

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
Revision of the Commission's Rules to) CC Docket No. 94-102
Ensure Compatibility With Enhanced 911)
Emergency Calling Systems)
Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 to Implement the) IB Docket No. 99-67
Global Mobile Personal Communications by)
Satellite (GMPCS) Memorandum of)
Understanding and Arrangements; Petition of the)
National Telecommunications and Information)
Administration to Amend Part 25 of the)
Commission's Rules to Establish Emissions)
Limits for Mobile and Portable Earth Stations)
Operating in the 1610-1660.5 MHz Band)

Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Adopted: December 11, 2002

Released: December 20, 2002

Comment Date: February 3, 2003
Reply Comment Date: February 28, 2003

By the Commission: Commissioner Adelstein not participating.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paragraph

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1
II. BACKGROUND 3
III. DISCUSSION 11
A. General Criteria..... 12
B. Individual Voice Services and Devices 16
1. Mobile Satellite Service (MSS)..... 17
2. Telematics Services 57
3. Multi-Line Telephone Systems 81
4. Resold Cellular and PCS Service 92
5. Pre-paid Calling 98
6. Disposable Phones 103
7. Automated Maritime Telecommunications Systems (AMTS) 107
8. Emerging Voice Services and Devices 111
IV. PROCEDURAL INFORMATION 116
V. ORDERING CLAUSES 125
VI. APPENDIX A
VII. APPENDIX B

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Over the last four decades, access to 911 service has dramatically improved the ability of emergency personnel to respond quickly to people in distress.¹ Efforts by the telecommunications industry, state and local governments, and the federal government have resulted in wireline 911 service being available to approximately 98 percent of the population.² Congress found 911 service to be of such importance that it enacted a statute codifying 9-1-1 as the national emergency telephone number.³

2. We here initiate a reevaluation of the scope of communications services that should provide access to emergency services.⁴ Today, wireline local exchange carriers provide 911 services generally pursuant to state or local provisions. Most CMRS licensees are providing basic and enhanced 911 service pursuant to Commission rules. In this *Further Notice*, we examine and seek comment on the need to require compliance with our basic and enhanced 911 (E911) rules, or similar requirements, by various other mobile wireless and certain wireline voice services. We consider whether existing services such as telematics or voice service provided by multi-line systems should be required to provide access to 911 service.⁵ We also consider whether some new services should be subject to any E911 requirements. We seek comment throughout this *Further Notice* on the impact that exclusion of these services and devices from our 911 rules may have on consumers, as well as the technological and cost issues involved in providing E911, all in the context of the expectation of consumers for 911 service when they use these services and devices. In initiating this *Further Notice*, we are mindful of the need to balance the expectations of consumers to have access to 911 service with the need to continue to foster growth and competition in the telecommunications marketplace.

II. BACKGROUND

3. In 1994, the Commission initiated this proceeding by proposing to amend its rules to address issues raised by the provision of 911 and enhanced 911 services through certain telecommunications technologies.⁶ The Commission initially sought comment on rules that would require certain mobile

¹ In 1965, AT&T first announced its plans to make the three-digit number “911” available nationally as a number for accessing emergency personnel. See Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility With Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 9 FCC Rcd. 6170, 6172 para. 3 (1994).

² See Implementation of 911 Act, The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements, CC Docket No. 92-105, WT Docket No. 00-110, *Fifth Report and Order, First Report and Order, and Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, 16 FCC Rcd 22,264, 22,267 para 7 (2001) (*Fifth Report and Order*).

³ *Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999*, Pub. L. No. 106-81, 113 Stat. 1286 (codified at §§ 222 and 251(e)) (911 Act).

⁴ See 47 U.S.C. § 615 note.

