

Comments concerning the remarks of Commissioner Abernathy

I have studied the subject remarks, including the heading "Reaching Broadband Nirvana".

"Oblivion to care, pain, or external reality" is one definition of Nirvana. I believe that definition is directly applicable to "broadband-over powerline" (BPL) technology.

To elaborate, care should be taken not to be oblivious to the reality of the pain caused to the licensed and non-licensed (see Note below) users of the RF spectrum!

I realize that in regulatory considerations, the technical aspects represent but a part of the equation. However, in the case of RF spectrum regulatory considerations, it is an extremely important part; to be ignored only at one's peril. This is certainly true when considering BPL. I strongly recommend that the Commission pay heed to the interference concerns which obtain.

Of many points which could be made against authorization of BPL, let me make only one. Some argue that if interference is not heard, it does not exist. This ignores the fact that all RF emissions contribute to the noise floor of the spectrum. Increasing the noise floor means that one cannot transmit as far without increasing their power. When increasing power, even more interference obtains. Why add to the spectrum pollution, which is swiftly becoming intolerable?

Thank you for your consideration.

Frank L. Rose, NCE

Note - The FCC appears to use the terms "un-licensed" and "non-licensed" operations interchangeably. I believe that this leads to confusion. Many years ago the Commission used the term "non-licensed" to indicate operations which did not receive an individual authorization, but were permitted under the Rules and Regulations; e.g., Part 15 and Part 18 operations. Whereas, the term "un-licensed" indicated operations which were not provided for under the Radio Regulations and which violated the Communications Act. I believe the Commission should revert to those definitions.