity for things like inner mod.

There is a -- you know, talking about signals coming from different directions, the signals that are increasingly noise-like and, therefore, more difficult to find out, and also the aggregate noise problem. We have not talked about unintended interference here, but there's all kinds of unintended interfering sources out there.

So when we talk about interference at any one place, it may be some combination of a bunch of intended emitters plus a bunch of unintended emitters and I -- I get worried that the end result of that is such a noisylike structure in the aggregate that you can't -- even with a big budget and the best of intentions, you may not be very easily able to
figure out the person you want to go to and subject to a fine.

So I -- it just -- it -- it
bothers me but when Janice raised it, I -- in fact, $I$-- I don't have to give my talk here. I start at the end of Thursday because I've just basically given it, but I am worried that -- I am worried about that sort of aggregate problem and noise-like situation that may be difficult to track down the culprit.

PARTICIPANT: Karl -- or Bryan?
MEMBER TRAMONT: So I just want actually us to go back to Karl. So you flag this concern, which I share about whether or not we're being too -- is there a path to modifying the language that you feel like would preserve the flexibility you just flagged as an issue? Because $I$ think it's sort of -- I think I said that it would help solve the problem and $I$ do have the concern that we're somehow locking ourselves into a certain path. So $I$ just want to go back to
that if we could.
MR. NEBBIA: Yeah, actually, I didn't think -- this is Karl. Yeah, that's right, with a "K".

I actually didn't think the recommendation was confusing. I think sometimes we -- we see things written and we view them from a perspective that we have but I think, for me, the emphasis is clear here. It has nothing to do with what technique you're using to -- to do the sharing but only that you're looking for an -- a connectedness in there. And I think there were other issues regarding that, that I'd like to talk about a little bit, but I do think the emphasis to me is quite clear.

MEMBER KAHN: Quick question.
This is Kevin. Would it help if you just deleted item three, because I don't think we actually lose anything by this business about drop -- by dropping the thing about change frequencies, because that's sort of implicit
anyway. And that avoids any notion that what we're doing is directing you to a frequency which kind of suggests the sharing.

If there's anything in here that, you know, I could see would make people think it was something it wasn't, it would be that little bullet three down there at the bottom. Because it wasn't intended for that, but I understand how you could read it as that. You know, if that helps clarify it, I would have no problem with just deleting that one item because it doesn't --

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: This is Greg Rosston. Does that mean, basically, you're told to stop -- in number two, stop using a particular frequency, and then your -- your device has the knowledge to go to another frequency itself --

MEMBER KAHN: Yeah, I mean, conceivably, this device had ten frequencies to operate on and you told it to stop using that one, we would still have ten minus one
frequency to operate on but --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER KAHN: -- exactly. So that's why I don't think you would lose anything by deleting that item three and it might avoid this -

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: That's fine. Why don't with go with that? You know, frankly, I think that Bob, as always, is raising an interesting issue because I always want to have it both ways. I do think it's sort of a subtle world in which we're operating here.

I, for one, am not intending this set of recommendations be like an endorsement in a more sophisticated PCAST environment, but what I am -- but I think that we all agree however we feel about the pace of that, you know, future, that the entire committee really bought in strongly to the idea that you can't be allowing unlicensed devices, going forward, to sort of be in a very primitive self-help,
self-enforcement mode, and this was the minimum necessary to try to take us into a future state.

So I think that is a good edit that you promoted here, Bob, and I think that we can all agree and with that said, if you have other comments, $I$ would like to -MEMBER ALDER: This is Larry. All right. Janice had a comment on recommendation five which I agree with wholeheartedly in spirit, which we're basically saying is that cheap dumb devices have to be dealt with appropriately, and I like the fact that she used the word "generally", but I see also here that you're getting a little bit prescriptive by saying the solution is put them on a legacy band.
It just seems like we may
encounter situations in the future where that's not the appropriate action. I think the spirit is good. I'm wondering if there's just a way to be less prescriptive on that.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I would actually support such an edit. I think it's -- and, in fact, you know, one of -- one of the views that $I$ voiced during the committee's work is, you know, the fact that the 9 is a 9 MHZ band and is an unlicensed band, and that is a beautiful piece of spectrum. It's totally trashed now with all sorts of stuff. So, you know, saying that, you know, it should be legacy spectrum probably wasn't the right choice of words, so if anybody can suggest a better choice of words. I mean, basically, it's to find a select piece of spectrum where that form of device would be best suited and ensure that it would be limited to that, you know, area.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: If I can make a -- to me -- This is Tom Dombrowsky.

To me, the first sentence is all you need in recommendation five. Really, why don't we study the regulatory treatment of cheap, dumb devices and not get into all the
other things because, frankly, there's a lot of dumb devices, a lot of bands that aren't even covering their 49 MHZ. You know, there's a lot of stuff being used there for dumb devices and, frankly, being used well. I mean, people like their remote key entry for their car. They don't want to go and open that car if they don't have to.

So I think just leaving it just to that first sentence, let's study that and see if there's a way to get around it, and it might -- it might be the easiest way to get there.

MEMBER CALABRESE: We did study it and the recommendation we got was the second sentence. I mean, you know, essentially, that -- that unconnected devices should be restricted to, you know, some -- some limited number of bands so --

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Limited number of bands.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah, so I --
so I would disagree with that, although if we wanted to make it less -- less prescriptive about --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: -- Tom, why
would you object to the third -- third? I mean, there's -- you know, in -- in bands that are, you know, low --

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: This is Greg
Rosston. Can I just suggest maybe moving more generally to "should generally be restricted" as opposed to becoming "generally recommends"? Would that change your feeling about it any? MEMBER CALABRESE: Could you repeat that again?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Just moving the word generally to after should. Should generally be restricted.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Should
generally be restricted to legacy bands where they are already prevalent.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Or just
recommend study of. I don't have a problem. I mean, I'd like the FCC to take up this topic in a more disciplined fashion.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Yeah, I mean, my take is that the FCC hasn't done any coordination on this yet so, you know -- I'm sorry. Tom Dombrowsky again. And so I know the committee has looked at it and we have some thoughts about it, but at the end of the day, some of these may be a little bit too strong at this point just because there are so many dumb devices out there and to try and say you're now stuck here, we may be cutting you out, it's just a-- I think something that needs to be thought through a little bit more.

MEMBER KAHN: Kevin Kahn again. I think really all we were trying to get to there was that -- that if the big demand on additional spectrum which is -- I mean, if you didn't have demand for additional spectrum, none of this would be interesting, and the big demand for additional spectrum is not coming
from cheap dumb devices, it's coming from smart connected devices.

So the intent -- and, I mean, I think maybe we're too specific, but the intent was basically to say, for the devices that are not smart connected devices, let's try to keep them isolated to some limited set of bands that make sense to them rather than allowing them to proliferate all over the place and have, you know, interference problems with no recourse that we could have for the connected devices.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Could that be the second sentence? This is Bryan. Could that be -- could what Kevin just said be the second sentence in --

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: I mean -(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: -- intend any more discussions, right.

MEMBER TRAMONT: So more like --
MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: This is Tom
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Dombrowsky. That's kind of what I was driving at is just sort of getting the framework of we've got a problem, let's not let it spread, yeah, but then having that last sentence that sort of says, not only do we not want it spread, we want to tamp it down, I think that's where $I$ have some concerns just because a lot of the bands that they're in, we're not going to be moving other stuff in there. There's not enough spectrum there. They're not broadband. I mean, 49 MHz is not broadband. We're not going to put smart connected devices in 49 MHz . So I think that was my reaction.

MEMBER FELDMAN: This is Molly Feldman. I mean, what Janice said earlier, what about just taking out legacy and just limited or specific at the end?

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Could somebody now give us a corrected -- are you going to try to give us a corrected --
(Laughter.)