⁵ “Telematics” can be generally defined as the integrated use of location technology and wireless communications to enhance the functionality of motor vehicles. Additionally, we use the phrase multi-line telecommunications system (or “multi-line system”) to describe a set of phone systems that include: a private branch exchange (PBX), a Centrex telephone system, a key telephone systems, and a hybrid telephone system. A private branch exchange is an electronic telephone switching exchange that acts as a branch of a central office for the private use of an organization. See A. Michael Noll, *INTRODUCTION TO TELEPHONES AND TELEPHONE SYSTEMS* at 196 (1998). Centrex is the use of the switching system at the local central office as if it were a PBX. *Id.* at 198. Key telephone systems serve a small number of extensions; to access a line, a key is depressed and a light indicates whether the particular line is available. *Id.* A hybrid telephone system is a system with PBX and key telephone system features.

⁶ See generally Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility With Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 9 FCC Rcd. 6170 (1994).

wireless licensees to ensure that their networks included features that would make enhanced 911 service available to their subscribers.⁷ In addition, the Commission sought comment on amending its Part 68 rules to ensure the compatibility of private branch exchanges (PBXs) and other dispersed multi-line telephone systems with enhanced 911 services.⁸

4. On June 12, 1996, the Commission adopted an order requiring certain mobile wireless licensees to implement basic 911 and enhanced 911 (E911) services.⁹ The *E911 First Report and Order* represented the culmination of efforts by the public safety community, the wireless telecommunications industry, and the Commission to improve the quality and reliability of 911 services to wireless customers nationwide. In the *E911 First Report and Order*, the Commission specified criteria for determining which licensees should be subject to its E911 requirements. It required compliance by those licensees (1) that offered real-time, two-way switched voice service, interconnected with the public switched network, either on a stand-alone basis or packaged with other telecommunications services; (2) whose customers clearly expected access to 911 and E911; (3) that competed with analog and broadband PCS providers; and (4) where it is technically and operationally feasible to provide enhanced 911 service.¹⁰ Based on these criteria, the Commission determined that cellular licensees, broadband Personal Communications Service (PCS) licensees, and certain Specialized Mobile Radio (SMR) licensees,¹¹ collectively “covered carriers,” would be required to meet basic and enhanced 911 service requirements for completing emergency calls, including forwarding all 911 calls without delay¹² and relaying a caller’s Automatic Number Identification (ANI) and Automatic Location Information (ALI) to the appropriate Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP).¹³

5. The Commission exempted certain other two-way voice services from its E911 requirements. For example, the Commission exempted Air-to-Ground (Part 22, Subpart G)¹⁴ and Public Coast Stations (Part 80, Subpart J)¹⁵ because passengers and crew using these services did not rely on ground-based emergency services such as 911 or E911.¹⁶ The Commission deferred a decision on whether to require

⁷ *See id.*

⁸ *See id.* para 1.

⁹ *See* Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility With Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 11 FCC Rcd. 18676 (1996) (*E911 First Report and Order*).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 18716-18 paras. 80-84.

¹¹ The Commission’s E911 requirements covered only SMR licensees that held either licenses or authorizations to operate 800 MHz or 900 MHz service. *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 18676, 18716-18 at paras. 80-84. “Covered SMR” also included those 800/900 MHz SMR licensees that offered real-time, two-way switched voice service that was interconnected with the public switched network, either on a stand-alone basis or packaged with other telecommunications services. *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 18676, 18716-18 at paras. 80-84.

¹² *See E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18692-97 paras. 29-42 (requiring covered carriers to transmit all 911 calls without subjecting them to any call validation procedures).

¹³ *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 18676, 18689-18722 paras. 24-91. Recognizing the need for vigorous implementation of the E911 requirements, the Commission adopted a phased implementation plan for the covered carriers. Phase I implementation, which requires a covered carrier to transmit a 911 caller’s call-back number and cell site to the appropriate PSAP, began on April 1, 1998. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(d). Phase II implementation, which requires a covered carrier to transmit a 911 caller’s location information to the appropriate PSAP, began on October 1, 2001. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 20.18 (e), (h).

¹⁴ 47 C.F.R. pt. 20, subpart G.

¹⁵ 47 C.F.R. pt. 80, subpart J.

