

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1615 L STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5694
TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300
FACSIMILE (202) 223-7420

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1946-1991)
RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1946-1956)
SIMON H. RIFKIND (1950-1995)
LOUIS S. WEISS (1927-1950)
JOHN F. WHARTON (1927-1977)

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019-6064
TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000
FACSIMILE (212) 757-3990

62, RUE DU FAUBOURG SAINT-HONORÉ
75008 PARIS, FRANCE
TELEPHONE (33 1) 53 43 14 14
FACSIMILE (33 1) 53 43 00 23

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING
2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME
CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN
TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101
FACSIMILE (81-3) 3597-8120

ORIENTAL PLAZA, TOWER E3
SUITE 1205

NO. 1 EAST CHANG AN AVENUE
DONG CHENG DISTRICT
BEIJING, 100738

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
TELEPHONE (86-10) 8518-2788
FACSIMILE (86-10) 8518-2780/81

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING
3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL
HONG KONG
TELEPHONE (852) 2536-9933
FACSIMILE (852) 2536-9622

ALDER CASTLE
10 NOBLE STREET
LONDON EC2V 7JU, U.K.
TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600
FACSIMILE (44 20) 7367 1650

PARTNERS RESIDENT IN WASHINGTON

HENK BRANDS
PATRICK S. CAMPBELL
KENNETH A. GALLO
ROBERT P. PARKER
WARREN B. RUDMAN, OF COUNSEL

DALE M. SARRO
JOSEPH J. SIMONS
PHILLIP L. SPECTOR
STUART G. STEINGOLD

PARTNERS NOT RESIDENT IN WASHINGTON

NEALE M. ALBERT*
MARK H. ALCOTT
ALLAN J. ARFFA*
ROBERT R. ATKINS*
JOHN F. BAUGHMAN*
LYNN B. BAYARD*
DANIEL J. BELLER*
MITCHELL L. BERG*
MARK S. BERGMAN
BRUCE BIRENBOIM*
H. CHRISTOPHER BOEHNING*
RICHARD S. BORISOFF*
JOHN F. BREGGIO*
RICHARD J. BRONSTEIN*
JEANETTE K. CHAN*
YVONNE Y. F. CHAN*
DOUGLAS A. CIFU*
LEWIS R. CLAYTON
JAY COHEN
RUSSELL E. COLWELL*
KELLEY A. CORNISH*
DOUGLAS R. DAVIS*
JAMES M. DUBIN
LESLIE GORDON FAGEN
MARC FALCONE*
PETER T. FELCHER*
PETER E. FISCH*
ROBERT C. FLEDER*
MARTIN FLUMENBAUM
ANDREW J. FOLEY*
HARRIS B. FREDJUS*
MICHAEL E. GERTZMAN*
PAUL D. GINSBERG*
ERIC S. GOLDSTEIN*
ERIC GODDISON*
CHARLES H. GOOGE, JR.*
ANDREW G. GORDON*
BRUCE A. GUTENPLAN*
GAINES GWATHMEY, III*
ALAN S. HALPERIN*
CLAUDIA HAMMERMAN*
GERARD E. HARPER
ROBERT M. HIRSH*
STEVEN R. HOWARD*
JOYCE S. HUANG*
JEH CHARLES JOHNSON
MEREDITH J. KANE*
ROBERTA A. KAPLAN*
BRAD S. KARP*
JOHN C. KENNEDY*
ALAN W. KORNBERG

RUBEN KRAJEM*
DANIEL J. KRAMER*
DAVID K. LAKHDIR
JOHN E. LANGE*
DANIEL J. LEFFELL*
MARTIN LONDON
JEFFREY D. MARCELL*
MARGO V. MASOTTI*
EDWIN S. MAYNARD*
TOBY S. MYERSON*
JOHN E. NATHAN*
KEVIN J. O'BRIEN*
ALEX YOUNG K. OH*
JOHN J. O'NEIL
KELLEY D. PARKER*
MARC E. PERLMUTTER*
MARC E. POMERANTZ*
VALERIE E. RADWANER*
CAREY R. RAMOS
MICHAEL B. REEDE*
CARL L. REISNER*
WALTER RIEMAN*
SIDNEY S. ROSDEITCHER
RICHARD A. ROSEN*
ANDREW N. ROSENBERG*
STEVEN B. ROSENFELD
PETER J. ROTHENBERG*
RAPHAEL M. RUSSO*
JEFFREY D. SAFERSTEIN*
JEFFREY B. SAMUELS*
TERRY E. SCHIMEK*
KENNETH M. SCHNEIDER*
ROBERT B. SCHUMER*
JAMES H. SCHWAB*
MICHAEL J. SEGAL*
STEPHEN J. SHIMSHAK*
DAVID R. SICULAR*
MOSES SILVERMAN*
STEVEN SIMKIN*
MARILYN SOBEL*
AIDAN SYNNOTT*
ROBYN F. TARNOWSKY*
JUDITH R. THOYER*
DANIEL J. TOAL*
MARK A. UNDERBERG*
MARIA T. VULLO*
THEODORE V. WELLS, JR.
STEVEN I. WOLFRAM*
LISA YANO*
JORDAN E. YARETT*
ALFRED D. YOUNGWOOD

*NOT AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE DC BAR.