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: The committee recommends that future unconnected devices -the -- the location of future unconnected devices should be studied further by the FCC, you know, and --

MEMBER CALABRESE: After the first sentence, you could have, the committee rec -let's see -- the committee recommends -- and just start off the third sentence, actually. The committee recommends the policymakers should consider whether such devices should be restricted in the future phasing out their access to very high quality bands over an appropriate time period.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: I think I -- I share the concern of the last sentence that Tom has.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan. I'm sorry, but $I$ don't want to -- we have a lot of legacy devices and a lot of investment in a lot of bands, and $I$ don't know that $I$
would to put a cloud over them that we're going to pull it out from underneath them at this stage, so that last sentence makes me nervous.

I notice Kevin has language for his new sentence -- a different version of sentence two.

MEMBER KAHN: Yeah, if we get just get rid of some of the specificity, I think you can do it. I mean, you know, if the committee recommends that, you know, unconnected devices, you know, be, you know, assigned to, you know -- isolated sounds negative --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER KAHN: -- let me look for a better word, but --

MEMBER CALABRESE: A limited number of bands.

MEMBER KAHN: A limited number of bands where, you know, -- no, recognizing that, you know, once deployed, they will
always continue to exist, we recommend unconnected devices be assigned to a limited number of bands.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Let me give it a try. This is Tom Dombrowsky again. Maybe we can do it from a positive perspective which is, what are we trying to say: we want connected devices in the new spectrum bands and the broadbands. And so why don't we in the second sentence say, for new bands that could have broadband capability for unlicensed use, they should be connected to the extent that --

MEMBER KAHN: That was really what the origin of this.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: -- let's make it positive instead of restrictive. I mean, that, to me, seems like what you're trying to do and --

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: No, but that wasn't all that we were trying to do.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Okay. I'm
sorry.
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I'm not -- I don't know how we say this and maybe we should - -

CO-CHAIR FONTES: This is Brian here. I think what we may want to do is take a break, caucus end this so you can come out with specific language rather than trying to edit in a forum, and then after that break, come back and present that agreed-upon edit to recommendation five. Any thoughts?

So we'll take a 10-minute break. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:53 p.m. and resumed at 3:02 p.m.)

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. So they made progress during the break, and I'm going to turn it over to -- and I'll turn it back over to Janice and Michael to go through the edits, and they're being typed in now, as I believe, and then we'll read it for those folks that are on the call.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Right. Okay. So what we have -- this is -- I think we have found an appropriate change for recommendation number five to strike the sentence two and sentence three, and replace those two sentences with: "The committee recommends that in the future", quote, "unconnected devices generally should be restricted to a limited number of appropriate bands" --

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Okay, unconnected devices --

MEMBER CALABRESE: -- actually, recommends that in the future -- so, yeah -I'm sorry --

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Delete the second that --

MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah, delete the second that, and sorry about that. Okay. But in the future, unconnected devices generally should be restricted to a limited number of appropriate bands.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Can everybody
live with that? Can everybody live with that? Are there any more comments on these recommendations? I am so excited -(Laughter.) MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: -- that my field could generate such drama.

PARTICIPANT: Okay. Michael? MEMBER CALABRESE: We found a -it looks like Kevin flagged this that in -MEMBER KAHN: Actually, Mark flagged it but --

MEMBER CALABRESE: Oh, Mark, okay. (Simultaneous speaking.) MEMBER CALABRESE: Recommendation two -- so --

MEMBER KAHN: In addition to the--
MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah, so we should probably do that if there's -- so delete three and then after -- after the comment after firmer update, it's probably where three should go because -- and/or because I'll give you a firm update and


CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Now, I
think Karl had some comments.
MR. NEBBIA: Thank you. I've been enjoying the fray. Janice uncensored is really, you know --
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: Anyway, I had a few comments to make. First of all, we -- I noticed this committee was getting created, we had a lot of discussions internally about what kind of things we should have the group consider and whether the recommendations should all pertain to federal use of the spectrum or be more general. There was a lot of argument back and forth. And, in fact, the four questions here were constructed in a way where we were sort of limiting ourselves to what can the federal government do about these problems that we're experiencing, and as Janice said earlier, you know, the news today is that the problems still exist on the garage door side.

So -- and I understand the idea that ultimately the answers are in fixing the technology, and so on, but interestingly enough, it seems that more from the, what does the government do? How do we respond to these problems to an FCC problem?

And as we look ahead here, I think it's the recommendations, of course, are all stated, in essence, that NTIA should recommend to the commission that we alter something.

But I think one of the questions that's of interest to me here is when we see anywhere from industry a recommendation or a petition to the commission to make these kinds of changes, because that seems to me to be -certainly, if the unlicensed community steps up and says, this is how we would like it done in the future in order to keep ourselves out of these problems, it has a whole lot of weight if it's done that way, as opposed to the federal agencies, you know, complaining about an item -- which, to be honest, I was
talking earlier, I'm not sure $I$ know of a single case where an unlicensed device is actively interfering with a non-federal user or, vice versa, that the non-federal user is interfering with an unlicensed device and, therefore, people are calling the Hill.

It seems like many of these
untethered devices, and even the newer devices that are linked to the -- to the Net have, in fact, been placed in bands where the federal government operates. So it remains a significant issue for us.

And, certainly, I don't know based
on the information here, I recognize that Wi-
Fi has become like a focal point for many people, but I honestly don't know how many untethered devices are still out there. Certainly, all the car key fobs are untethered. Many of the new car ignition systems have a radio linked in them. The -the tire reporting gauges are not tethered. The garage door openers more and more, I Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
think, are getting tethered to people's cell phone connections, and so on; but I don't really have a good sense of how big a piece this is, and we didn't -- we didn't spend time necessarily on that, but I would certainly hope that if this is a significant item for us in the future, that we would see folks from the industry side step up and say, yes, this is really needed.

I mean, we can certainly, I think, maybe start the ball rolling by the fact that it has been interference in the federal systems that have really stood out -- or to or from federal systems. So we -- so we may able to take the ball on but, ultimately, this is an area that the non-feds -- in fact, the FCC does -- does regulate.

Now, one of the things I thought
also was a key item in here is that the concept of requiring devices in the hands of all of our Americans with all of our rights and freedoms that their devices are all
calling back into somebody else's data system and reporting on themselves, I -- I found a little -- I mean, I understand the -- the concept of it and why it sounds like a really good idea to make this work, but I just found it a little bit surprising with all the kind of policy people we have around the table that nobody stood up and said, there are issues with requiring everybody's devices to report and especially those that carry location information, and so on. And so I just -- that seemed to me seeing them be two major items -but, Kevin.

MEMBER KAHN: Just an observation. This is Kevin. The devices should not have to report in, in this recommendation. It simply has to ask whether it is still authorized. So, really, all it needs to do is query the database to ask, is the signature of its current former hardware still authorized? So the -- it's, for the most part, in one way -I mean, you know, you can argue that there's
some privacy issues there, but, for the most part, this is used as a one-way query of a database. So it's not -- the device isn't telling you anything particularly in this case.

Just -- so that's just an
observation on that last comment. But I would agree, if it were, then this gets a lot dicier.

MR. NEBBIA: I know -- this is
Karl again.
Certainly, in the 5 GHz issues that we've had, part of what we wanted to do was get them to make contact so that these downloads could -- you know, could actually be placed on their devices, but I think that's interesting that the queries one direction. I'm not sure --

Janice, do you have a comment?
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I'm sorry. I
don't -- I agree that that's typically what would happen, but I do think there were --
there was discussion about firmware, whatever, being, you know, upgraded in some instances but --

MEMBER KAHN: Sure, but that's -that happens even now. If you go to your manufacturer's site with your device, they will, you know, download an upgrade to firmware. It's still a one-way -- I don't mean one-way because obviously these are -there's a protocol handshake, but the information content flow is from the database to the device. The device is not saying where it is, you know, it is not saying who owns it, you know, it's simply saying, you know, give me the keys that are valid for a device, you know, of this type and, you know, it will give back a set of information. If you have one of the following hash keys, you're still good to go, and if it doesn't, then it needs, you know, to get new firmware or do something else. Again, it goes to the manufacturer and says, you know, give me an update to my
firmware.
So it really is -- I mean, this one -- this one we did think about some, and it's not a -- I'm not saying you could not add, okay, big brother capabilities here, but that's not -- that is not required to meet the description of this.