¹⁶ *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 18676, 18717-18 para. 82. In the *Fifth Report and Order*, the Commission required VPC licensees, to the extent that they offers a land-based “real-time, two-way switched voice

(continued....)

compliance with its enhanced 911 rules by multi-line systems,¹⁷ but has continued to refresh the record on multi-line systems.¹⁸

6. In addition, the Commission concluded that given technological impediments and the coordination of international standards, MSS should not be required, at that time, to provide appropriate access to emergency services.¹⁹ The Commission did indicate that it would consider adopting requirements at a later time for MSS, and urged MSS providers to continue to cooperate with public safety agencies in the development of mutually acceptable means of accessing emergency services.²⁰ The Commission, however, noted that it expected that MSS providers would eventually need to comply²¹ and “provide appropriate access to emergency services. . . .”²²

7. The Commission again addressed the subject of emergency-call service for MSS users in IB Docket No. 99-67, which primarily concerns adoption of rules to facilitate and promote international circulation of customer-operated satellite earth terminals used for Global Mobile Personal Communications by Satellite (GMPCS). In the initial Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in that proceeding, issued in 1999, the Commission also sought comment as to whether, in light of recent technological developments, it should require MSS providers to implement 911 features, subject to transitional measures to avert adverse impact on systems already in operation or at an advanced stage of development.²³ The Commission received 30 comments and 16 replies in response to the GMPCS NPRM, representing 34 entities. Of these, 18 parties filed comments and/or replies regarding the 911 issues.²⁴

8. In the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* that proposed licensing and service rules for the 2 GHz MSS, the Commission inquired whether it should require licensees in this service to implement basic and/or enhanced 911 capabilities.²⁵ In the *2 GHz Report and Order*, the Commission acknowledged that 911 services can save lives and that significant strides had been made in developing location technology, but found that the information in the record was insufficient to support adoption of specific 911

(...continued from previous page)

service that is interconnected with the public switched network,” to comply with the Commission’s wireless E911 rules. See *Implementation of 911 Act, The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements*, CC Docket No. 92-105, WT Docket No. 00-110, *Fifth Report and Order, First Report and Order, and Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, 16 FCC Rcd 22,264 (2001) (*Fifth Report and Order*).

¹⁷ *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18678 n.1.

¹⁸ See *Common Carrier Bureau Seeks Comment on Telident’s Enhanced 911 Part 68 Recommendations*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Public Notice*, 11 FCC Rcd. 22,475 (1996); see also *Common Carrier Bureau Seeks Comment on Enhanced 911 Wireless Consensus Agreement*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Public Notice*, 12 FCC Rcd. 24,323 (1997).

¹⁹ See *First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18718 para. 83.

²⁰ *Id.* See also *Wireless E911 Recon Order*, 12 FCC Rcd. 22,665 at para. 88.

²¹ See *First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18718 para. 83.

²² *Wireless E911 Recon Order*, 12 FCC Rcd. 22,665 at para. 88.

²³ Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 to Implement the Global Mobile Personal Communications by Satellite (GMPCS) Memorandum of Understanding and Arrangements; Petition of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to Amend Part 25 of the Commission’s Rules to Establish Emissions Limits for Mobile and Portable Earth Stations Operating in the 1610-1660.5 MHz Band, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 14 FCC Rcd 5871 (1999), at ¶98. (*GMPCS NPRM*).

²⁴ See Appendix A for a listing of the commenting parties.

²⁵ Establishment of Policies and Service Rules for the Mobile Satellite Service in the 2 GHz Band, IB Docket No. 99-81, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 14 FCC Rcd 4843, 4885 para. 94 (1999) (*2 GHz NPRM*).

requirements in the 2 GHz MSS service rules proceeding.²⁶ Therefore, the Commission decided that it would address issues concerning 911 requirements for 2 GHz MSS in the more general 911 inquiry conducted in the *GMPCS* proceeding.²⁷ To that end, the Commission directed the International Bureau to issue a public notice in the *GMPCS* proceeding to request additional information “regarding the technological, regulatory, and international aspects of Basic 911 and E911 for satellite services.”²⁸ Accordingly, in December 2000, the International Bureau released a public notice, and received 10 comments and six replies, accounting for a total of 11 parties.²⁹ A subsequent informal meeting held between Bureau staff and several satellite licensees regarding currently used emergency call procedures provided additional information in this docket.³⁰ The record developed thus far³¹ provides a basis for proposing emergency call procedure requirements, in particular the establishment of operator-staffed emergency service bureaus or call centers. Based on these various records, we also now seek comment on more detailed questions concerning how MSS should provide access to 911 service.³²

