

(202) 828-0155

January 25, 2002

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Magalie R. Salas
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: Oral Ex Parte Presentation
ET Docket No. 98-153**

Dear Ms. Salas:

This is to report that on January 24, 2002, representatives of QUALCOMM, Cingular Wireless, and Sprint PCS (collectively referred to as the "Wireless Companies") met with Peter Tenhula, Senior Legal Advisor to Chairman Powell to discuss the above-referenced proceeding, and specifically QUALCOMM's recent study demonstrating that QUALCOMM's E911 technology (so-called gpsOne) cannot meet the FCC's E911 mandate in the face of harmful interference from ultra wideband ("UWB") devices. Attending the meeting were Jonas Neihardt, Kevin Kelley, and myself on behalf of QUALCOMM; Jim Bugel on behalf of Cingular Wireless; and, Luisa Lancetti on behalf of Sprint PCS. Bob Calaff also observed the meeting on behalf of VoiceStream Wireless.

During the meeting, the Wireless Companies expressed their concern that QUALCOM's recent testing had demonstrated that a wireless phone containing the gpsOne technology will suffer substantial degradation from emissions from a UWB device in its vicinity such that the phone's ability to deliver the location of a caller to 911 is jeopardized. They emphasized that QUALCOMM's testing was conducted in a very benign indoor environment and with a relatively strong GPS signal, and they explained that at the weaker signal levels set forth in the TIA draft standard, which, when approved, will be the worldwide standard for the performance of wireless phones containing position location technology and using the code division multiple access ("CDMA") air interface, the degradation suffered by the gpsOne receiver as a result of UWB emissions would be much more severe. Thus, at realistic scenarios, E911 service could be substantially jeopardized by UWB emissions, and the Wireless Companies urged that as a matter of Commission policy, the Commission should not permit such degradation to a safety of life service such as E911.

The Wireless Companies also explained that the major UWB proponents had declined to loan or sell QUALCOMM a UWB device for testing purposes, and there should be collaborative testing of the harmful interference from actual UWB devices before the Commission sets the technical parameters for UWB devices. As it stands now, there is no test in the record to verify that such parameters will prevent harmful interference to wireless phone calls, both in general and particularly with regard to E911 service.

Finally, the Wireless Companies discussed their concern about the difficulty and expense of attempting to ameliorate harmful interference from UWB devices. It will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate such harmful interference, and to place the burden of doing so on the wireless carriers would be fundamentally inconsistent with Part 15 and grossly unfair.

Sincerely yours,

Dean R. Brenner
Attorney for QUALCOMM Incorporated

cc: Peter Tenhula