MR. NEBBIA: This is Karl again. Also, the recommendation statements up front in the recommendation one about proactively educating policymakers here. Certainly, from our experience, I think the critical component of that is, once again, the unlicensed industry being willing to educate the folks up on the Hill.

Because, first of all, I think you've got to recognize there's a limited number of folks on the Senate and House side that are directly linked to telecom issues, and most of the people getting the calls are people just representing, you know, Joe Smith at home that called them. They don't know
anything about telecom at all and to make a -you know, a major educational effort across the House and Senate, that's a pretty significant challenge when, in fact, when the problems happen, if the industry stood up right away and said, "these are the rules we live by, they make our industry work, we need everybody, including the folks on the Hill, to support the structure that we have in place, otherwise the whole system begins to erode," that would have significantly altered the amount of time and resources that went into correcting at least the garage door problem, as temporarily as that may be.

And the challenge there was we didn't have the door opener stepping up and saying, "you know, yes, Madam Congressperson, this is the correct way, we've got to stick by these rules."

So I think that certainly the educational aspect, I think, needs to be carried out to a great extent and certainly
encouraged by the industry. So I think as we look at that, we certainly would appreciate the industry's support in -- in looking at this.

Also, as we get into -- there's the recommendation three, which we really haven't talked about to a great deal, the streamlining of interference reporting tools. I'm not sure what that exactly means or what your understanding of the -- of the reporting requirements right now. If we have interference in the 5 GHz radars, we're getting calls immediately from the FAA. They've gone into -- into the FCC. They got people out in the field that are going after these folks.

So I'm not sure, some of those things about the reporting aspect, I just -I didn't quite grasp what speeding up of the process people felt really did happen. We've certainly not sensed, certainly, a lack of response by the Commission enforcement bureau
people, so I'm not exactly sure, you know, where we go with that.

But looking to the future, I think one of the considerations that we had here is the cost aspect and, as most of you know, there were probably times during the drafting of the Middle Class Tax Relief Act where costs related to sharing spectrum with unlicensed was in the text. It, in the end, was removed from the text as a -- you know, as that discussion went forward.

So that still becomes a critical item right now. We're working on 5 GHz expansion that's going to take resources from the agencies to make that happen, and clearly there is not a mechanism in place now.

When we talk about the inventory,
I think what we were hoping was not an
inventory in the sense that we know where everybody is, but could we -- could, in fact, through the FCC's product certification process, isn't there something there that
says, okay, all of the garage door openers are in three to four hundred MHz , the car key fobs that are 315, so that we had a sense as we were making plans that these folks are in certain locations.

I don't need to know where everybody's car key fob is, but I would like to know that the car key fob industry had settled on 315, and if we start seeing issues, that we know they're there. So I'm not looking for an inventory as in a licensing inventory. I'm just talking about where are the products? Where are the baby monitors? And so on, in the -- and so on.

The last interesting thing I've found as recently -- I don't know if many of you are aware -- but the Europeans, I think, have finally gotten frustrated with the unlicensed device routine, and their problem was they were pushing them into specific bands and the rest of the world wasn't buying it, particularly, the United States, and we were -

- equipment was floating around the world, and now they finally have adopted a much more -or a new direction headed toward basically allowing unlicensed devices to go anywhere if they meet certain power requirements, and so on.

So it's interesting that we're suggesting a solution for the future is forcing the untethered guys into more focus spectrum when the Europeans have finally gotten frustrated with their own approach and now they're heading in the other direction, so.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Is that your last
comment?
(Laughter.)
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Turn it back over to Janice and Michael. Wait, wait, microphone.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: With all that said, and recognizing the very positive editorial work of the group here, we would
like to put these recommendations to a vote.
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Is that a
motion?
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: That is -- I make that motion.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Is there a second to that motion? Okay. Is there any further discussion?

Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Thank you. And
I want to thank everybody for their cooperation on the edits.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Now we're moving onto the structured spectrum subcommittee report and this is -- we discussed these -- this report and these recommendations at the March meeting and have re-circulated in hard copy, although it's
available on the website from the previous meeting, the slide deck that Larry and Mark were going to prepare and going to discuss with the recommendations from that March meeting. So I'll turn it over to you guys. MEMBER ALDER: All right. This is Larry. I'll kick it off. So, again, as Greg just said, these were discussed in the March meeting, and we just didn't have time to bring them for a vote for approval, so that's sort of what we're doing today.

To remind everyone of the background, the question we were working really on is how do we set up sharing arrangements when the primary service may continue or has the right to continue to evolve, and what kind of sharings are workable for the industry in the long term. We basically distilled the recommendations into two sets of technology set of recommendations, and a process set. So I'm going to turn it over to Mark.

MEMBER MCHENRY: So the technical recommendations from the chart are not up there. There's three recommendations. The first was that NTIA should develop a set of spectrum sharing requirements. I'm on the new working groups, and we were sent the planned exclusion zone but, really, spectrum sharing has more features, you know. Is there -what's your enforcement mechanism? What changes can the incumbent make in the weight form or the entrance? So if the NTIA would make like a memo or a list of all these requirements, they might not put numbers against them but at least they would say that there is this issue that needs to be resolved. So we kind of become a template for making spectrum deals. So that's the first recommendation.

The second recommendation, which was already talked about, is even in licensed band and unlicensed band, you need a management and control approach to change the
software. And this has already been discussed, so I think our recommendation, I can't imagine a situation where you wouldn't want this, where the two parties are sharing and they could cause interference with each other, the incumbent's going to want some type of management control.

And the third recommendation is -it's too early to pick winners and losers -we would look at different bands, like aircraft telemetry where the database works, where the sensing works, and sometimes both work and some other scenarios a different case works. So I recommend NTIA not pick a general approach and they kind of let it get worked out on a band by band approach. It could be even that within the band there might be two or three approaches depending on the incumbent and the entering systems. There are no clear winners or losers, and that would just leave it open. So those are the three technical recommendations.
And then if you turn forward a couple pages -- there's no page numbers for some reason on this one that $I$ have, my printed copy -- that there's a process recommendation, titled recommendation four, which largely is one $I$ think with the NTIA is already adopting, so this is kind of a softball for Karl and Mark. This is essentially a dialogue between the incumbents and the new entrants to develop specific sharing recommendations.

Generally, the feeling was that, without reading all the rules here -- maybe I will -- but the general idea was you need good cooperation between the incumbents and the new interests to really figure out the technical solutions. You can't do it in silos. It has to be cooperative. And I think that's the process that the NTIA is undertaking now with the 1755 band.

> So just to read the
recommendation, it says: In the interests
where sharing is necessary, NTIA should work with the FCC, federal agencies, or potential new interests to develop specific recommendations on the extent, impact and method of sharing spectrum. Direct discussions between the experts result in the most efficient and dynamic sharing method based on detailed understanding of how systems and technologies operate and are used. Discussion should be open to any interested party but must be focused on a limited number of issues or scenarios to develop actionable recommendations that would be codified in the rulemaking procedure.

The discussions should be held as early in the process as possible to provide sufficient time and to allow open and direct discussion between the parties, including the federal agencies. They must have senior level oversight to ensure the discussions are based on official recommendations and with an expectation that proposals will be
implemented.
So that -- again, we presented these last time, there was some discussion last time, we wanted to bring them back, have a discussion, and then maybe entertain a motion to adopt these.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Is the discussion of these in addition to what we discussed last time?