9. In 1997, the Commission narrowed its definition of “covered SMR” to include only those SMR licensees that will directly compete with cellular and PCS in providing comparable public mobile interconnected service.³³ By its action, the Commission removed from its requirements those SMR licensees that primarily offer dispatch service.³⁴ As a means of distinguishing which SMR licensees remained under its E911 obligations, the Commission found that only those SMR licensees that have “in-network” switching capabilities should be so obligated.³⁵ The Commission further recognized, however, that certain SMR licensees that had an in-network switching capability may also offer their customers dispatch capability. The Commission, therefore, concluded that covered SMR licensees that offer dispatch to customers may meet their E911 obligations to their dispatch customers by providing either

²⁶ Establishment of Policies and Service Rules for the Mobile Satellite Service in the 2 GHz Band, IB Docket No. 99-81, *Report and Order*, 15 FCC Rcd 16127 at para. 125 (2000) (*2 GHz Report and Order*).

²⁷ *Id.* While the Commission declined to adopt any 911 requirements for 2 GHz MSS, it did require that any handset used for 2 GHz MSS that does not have access to basic 911 or E911 clearly indicate the lack of these functions with a label or sticker affixed to the handsets. This labeling requirement remains in effect until the Commission adopts an order in the *GMPCS* proceeding. *Id.* at para. 126.

²⁸ *Id.* at para. 125.

²⁹ International Bureau Invites Further Comment Regarding Adoption of 911 Requirements for Satellite Services, IB Docket No. 99-67, *Public Notice*, 16 FCC Rcd. 3780 (2000) (*Satellite 911 Public Notice*).

³⁰ Ex Parte Meeting in IB Docket No. 99-67, Memorandum from Arthur Lechtman, Satellite and Radiocommunication Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission to William F. Caton, Acting Secretary, February 22, 2002 (*Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo*).

³¹ In making the proposals and raising the questions contained in this *Further Notice*, we consider the comments received in both IB Docket No. 99-81 (Establishment of Policies and Service Rules for the Mobile Satellite Service in the 2 GHz Band) and IB Docket No. 99-67 (both the *GMPCS NPRM* and the *Satellite 911 Public Notice*). See Appendix A.

³² See *infra* paras. 17-56.

³³ See Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 22665, 22703-05 paras. 78-83 (1997) (*Wireless E911 First Recon Order*).

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ *Id.* at 22703-04 para. 78. The Commission chose this network capability because “in-network” switching allows for seamless hand off of calls and allows for frequency reuse, thus allowing the SMR licensees to accommodate a larger group of customers, which enables the SMR licensee to compete directly with cellular and PCS. *Id.*

direct 911 dialing or, alternatively, by routing dispatch customers' emergency calls through a dispatcher.³⁶

10. In 1999, Congress established 911 as the universal emergency service number.³⁷ Through the 911 Act, Congress sought to "facilitate the prompt deployment . . . of a seamless, ubiquitous, and reliable end-to-end infrastructure for communications, including wireless communications, to meet the Nation's public safety . . . needs."³⁸

III. DISCUSSION

11. In this proceeding, we are seeking comment on whether providers of various services and devices not currently within the scope of our 911 rules should, consistent with the public interest, be required to provide access to emergency services. We also ask what type of information, such as call-back and location should be delivered to PSAPs on a service-by-service basis. We begin by setting out and seeking comment on the general criteria that we want commenters to use in analyzing whether the enumerated services and devices should be included within the scope of services that offer 911 service.³⁹ We then turn to the individual services and devices on which we seek comment and raise additional questions where needed. For example, in each of the sections below we ask commenters to address the Commission's legal authority over either the entity that manufactures the device or that provides the service to the general public. We seek comment on those services and devices that offer voice communications to their end users.