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

202-223-7340

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

202-223-7440

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

pspector@paulweiss.com

April 27, 2004

Received

MAY 05 2004

RECEIVED

Policy Branch
International Bureau

APR 27 2004

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

By Hand

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Ex Parte Communication – Report No. SPB-196;
SAT-PDR-20020425-00071

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On April 27, 2004, Nancy Eskenazi, Vice President and Associate General Counsel of SES AMERICOM, Inc. ("SES AMERICOM"); and the undersigned, attorney for SES AMERICOM, met in person with Jennifer Manner, Office of Commissioner Abernathy; and with Roderick Porter, Thomas Tycz, John Martin, and Steven Spaeth, all of the International Bureau. Each of these meetings was for the purpose of discussing

matters identified in the attached document, which was distributed at each meeting. We are filing an original and one copy of this letter and the attachment in each of the referenced dockets.

Respectfully submitted,



Phillip L. Spector

Attorney for SES AMERICOM, Inc.

Attachments

cc (via e-mail, with attachment):

Jennifer Manner
Roderick Porter
Thomas Tycz
John Martin
Steven Spaeth
Qualex International

**THE FCC SHOULD NOT INITIATE A RULEMAKING ON
REDUCED ORBITAL SPACING OF DBS SATELLITES**

- **The FCC rules already provide an effective mechanism for evaluating proposals for satellites at reduced spacing.**
 - The DBS bands are internationally planned, and governed by Appendices 30 and 30A of the ITU Radio Regulations.
 - Appendices 30 and 30A contain procedures for modifying the “BSS Plans,” including to accommodate satellites at reduced orbital spacing. These procedures prescribe international coordination to protect existing systems.
 - The FCC rules incorporate these international procedures. Compliance with these rules is essentially the only technical qualification imposed by the FCC on DBS applicants. (*See* 47 C.F.R. §§ 25.111(c), 25.114(c)(22), 25.148(f).)
 - In its 2002 revision of the DBS rules, the FCC explicitly held that these procedures ensure adequate protection of existing systems, while permitting new entry. With reduced-spacing scenarios fully in mind, the FCC declined to adopt other technical constraints. (*2002 DBS Order*, ¶ 130.)

- **The FCC should continue to support the existing coordination procedures.**
 - The FCC has consistently followed the international procedures in licensing U.S. DBS satellites.
 - The modification procedures have been used for all U.S. DBS satellites in operation today.
 - The FCC itself has undertaken to modify the BSS Plans to introduce satellites at locations that were not assigned in the original BSS Plans, not only for service to the Americas, but also to Europe and Asia.
 - The FCC has required U.S. licensees to honor the ITU priority system.
 - The FCC is currently participating in a number of coordinations involving DBS satellites at reduced spacing, including SES AMERICOM’s proposed satellite at 105.5°.
 - Coordination will result in more DBS capacity than a rulemaking.
 - Coordination avoids imposing restrictive “one-size-fits-all” requirements. Technical rules cannot effectively take into account the differences in the sharing conditions at each individual DBS slot, and can preclude otherwise viable sharing arrangements.
 - Coordination allows the sharing arrangement between operators to evolve as requirements change, for example, as new satellites are launched. Formal rulemakings cannot keep up with such changes.
 - The acceptable range of values for many technical parameters (such as power levels) depends on the values of other system parameters. Rules of general applicability cannot take advantage of such flexibility.

- A satellite designed to meet a one-size-fits-all requirement in all operational scenarios will necessarily result in degraded capacity at some or all orbital slots, resulting in lost capacity to the consumer.
 - Innovations -- such as spot beams, higher order modulation and coding, and HDTV -- can be, and routinely are, taken into account in coordination.
 - All of these advantages of coordination have been exploited by U.S. DBS operators to date, to permit, for example, smaller dishes and spot-beam satellites.
- Coordination has been used successfully for decades across many satellite bands. Even among potential competitors, agreements permitting new services have been developed in good faith. There is no reason why coordination will not function well in this case.
- The FCC, via its participation in each coordination, and its ultimate responsibility for agreements reached, can fully pursue its policy objectives.
- **The FCC should reject EchoStar's proposal to tie the technical issues of reduced orbital spacing to the question of U.S. market entry by foreign-licensed satellites.**
 - The two issues are not linked in any logical way.
 - There is no reason to re-open issues resolved by adoption of the ECO-Sat test.
- **Initiation of a rulemaking conflicts with key FCC policy objectives that require increased DBS capacity in the near-term.**
 - The FCC has found that more competition is needed in multichannel video.
 - It has also encouraged DBS providers to offer more local-into-local and HDTV channels.
 - Authorization of new BSS satellites, consistent with ITU coordination procedures, will further these policy objectives within a two-year timeframe.
 - By contrast, a rulemaking will introduce more delay, in a process that has already been delayed unreasonably.
- **SES AMERICOM could have launched a BSS satellite for 105.5° WL in 2004.**
 - The SES AMERICOM Petition for Declaratory Ruling has been pending with the FCC for two years, despite the fact that the Petition complies with all FCC rules and policies and is ripe for grant.
 - When it filed this Petition in April 2002, SES AMERICOM indicated it could launch a new satellite, offering new DBS services, by 2004.
 - The FCC should focus on authorizing new services and promoting competition, resisting DirecTV's self-serving attempt to introduce additional delay.