Karl, do you want to --
MEMBER NEBBIA: My -- my only
comment was, just to be clear on the technical recommendations, that these are for sharing the federal spectrum, because $I$ don't think we want to say that we need to have as an interactive database if they're sharing between two commercial operators that decide to do it on their own, just to make sure that it's -- it doesn't say it anywhere in here, but with that understanding, at least in my perspective, it should be only for a federal perspective in this since it's NTIA.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: The question I -

- I --Before you do that, for those who are on the call, if you can mute your phone, that would be helpful. If somebody's moving papers around or microphone around --

MEMBER ALDER: Oh, I just want the respond to Greg. So, Greg, I don't know if we -- if you're suggesting an edit. The recommendations do the NTIA share --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER PEPPER: My question, though, is you said something that maybe I missed it, I didn't read it, that the recommendation, which I agree we should get to the federal spectrum, but that was to use an interactive database. That's an example in the text but not on the PowerPoint -- these are still recommendations or am I missing that?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: I'm looking at technical recommendation number two.

MEMBER PEPPER: Oh, okay, you're
right. Yes, but if you want to do that, an interactive database, but there are other names as well. If you want to put examples, you can put in other examples, whether it's sensing or peak, there are a number of different approaches that are not in the database --

MEMBER MCHENRY: Again, this is just an ad hoc control. Once the device is screwed up and it gets put in time-out, how do you -- you know, experiments are taking a time-out. While it's operating normally, it can be doing beaconing, any other thing you'd want. This is only after there's a problem, how do you fix it? That's management and control. This isn't -- maybe you're saying management means that moment-by-moment management, but this is kind of a month-bymonth management.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: And that was Mark McHenry. And there's someone on the phone who keeps moving stuff around. Please
do a mute so we don't have to hear your papers going around. Thanks.

MEMBER MCHENRY: Well, did you get the management, not a dynamic spectrum --

MEMBER ALDER: It's not operational control, it's a management.

CO-CHAIR FONTE: Then I guess we can't mute from our end?
(Laughter.)
MEMBER MCHENRY: Maybe it's not somebody just moving papers, they're just walking around.

MEMBER PEPPER: Okay. So, anyway,
I guess the question, Mark, is I understand the management controls -- it does not -- you know, it does not necessarily define, but this is an interactive database. I mean, we heard some -- I mean, this is enforcement, right, so we heard some of the other examples.

It's not necessarily, you know, querying an interactive database, but in the management control, it could also be turned
off to a specific frequency, or use of that frequency being turned off, and maybe it's just over-definition of interactive database.

MEMBER ALDER: What words do you want in there?

So the reason -- let me give a historical context before you respond to that. So, again, the question -- one of the questions that was proposed to the group to work on was the situation where you're having a sharing and the primary service may continue to evolve, and so the idea was, a solution to that was to have a management and control interface versus having some kind of magical one-size-fits-all sharing technology, that was the approach that we thought of as a group. So that's the background of the discussion and how the recommendations came out why.

There's kind of this management -you can do the spectrum sharing and the incumbent user has the right to evolve each of the management and control capabilities so you
can deal with things that might not be unanticipated in the future.

MEMBER MCHENRY: I think we kind of recommend just one side -- this is Mark. Imagine if you had a million unlicensed devices and a radar complain, you just can't turn them million off to figure out what it is. You might go ask people questions, like what frequency are you on? Or you might have a process to figure out, what is this problem versus, just what Kevin said, call for permission to keep going, because it might be pretty painful if you have a million unlicensed devices just to turn them all off --

MEMBER PEPPER: But, again, it's in the previous discussion, right, it's a device -- if the device is operating across the range of frequencies, to tell, you know, a million devices not to use a particular frequency but there's still other frequencies that they can use.

MEMBER MCHENRY: But then what's the next step? Then what -- you still haven't fixed the problem. You just -- you know, you turned them all off in some parts of band. You might want other features -- the committee didn't work out what these other features, and that would be worked out band by band.

MEMBER PEPPER: Yeah, but I guess the question is, is it interactive or is it interactive database? You know, maybe it's just the way I tend to think of database in a very narrow sense of, you know, the TV white space database --

MEMBER MCHENRY: No, I can imagine --

MEMBER PEPPER: -- because this is different. I mean, it's, I think, broader than that in terms of --

MEMBER MCHENRY: You might force that license device to run a log file and keep it for a day and ask, send me your log files because I want to figure out what unlicensed
device caused the problem. That would be one extreme of what this might be. It's going to be very hard to figure out what unlicensed device or what was the problem, and just turning things off, that's only --

MEMBER PEPPER: No, no I
understand. I guess it's -- it's maybe it's -- it's the definition of database and thinking about it more broadly. What you just described, $I$ don't think of as a database.

MEMBER MCHENRY: Okay. We could put ergo database. We could list ten other things. Maybe we should take the example out just so that --

MEMBER PEPPER: Why don't we just take the example out. I think that would be --

MEMBER MCHENRY: I'm not supportive of taking the example out. I think the example helps clarify the intent. I'd be more inclined to add other --
(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER MCHENRY: -- other examples.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Do you want to propose adding other things perhaps?

MEMBER ALDER: If there's a suggested additional example. CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Do you just want to have just one more example, beacons or --

MEMBER MCHENRY: Well, you could request a log files from device. Please send me a report.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: We want
something that we can actually put in here --
MEMBER MCHENRY: Yeah, on the -suggest log file be sent would be another example feature you'd want the device to do. Send in the frequencies that you transmit on the last three hours so I help diagnosis the problem.

MEMBER PEPPER: I mean -- yeah,
well, I'm not sure how --

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Kevin, Kevin, you need to --

MEMBER KAHN: This is the user's device that's going to send you this information?

MEMBER MCHENRY: No, the incumbent. The more features you put in the incumbent to diagnose the problem --

MEMBER KAHN: Oh, the incumbent. MEMBER MCHENRY: No, no. The entrant.

MEMBER KAHN: The entrant.
MEMBER MCHENRY: If the entrant had total recording and helped the incumbent figure the problem out, they could --

MEMBER PEPPER: You did now just walk across --

MEMBER ALDER: Wait, wait. Time out. Mark is now adding speculative stuff. It's not the recommendation of the group.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER ALDER: The recommendation
of the group is --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER ALDER: So Mark is
speculating here how to add other possible techniques. The recommendation of the group is to require a management and control feature using the spectrum sharing approaches, and we put an example so people understood what that meant, we said that interactive database would be one example. We didn't specify other examples. Mark's thinking about that right now.

MEMBER PEPPER: Right, but if you want to think of it broadly, a management and control technique would be, you know, using sensing and beacons.

MEMBER ALDER: Beacons, sensing, fine.

MEMBER MCHENRY: You might ask, did you get a beacon? What beacon strength? Let's try to diagnose why did this fault happen.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Can we just -rather than -- we just want to have something that's very clear and concise --

MEMBER MCHENRY: Do you want "comma beacons"?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Can we do that and is that enough?

MEMBER MCHENRY: Beacon's not the controller.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Well, I'm fine for leaving it but I'm fine for adding something if you want. Just add away.

MEMBER MCHENRY: So I think the ball's in your court, Pepper.
(Laughter.)
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER PEPPER: You know, I can't think at the moment of what to add as opposed to, you know -- deleting it makes it easy, but it's actually to some extent interactive features, not just a database. It's, you know, in an interactive database --


MEMBER TRAMONT: What other examples where NTIA is being asked to do things that are related to commercial use, so I think it's probably useful to go ahead and do your edit here.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: So what would my edit say?
(Laughter.)
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: NTIA should, when adjusting from federal bands?

MEMBER TRAMONT: Yeah, consider the following technical recommendations when addressing shared federal system bands, I guess. The NTIA should when addressing shared federal -- shared federal spectrum?

MEMBER PEPPER: Shared federal bands.

MEMBER ALDER: The following tentative recommendations when addressing -yes.