A. General Criteria

12. We begin by seeking comment on the criteria the Commission should use in analyzing whether a particular class of providers should be required to comply with our basic and enhanced 911 requirements, or with similar requirements. We recognize that we are reviewing services and devices that vary greatly over technologies and are at different stages of development. We believe that by establishing criteria of general applicability, the Commission will be able to provide a transparent methodology for determining which classes of services and devices may be expected to comply with our E911 rules. Moreover, by establishing a list of general criteria, we provide commenters a basis on which to make their arguments for or against inclusion of providers of a particular service or device.

13. We thus seek comment on our proposed analysis of different types of services and devices starting with the criteria that guided our decision in the *E911 First Report and Order*.⁴⁰ Based on those criteria, we propose analyzing each service or product based on whether: (1) it offer real-time, two-way voice service that is interconnected to the public switched network on either a stand-alone basis or packaged with other telecommunications services; (2) the customers using the service or device have a reasonable expectation of access to 911 and E911 services; (3) the service competes with traditional CMRS or wireline local exchange services; and (4) it is technically and operationally feasible for the service or device to support E911.⁴¹ Underlying the Commission's earlier decisions on 911 service was an understanding that the customers of "public telephone services" expect access to 911 and E911 services.⁴² So, for example, in the *E911 First Report and Order*, the Commission required CMRS,

³⁶ *Id.* at 22704 para. 79.

³⁷ See *Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999*.

³⁸ See *Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999*.

³⁹ *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18716-18 paras. 80-84.

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.* at 18716 para. 81.

⁴² *Id.* at 18716 para. 80.

Broadband PCS and certain SMR providers to comply with our basic 911 and E911 requirements, while it excluded Air-To-Ground (Part 22, Subpart M) and Public Coast Stations (Part 80, Subpart J) providers, in part because their customers would not expect to access 911 services in the event of an emergency. The Commission noted that users of Air-To-Ground and Public Coast service providers likely would seek emergency service using established radio communications channels.

14. We note we have required access to emergency services for TTY devices in the context of the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 255 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.⁴³ TTY, which enables persons with speech and hearing disabilities to communicate with others, however, fits the general criteria in that it is a voice equivalent. We seek comment on how the various services discussed herein relate to the provision of access to emergency services for persons with disabilities.

15. We also ask commenters, as they address the various services, to consider as part of their analysis the abilities of PSAPs to handle calls and information related to those services. Some of these services may raise new technical and other implementation issues.

B. Individual Voice Services and Devices

16. In this section, we seek more specific comment on whether particular voice services and devices should be required to comply with our basic or enhanced 911 rules. Recognizing that our E911 rules were based on CMRS architecture, we also seek comment on possible mechanisms other than those of our specific mobile wireless E911 rules to provide consumers with access to emergency services. We note, for example, that different accuracy requirements may be needed depending on the type of service. Commenters are reminded that in analyzing whether a particular service should be required to provide access to 911 services, we ask that they consider, at a minimum, the general criteria that we set out above.⁴⁴

1. Mobile Satellite Service (MSS)

17. Introduction. We first seek comment on 911 services in connection with MSS systems. As noted above, the issue of MSS emergency call procedures has been under consideration in a number of proceedings, and, although the Commission has refrained from requiring MSS to comply with any 911 requirements, the record developed in these proceedings provides the basis for the proposals and detailed questions that follow. We first propose that all MSS licensees providing real-time, two-way, switched voice service that is interconnected with the public switched network establish national call centers to which all subscriber emergency calls are routed. Call center personnel would then determine the nature of the emergency and forward the call to an appropriate PSAP. We also seek to develop further the record on implementation of enhanced 911 for satellite carriers in order to determine whether and when such service can reasonably be implemented.