MEMBER MCHENRY: So -- this is
Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
202-234-4433

Mark. After its auction, is it still a federal band? So what's the point of this if they turn around and auction it?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Well, if it's not shared with federal anymore -- shared with federal users? When they auction bands, right, they have federal users still in them so it's not as if auction alone takes them out but it's just depends --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: -- but still -you could still auction the right to share it with the federal bands, with federal users, that's what I meant to say.

PARTICIPANT: So what is the wording we came up with?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Should consider the following technical recommendations when addressing sharing with federal users.

Okay. So are we at a -- do we call --

MR. NEBBIA: Couple short non-
controversial comments.
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: First of all, the issue of requirements, I think, certainly understanding what the requirements are as part of any interaction and trying to come up with best solutions, I think is important. I don't think it's really possible to specify out front what all those requirements are.

And also once -- once you get into this kind of discussion, I think, with an incumbent service, there has to be a certain since of limitation on their stating their requirements as they are, the idea you're going to open up all their requirements and re-discuss the wave forms and so on. I'm not sure that you can realistically pursue that but, certainly, the understanding that the requirements for the users involved in the sharing arrangement need to be known, I would certainly agree with that and can support that.

As we discussed the sharing arrangements, $I$ know down at the WSRD earlier, they named the database side, the sensing side, and then of course the beacon side which has recently been mentioned here. One of the things that we're looking at in the 1755 to 1850 band is the whole question of interference acceptance or tolerance, which is not particularly a new -- it's not a technique, necessarily, but it may, in fact -particularly when we're talking with intermittent operations, may, in fact, become a critical part. So just so everybody recognizes when you're -- when you're thinking of those different approaches, that may become a really important one.

And then certainly on the fourth recommendation, $I$ think this is pointing in a direction -- and I realize this recommendation has been developing over time, but certainly as it was developing, we are seeing this need to get the -- the sides of the issue together,
and as we look at the working group discussions coming up, I think that's what we are attempting to do there. And it seems like in solving future problems, it's going to become a critical component of what we do.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. I think I -- I think I lost track, but I'm not sure we've had a motion on this.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER ALDER: I will make a
motion to adopt these recommendations.
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Second. Okay.
Any further discussion?
Okay. All those in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Opposed?
(No response.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Great.
CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Now we're
in the next item in our agenda, and this is a progress report in the CSMAC working groups.

And in this one, Karl, $I$ don't
know if you want to start it out, but I think we're really looking for the liaisons for each of the five working groups to kind of give us a quick update.

MR. NEBBIA: That's all. Yeah, we're just we're looking for that kind of report from folks who are in the groups.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: So for the 16951710 MHz meteorological satellite, Mark, if you want to give us a quick update? Or Dennis?

MEMBER MCHENRY: I'll give you the update. So there's been two face-to-face meetings. NTIA gave a nice briefing on the fast track analysis, went through all the technical details, and then NOAA provided an excellent overview of how all the satellite systems work and the frequencies. And there was a lot of technical discussions in the meetings and aggregation effects and they're starting to get down to the nuts and bolts. So there is a listing generated, we need to
know all these parameters, and the entrant and the incumbent will do the analysis. And Steve is circulating that around.

They set up a data repository and people were so friendly no head-knocking yet. So there's no problems. That's it.

MR. NEBBIA: Not like this group.
MEMBER MCHENRY: Not like this group. Very congenial.
(Laughter.)
CO-CHAIR FONTES: So the next group is the working group two, 1755 to 1850 MHz, law enforcement, surveillance, et cetera, et cetera. Tom?

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Yes, Tom Dombrowsky. The group has had an initial call just this week, in fact, yesterday, and expects to have a face-to-face in about a week-and-a-half on this issue. I think one of the questions that's come up in that working group, and there will be questions coming back to NTIA on that, is a little bit on the scope
side, because there is some concern as to whether they should be looking at sharing or just looking at relocation schedules or not.

And I think more broadly another question, I think, Karl, you've heard from other groups, I think we're hosting several of these working groups and I think one of the questions is on the ethical side of providing foods and drinks for all the government folks that are coming to these meetings, so clarification there would be greatly appreciated, too, so we don't get into any trouble on that.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: This could be the Office of Special Counsel.
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: A couple quick
comments. First, you're always safe at giving them nothing.
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: That's a good -- good place to start. But with respect to the --
and we have sent this information back to our own staff who are participating -- certainly, we have done testing in the past that make it appear that traditional sharing between the existing incumbents and a wireless broadband system is not realistic, given the need for these agencies to go anywhere, and so on, at any time.

So from that standpoint, $I$ don't think that sharing is a realistic aspect to pursue. The critical issue is what's the order of march for moving the systems out of the band.

However, there were some questions that came up that I think can be linked into that, and that is whether, ultimately, the law enforcement community can use the network, and in that sense share the industry's technology, and, in doing that, might be able to be on the network where the network is available, and in places where the network's signal is not strong enough for them to use, that they would
have some sort of agreement with the network operators that they would be free to put up their own stick there to do whatever they needed in that location.

So it might end up in some sort of broader cooperative sharing capability or arrangement but, certainly, the initial step has to be looking at the order of march for moving systems out.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: All right. Any other comments then, Tom?

MEMBER GIBSON: Yeah, this is Mark. I want to make one comment. There was a question from that working group as to what you meant by other short distance links. We thought what you meant was the -- essentially, the repeaters that were put in place to facilitate the connection with the law enforcement efforts, but we weren't sure.

MR. NEBBIA: I would have to go
back to our list, but I think that would probably also include like some of the
electronic ordinance disposal, maybe that type of thing. So there were some very short range, mostly, once again, linked to law enforcement.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Any
others?
Okay, the working group three. Rick, if you want to provide a comment or --

MEMBER REASER: We had our first telecon last week, was primarily mostly about getting to know each other, and it was fairly, I think, friendly and so forth. Not a whole lot of technical things were done at the meeting.

I think the plan -- there's a couple of action items, most of them dealt with federal government side providing information about technical characteristics regarding satellite uplinks, and so forth, for the ground stations. There's some continuing discussion about exactly how the electronic warfare stuff would be handled, and there's
going to be some things provided by the government next week.

The first face-to-face meeting will be next week on August 1st, downtown, and hope to accomplish a lot. It can be a long meeting. It starts very early in the morning and goes till late at night. So lots of things to be discussed, but we are off and running.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Great. Any
comments? Okay. Working group four? Mark?
MEMBER GIBSON: I'm going to have to defer to either Tom or Mark because -- this is Mark Gibson -- I wasn't able to make the call, but I would add that I think our next meeting's got yours beat because it's scheduled from 12:00 a.m. till 12:00 a.m. (Laughter).

MEMBER GIBSON: So it's a 24 -hour meeting, or a very short one, for the working group four. But I wasn't on the call so, Tom or Mark, you know, you have the details.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Sure. This is Tom Dombrowsky. I was on the working group four call, and as he said, we have an initial call, we have a face-to-face meeting that I hope the schedule's not midnight to midnight, but that will be next week. I think that group went very -- very cleanly.

I think there was a little bit of discussion about not everybody was involved in the last go around with the fixed microwave so there was concern about should we be doing sharing or should we not, and we said, no, you've fixed microwave, you're moving, everybody knows you're moving. We don't need to talk about sharing with fixed microwave.

And there was a lot more discussion of the tactical radio because that's where we really haven't done a lot of ground work. So the focus of the group's primarily going to be on the tactical radio, not on the fixed microwave, and I think everybody agreed with that.

## CHARIR FONTE: Karl?

MR. NEBBIA: Just a note.
Certainly, with the experience of 1710 and 1755, there has been a lot of work done with the tactical radio, at least in being able to shrink the areas that you would have to protect until you came up with some other arrangement.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. No other comment?

For working group five, I don't know if Jennifer Warren is on the call to make a presentation, or do you, Bryan?

MEMBER TRAMONT: I believe Ms. Warren is going to take the lead here.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Great. Jennifer?

MEMBER TRAMONT: She was going to take the lead per e-mail. If not, I can take the lead.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Simultaneous speaking.) } \\
& \text { CO-CHAIR FONTES: Jennifer, if you }
\end{aligned}
$$

can hear us, just hold for a moment, please. We were trying to mute the call based on the interference we were hearing at this end.

Jennifer, are you on the call?
You know what, Bryan, why don't you go ahead and, Jennifer, when you're on the call, why don't you give me a quick text or send me a quick e-mail just so $I$ know you're on the call.

MEMBER TRAMONT: So the working group five had our initial conference call last week. It was very productive. Our task is fairly complex, like many of the other committees, so there is going to be some division of the group into multi-subgroups.

I think we had upwards of 80 people on the call, so we were very well attended. And we actually -- 85, I think was the number.

And our next meeting is scheduled for next week, August 2nd, I guess we're the slackers of the group, similar all-day affair.

We're going to start to dig in. There were some work items in terms of people volunteering for leadership roles in our subgroups as well as submitting questions that can help to frame the debate on the incumbent systems across five different vectors. So we are underway and, hopefully, the heavy lifting is starting now and will continue on the $2 n d$. MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Just one correction. It's a two-day meeting. It's Thursday and Friday.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: For the rest of the committee it's a two-day meeting, is that what you're saying, Tom? Thank you.

Okay, any other questions for Bryan?

Okay. Jennifer is on the call and, unfortunately, we're unable to hear her. MR. NEBBIA: Just one comment. I'd ask just that you keep us informed along the process if, in fact, the 80-person, 100person participant list gets to be an issue,
we may have to figure out another approach. We are trying to keep this as open as possible and yet -- but if you start getting 100 people trying to resolve issues, it will be even a little bit more difficult than it's been today.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Janice?
MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Yeah, I wanted to highlight a topic that came up at this meeting that I think is probably going to be across the board. The question came up of, you know, foreign participation, foreign participation in person, foreign participation by phone. That's sort of one subset of kind of who becomes directly involved in this process.

The second being kind of guidelines for protection of data, and while data may not be classified, one can envision that from a federal side, but also from a company side, if we're really going to get into the nitty-gritty, something this -- this Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
open-ended probably will not yield the results everybody's hoping for.

So I simply raise those two kind of subsets of organizational questions to you, and so NTIA will have to be guiding us through this process, and there may well be a time when, you know, we're going to have to close down some degree of openness.

MR. NEBBIA: This is Karl. Well,
I should indicate that I know the issue of the non-U.S. citizens came up at one point, and it just seemed like the simple solution, at least as the question was posed, was just not meet on restricted facilities. And it's not -it's harder on everybody to meet in those facilities anyway, so even the people that are hosting the meetings. So I think we've kind of solved that one, and I hope the co-chairs of each of the groups feel they have the ability to resolve a lot of these types of issues.

With respect to the data itself, Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
at this point, we would certainly look for the agencies that have such data that they feel is vital to the discussion that, obviously, that they would bring that up and that they would let it be known what kind of limitations there are.
We're not -- we're not sure at
this point whether there's going to be very much of that, as we've seen a lot of work go on in ITU work and other places where there's been a limited set of data that was all that was really necessary to get the formulating and outcome. So we're -- at this point, we're not putting out a general policy telling everybody how to do that.

We'd certainly like to get as much out on the table as possible, but if an agency feels they get to the point where a key factor in coming to a solution is something they can't release, then we'll -- we will certainly deal with that and may have to limit the group.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Thank you, Janice, for raising questions on foreign participation in database.

Any other comments on the brief reports?

Thank you.
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Next, we're going to move to the NTIA evaluation and the CSMAC recommendation regarding interference and dynamic access subcommittee.

MR. NEBBIA: This is Karl. We had put together a table going through all the recommendations in that report and, interesting enough, there's a report dating from November 10, 2010, so it pre-dates some of your involvement here.

We have noted, however, that the unlicensed group, and others along the way, have, in fact, referred to some of the recommendations in this report.

We're running a little bit behind schedule here today so I think, just
generally, I'd like to say that -- that we've tried to give a -- you know, a good explanation of what we think of the recommendations as they were, you know, laid out in this report. Most of them we think certainly are things that we will continue to do, things like guard bands, obviously a part of our tool chest with the new services. Of course, I think there is a general expectation that the new service provides the guard band, but I'm not sure that we can enforce that in every case, particularly if somebody participates in an auction and they're paying for spectrum right up to the boundary. We would expect that creating a guard band may not be the right -you know, expecting it to come out of their spectrum may not be the right thing. We've also found in some of these cases that there are choices that can be made in that sharing environment where, instead of establishing a guard band, we take some other
approach, it may be down tilting antennas, it may be selecting a different frequency in those areas where we're having interference. And some of you may have seen recently, we just have completed a report dealing with this adjacent band interference problem between the communications systems below 2690 and weather radar systems above 2700.

And, once again, there are cases where filtering the signal along that boundary was the only solution, but there are also lots of other approaches that could be taken and, certainly, fixed in a location-by-location basis not one that required a general rule that says everybody has to have guard bands and those sorts of things.

So I think we weren't real clear on what the virtual guard bands are, and we may need to spend a little bit more time looking at that. The same thing pertaining to this concept of data technology which, once again, it's not that easy for the feds to be
changing technology. They have but, nonetheless, I think most of these recommendations, I think, we can -- you know, we can work with, and are certainly within the frame work of what we're -- you know, what we're doing.

We do -- as indicated, there's a recommendation that we should examine the application of DSA technologies for sharing and increase that use. Once again, we have certain, you know, limitations on the amount of resources we have for moving that forward.

On the other hand, there are other groups. The NITRD WSRD group this morning are looking at how to expand those test capabilities and opportunities so we may see more on that in the future. The PCAST report cited a concept they called "test cities" which is another new interesting idea.

We're going to continue the progress on our spectrum sharing testbed that's working in one particular band but,
once again, certainly some of the limitations there are due to the amount of resources that we can apply to it. Some of them are due to the fact that it's -- for some manufacturers, it's a new thing to come into an environment where all those characteristics are being tested of their devices.

So we've got a number of recommendations that you've made here where, unfortunately, we've had to cite the reality that doing this work has not been placed in our appropriations, so you'll see some of those there. And they're not in the budget for 2013. That's in front of Congress right now. So those things are -- you know, there's just some realistic aspects about it.

As the talk about the database issues, I think once again, realistically, NTIA controls the federal database. The challenge oftentimes is that even though we hold the database, the information belongs to the agencies; and, therefore, we can't make
the GMF data, even the non-classified data that is FOI exempt -- that's how it's marked at the current time -- we can't make that available without the agency's participation.

So as we get into all the recommendations related to a database, there at least seemed to us the assumption that the federal database could be made available, and that assumption, of course, doesn't play out in reality. So until something changes along that line, you know, we will be, I think, handcuffed in some of those areas.

And so I think at this point -oh, there's another section dealing with harmonized spectrum, and I think that is certainly an area that we're looking toward. I think everybody has to recognize what harmonization generally means. Certainly, from my experience, the United States often jumps out in front in terms of implementing innovative concepts, new bands. We generally are willing to step forward in doing that, and
we make frequency decisions as quickly as possible to get those systems implemented.

The challenge that creates is that then the rest of the world looks at what we've done. They obviously have other market motivations and other motivations, so what we frequently find is the thing that we've set out, and it can be the 700 MHz band plan, it can be decisions that we've made about where we're putting wireless broadband, both in the past and the future. We find them, I think, making an effort to check our advancements by coming up with a contrary solution and, therefore, putting into question the direction we've taken.

So then when you start talking in terms of harmonization, they're call is for us to change to become what they want to do, not the other way around, so we have to realize the issue of harmonization is kind of a twoedged sword.

Certainly, from the DoD
perspective, harmonization always means they end up with less spectrum because nobody's harmonizing military, they're only harmonizing, you know, commercial uses, and so on. So I think we need to, you know, consider that. And I think that's probably all I feel like I need to go into in detail.

I know most of you just probably saw this last week when it popped up. So I'm happy to give you more time, and if you want to come back at the next meeting with any questions about what we're implementing, that's certainly a satisfactory way for us. CO-CHAIR FONTES: I think that will probably be the best approach. It is time to read this and review it carefully, and then where there are concerns based on your comments, then we can bring them up at the next meeting.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Actually, who are the co-chairs of that committee -- of the committee that made those recommendations?

Sorry, this is Bryan.
MR. NEBBIA: The co-chairs, it's -
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MEMBER TRAMONT: My only concern
is that somebody has responsibility for writing something down. And so you've asked for feedback on certain -- a list of things and I don't remember who the co-chairs were or how this is structured, but if we actually want that, we need to have somebody take responsibility for that.

MR. NEBBIA: We're hearing David Donovan's name spoken in vain.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: We can go back to the two CSMAC co-chairs.

MEMBER TRAMONT: We'll follow up with David, maybe, does that make sense? Okay.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: You are next.
MR. NEBBIA: So we're down to the
items scheduled for $3: 45$ so we're just a little bit behind, and I will talk fast. So, first of all, I want to bring everybody up-todate that the FSMS phase one implementation has begun, so we're actually starting that process of moving to the FSMS on the unclassified side, and this involves enabling the agencies to implement the data through new mechanisms. So the process is beginning of this transition and that's good news for us to finally get the system moving.

The phase two and three will be following along but, anyway, I think that's a major step for us and, once again, the new data coming in, the new data checks will be more substantial. We will have issues with some of the agencies in transferring over to the new system because there's security, IT security issues that we have to walk through there, but it is currently available to them to use.

Within that, we also noted earlier Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
that we have changed our own rules. Everything's signed off. The only thing that hasn't quite happened yet is the updating of what's called Spectrum 21, which is an internal component of our current system that provides them the place for them to electronically put in their name and verification of what's going on. But certainly the agreement that they're going to do that, that there's going to be a contact point in each agency who verifies that the assignment was necessary and the data was accurate is going to be inserted into the system. So that, I think, is progress. We also wanted to bring to your attention -- most of you probably seen it, at least through the trade press -- the letter that we received from the Hill requesting data on federal operations. It's broken out into a couple -- certainly, two major questions: The one asking us through three different band ranges, 300 MHz , the 3 GHz , 1755 to 1850, and
then the smaller band up to 1780, basically asking us for assignment counts and, you know, who they are linked to, whether they are space-based, air-based, or ground-based and then broken out by the frequency ranges. So that item is probably well within our grasp to do an assignment count.

The second item becomes a little bit more challenging and, certainly, it would be interesting if you had any thoughts on what that means and how we would go about doing that, maybe even on a non-federal perspective; but, once again, trying to come up with something that states the amount of spectrum. Once again, spectrum is a multidimensional concept. We don't give agencies whole bands or blocks of spectrum, we give them locations, characteristics under their authorization, and so on. So that one will certainly be more challenging. If you have any thoughts on how that can be reasonably done, just any thoughts at the moment before -

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, yes, this is Mark Gibson. What about just telling them the number of assignments?

MR. NEBBIA: That's the first question. So we --

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, then tell them the side of the assignment.

MR. NEBBIA: So I think one of the possibilities is that you can, in fact, take the number of assignments, you can link their bandwidth to them. It doesn't necessarily, once again, convey the idea whether they're a nationwide assignment, whether they are a very geographically restricted assignment, it's just not something that lends itself to a good number.

> CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Do you find that the number of ones that have a certain radius -- so one thing on the, you know, the commercial, the FCC side, they use MHz-pops but I'm not sure that that's a reasonable
thing to think about for -- for defense things but --

MR. NEBBIA: Yes, the pops was very appropriate.

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, it would seem that it's left, you know, to your own interpretation but, I mean what Rick was saying is, you know, it seems to make sense, I think it's a challenge but I also think it's doable. You know, the commission has done it before, but I can't remember when, but I do remember them undergoing exercises at some point to try to do something similar to this, and I forget the bands.

It might have been -- I forget the bands, but we tried to look at forgiven carriers, how much spectrum they had, you know, for given areas. So, you know, it's not intractable, it just needs -- I think you need some boundary conditions and definition.

MR. NEBBIA: Okay. Any other thoughts before I move on -- yes, sir.

MEMBER ROBERSON: Yes, just actually a couple questions. One in the previous topic, do we have a time line for phase one complete, phase two start, phase three start?

MR. NEBBIA: There are. I don't have them with me but, yes, there are schedules laid out for all those -- you know, and we would probably provide those schedules -- there's overlap between them but, you know - -

MEMBER ROBERSON: And then it's a question that's not really for you, it's really for Congress, but why would they use the 300 to 3 GHz and then cut out the band that is part of the 300 to 3 GHz , and then a part that's part of the 1755 to 1850, because it's really -- the latter two are redundant. They're actually covered by the first question. So I don't know why they would have used that structure.

MR. NEBBIA: I mean, certainly,
from our standpoint, trying to do any informational dumps is always easiest if you break things at clean band edges for one thing. That's always helpful. One thing we, I think, do recognize that within the 1755 to 1850 band, almost all of the uses are the same as those within the limited bands is that the system's operating across the entire spectrum, I think with the exception of the precision guided munitions don't operate down on that lower portion.

So if we're talking about times of systems operating, the reports will look very much alike. I would expect that the assignment counts of the 25 MHz will approximately be 20 to 25 percent of the total 95 MHz.

I think, certainly, that the difficulties in looking at the 300 to 3 GHz , that's much more difficult. If you're going across lots of different kind of spectrum, but we can certainly give assignment counts in
that range. One of the things that -- the odd things that comes up with those that deal with science services, we have been getting the radio astronomers and some of the other passive users to actually get assignments for or register their operations.

The problem in our database is they're all zero hertz. So you multiply the number of frequencies by the zero hertz and it still comes out to be zero when, in fact, they've got bands that they occupy.

MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. It's Mark again. One quick question. Your assumption is that this is spectrum used from transmitter side, not spectrum that the receivers can see? MR. NEBBIA: That's another good question because we do have bands, maybe not in this range that are -- well, the passive ones are receive only, but even on the -- like I said, we get up in the 4 GHz with the radar altimeters, there are no records there. Or if we look at the weather satellite downlink
band, the key factor there wasn't so much the specific sites but at least a portion of the band, the fact that everybody's brother bought a satellite receiver to get the weather information, and whether it's police stations or local TV stations or universities, and so on.

And so those things play into it as a difficulty in trying to calculate this kind of number. But in line with this, just so everybody knows, and I know you have heard about the Energy and Commerce Committee folks working on these spectrum working groups and they are meeting, they are calling in representatives from the FCC and NTIA and Department of Defense, and we're making presentations to them so that's actively underway.

And the last thing I wanted to mention is ask Peter Tenhula briefly to let you know what's going on, on the NTIA's work on the technical panel and dispute resolution
board that we're required by the Middle Class Tax Relief Act.

MR. TENHULA: Hi, this is Peter Tenhula, NTIA, and just want to provide an update on actually some recommendations that came out of CSMAC a few years ago regarding the improving the process for identifying spectrum for future reallocation or sharing -and that made it into the law, the 2012 Tax Relief Act -- specifically provided significant improvements and modifications to the Commercial Spectrum Enhancement Act, also known as CSEA.

Some of the improvements involving authorizing transfers from the spectrum relocation fund for a much wider array of costs incurred by the federal agencies that have to relocate. It also added the concept of sharing costs and getting those reimbursed. It also included in the list of costs that are reimbursable are pre-auction planning, using alternative technologies, using state-of-the-
art systems, research, engineering studies, economic analysis, and coordination with auction winners. All of those are not covered under the spectrum relocation fund.

Some processes were also put in place, I think, pursuant to the recommendations to improve transparency and accountability, specifically involving specifying contents for new agency transition plans. So a band that has been reallocated from federal to non-federal use, either on an exclusive or a shared basis, in order to get these reimbursements, they have to have a -the agencies have to have a transition plan.

These transition plans are then reviewed by a technical panel. The technical panel is made up of three folks, one appointed by NTIA, one appointed by OMB, and one appointed by FCC. The first technical panel serves 18 -month terms will be in place as of August 20th, and we're also developing the mechanisms for capturing the transitions plans.

The Act requires us to come up with a common format, or templates, for the NCC use in preparing their transition plans and, you know, part of the template and the format is to ensure that classified and sensitive information is protected as well.

Part of the -- I mentioned the technical panel and other part of the improvements involve a dispute resolution board that would be established when, and if, there is a dispute between non-federal and federal entities in implementing those transition plans.

So a lot of thought went into preauction planning, the transition process itself, and then even the implementation of these transition plans. And our implementation right now is kind of focusing on those transition plans, the contents of those, and that's going to be in the context of where those rules take place -- or they're
contained in Annex "O" of the NTIA manual -and two other rules involve the workings of the technical panel and the dispute resolution board, and so we recently issued a notice of proposed rulemaking on those two aspects of it and comment on that. Those proposed rules are due August 1st. That's it.

Any questions?
Thank you.
CO-CHAIR FONTES: I want to thank Karl and Peter for an update. Are there any questions based on their update?

Okay, the next one that we have on our agenda today is committee questions and discussion. So I've got questions coming from the committee. I thought that we had a few earlier, but go ahead.

MEMBER ALDER: Larry Alder again. Just one more question is on the whole 1755 of the subcommittee. I ended up getting disconnected from the e-mail chains along the way. I don't know if that happened to other
members. I sent in my list of preferred things, never heard anything from anybody and didn't know what was going on. What is the mechanism -- and that's actually fine. I'm happy with that outcome.
(Laughter.)
CO-CHAIR FONTES: We'll get people over there to figure this out.
(Laughter.)
MR. NEBBIA: At this point, we've provided you the leadership structure for the groups, so if you want to be in one of those groups, the easiest thing, I think, is for you to contact them and say, I want to participate in your group as opposed to --

MEMBER ALDER: So I guess that what happened is if you weren't actually on the CSMAC mailing list, so some names got dropped, mine got dropped, and I just confirmed -- I wasn't getting those e-mails. So $I$ don't know if you're going to use the mailing list to all CSMAC or just to
individuals, but I think that something happened in there and just wasn't sure. So there will be just going forward just contact the group chairs that have been named?

MR. NEBBIA: I think that would be the easiest way and, in fact, one of the group chairs, it almost seemed in working group five, was it seemed like they're mailing out the list to everybody. I was getting them all, and I've never signed up for any of the groups, so I don't know, but that's -- that would be the easiest route if you're missing--CO-CHAIR FONTES: Did that answer your question?

MEMBER ALDER: Yes, thank you. CO-CHAIR FONTES: Are there other questions from the committee? Okay. Great. Thank you. CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Now we have an opportunity for any public comment about -- as we put out the procedures of public participation. So the subject matter is
listed in the agenda, if there was any public comment in the room first? Is there anyone in the room that would like the speak? Okay. Is there anyone on the telephone who would like to speak?

MR. SNYDER: Yes, it's Jim Snyder.
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay, Jim?
MR. SNYDER: So it's Jim Snyder from the Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University, and my comments relate to the CSMAC working group. I'd like to get some clarification about some information about the working groups.

Today's agenda included contact information about the working committees in quite a bit of detail, but it's not clear to me if all the industry members are listed there.

Are their meetings public? And are all the informal and formal industry members posted on that list?

It certainly listed quite a bit of
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information, but $I$ have to think that there are industry members that are not listed there. So if I could get some clarification about that, $I$ would appreciate it.

And then $I$ have a few other questions about the working groups.

MR. NEBBIA: The -- certainly, all of the participants are not on the list that you have. They are, in fact, contacting the co-chairs directly so that's -- they are not on the list that you have.

MR. SNYDER: Okay, I would suggest that that's a problem. And then are there meeting dates posted anywhere? They certainly had a number of meetings but $I$ haven't seen any postings of their meetings. I would like to attend at least one of their meetings but, of course, $I$ can't unless the information is publicly posted.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Again, I think as Karl suggested to Larry, contacting the group leaders to get the information about the Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
committee meetings will allow you to understand when they are, and I think that would be good for us to make sure that these are well-known as well.

MR. SNYDER: Yes, I think that's impractical to contact them, so I think you have to either post them or assume that they are, as a practical matter, private.

Now I'd like to also note that if the industry wants re-licensees to the spectrum in the name of the public good, you need to convince the public you're acting in the public interest, which seems to be pretty reasonable. To build that trust, I would suggest you need to operate transparently and with accountability, and then I mean by this, not just as a public facade but for real, and that means complying with the laws and the ethics laws. It means not attacking those who speak to have those laws enforced or turning a blind eye while others engage in such behavior.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: No, I think that that's something that's not on the agenda for the day. The working group stuff and getting the contact information for the working groups is very appropriate, but then throwing in other things like that, I think we can have you take up at another time.

MR. SNYDER: Well, Karl, for example, said, you are always safe by giving them nothing, say, and, you know, Janice raised issues about coming -- what time to close down with degree of openers, so at least procedural --

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Karl's point about giving them nothing was in reference to food.

MR. SNYDER: Okay. Well, working group number two asked a procedural question, and then Karl said, You're always safe by giving them nothing. The attitude that I feel that, you know, has --

Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Jim, let's -let's stick to the agenda, please.

MR. SNYDER: Yes, but let me just also note, finally, in conclusion on this subject is the last meeting, it was very clearly stated that the procedural issues are relevant and public comments, which is the norm at FACA proceedings, and this was a unilateral change of policy. And it's really been now since last May of 2011, it really has been for one reason -- for technical problems, last meeting, the meeting was closed -- there really hasn't been any opportunity, and there's no other vehicle to do it than at these meetings, and it's not as though you're overwhelmed with public participation.
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Jim, if you'd
like to look at the very last bullet point on the participation policy, there is an opportunity for a public comment on this stuff, just not in the public comment period
at the meetings, but there is --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. SNYDER: -- comments are not posted online, for example, like the PCAST comments, they are posted publicly and yours are not, so it's a different type of public the way you've set it up, quite qualitatively would be different.

So, okay, I've had my piece and I've -- you know, I suppose that if you're within your powers to restrict such comments, but it clearly is implicit, the members of CSMAC have many procedural questions that came up repeatedly today, and there's certainly, in any type of democratic process --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to make a comment from the public on the phone?

Okay. I think we will not go till
4:40 a.m. before the next agenda item.
(Laughter.)
Neal R. Gross \& Co., Inc.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Either that or we've already concluded it.
(Laughter.)
CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: So I think this is just a notice of the schedule -- the next scheduled meeting so that you can get those on your calendar. And if there's any other -not any other comments, I think we're --

MEMBER TRAMONT: Can I make a quick comment?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Bryan, yes.
MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan
Tramont. I just want to welcome a number of students from CU who are part of our structure and policy course who, rather than going to class today, had the opportunity to sit around this table and listen to all of us.

So if students can raise your
hands, excellent. And I encourage the members of CSMAC and the members of the public to visit with the students. This is their learning -- this is an opportunity to see
public policymaking up close and personal. And so Dale and I were excited -- and our coteacher Jill Van Matre in the back. We were excited to be able to bring the students in and have them experience this firsthand. So I'm sure it wasn't planned as we had forecast but anyway. Just wanted to acknowledge their presence.

And also David Donovan has agreed to pick up the ball on the one thing that we talked about.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Fantastic.
Thank you. And we do welcome the students here. Yes. Anything else?

I think we stand adjourned.
Thank you everyone.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled
matter went off the record at 4:23 p.m.)
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