18. *Legal Authority.* In other sections of this item, we seek comment on the Commission's general authority to impose 911 and E911 requirements on non-traditional classes of providers. As demonstrated in the above, the Commission has determined previously that MSS is subject to 911 requirements, but has not imposed such requirements for other policy reasons. When the Commission adopted the E911 rules in 1996, it observed that "adding specific regulatory requirements to [the Mobile Satellite Service] may impede the development of the service in ways that might reduce its ability to meet

⁴³ See *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18699-703 paras. 47-53

⁴⁴ See *supra* paras. 12-14.

public safety needs.”⁴⁵ Still, the Commission has stated that “the public interest is likely to require that all CMRS real time two-way voice communications services provide reasonable and effective access to emergency services, [and] we expect that CMRS voice MSS will eventually provide appropriate access to emergency services, either voluntarily or pursuant to Commission’s rules.”⁴⁶ Although we believe that we do not need to revisit the issue of the Commission’s authority to require satellite carrier compliance with 911 requirements, we invite comment on the matter in light of the general criteria for basic and enhanced 911 compliance proposed above.⁴⁷

(i) Call Centers

19. **Background.** We seek comment on the use of call centers as a method for providing basic 911 service while we further develop the record on E911 implementation for satellite systems. We required covered terrestrial wireless carriers to provide basic 911 as a preliminary step before implementing E911.⁴⁸ “Basic 911 service” is the automatic transmission of all wireless 911 calls, without respect to call validation processes, to a PSAP, or where no PSAP has been designated, to a statewide default answering point or appropriate local emergency authority.⁴⁹ As the International Bureau observed in the *Satellite E911 Public Notice*, cellular carriers interconnect with local wireline carriers at many points throughout their service areas, enabling them to make use of existing facilities to route 911 calls directly to appropriate local PSAPs in the areas where the calls are placed.⁵⁰ By contrast, satellite systems have only a small number of (or just one) public switched network interconnection points in the United States and do not interconnect directly with most local wireline carriers. ICO Services Limited and Inmarsat noted that this lack of interconnection points makes even basic 911 service difficult for satellite carriers.⁵¹

20. Recognizing that MSS licensees face some unique infrastructure considerations (relative to wireless and wireline carriers), the International Bureau also asked whether it would be possible for MSS operators to route emergency calls to central emergency-call bureau operators, who could redirect the calls to the appropriate PSAP in the caller’s area.⁵² A number of commenters express support for this concept, including satellite licensees and public safety organizations.⁵³ Inmarsat, on the other hand,

⁴⁵ *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 83 (noting the expectation that “CMRS voice MSS will eventually be required to provide appropriate access to emergency services”). See also *Wireless E911 First Recon Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 22665 at paras. 87-88.

⁴⁶ *Wireless E911 First Recon Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 22665 at para. 88.

⁴⁷ See *supra* paras. 12-14.

⁴⁸ See *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 18676 at para. 29-46; *Wireless E911 First Recon Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 22665 at paras. 25-41; 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(b).

⁴⁹ See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(b).

⁵⁰ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 3.

⁵¹ Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 4 (arguing that basic 911 should not be required for MSS due to the small number of interconnection points); ICO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at n.13.

⁵² *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 3, 5.

⁵³ See, e.g., ICO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 6-7 (observing that several MSS carriers already use their own form of a call center, and suggesting that call centers might be a good interim solution for the MSS industry, until global standards are achieved); NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 5-6 (suggesting that the Commission investigate the utility of requiring call centers for first generation MSS systems, due to the potential high cost of enhanced 911); APCO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2 (suggesting using live operators as an interim measure (even though the organization prefers automatic location information), but pointing out that “callers may not be able to describe their precise location, especially to a ‘national’ operator unfamiliar with the area in question”).

dismisses as prohibitively expensive the Commission's suggestion that a national PSAP database could correlate a caller's location with the nearest PSAP, since an MSS system would need to have ALI (which Inmarsat currently does not have).⁵⁴ Using operators instead of a PSAP database poses the same problem for Inmarsat because doing so still requires caller location information.⁵⁵ Other satellite licensees, however, already provide emergency calling services to their subscribers. For example, subscribers of Mobile Satellite Ventures Subsidiary LLC ("MSV") can dial 911 on their handsets for emergency assistance.⁵⁶ Trained operators at the MSV Reston call center request the caller's phone number and location, then cross reference the location information with a national PSAP database to determine which PSAP should be connected to the caller.⁵⁷

21. Globalstar customers dial 911 or any of a number of international emergency dial codes (such as 112) to access emergency assistance (the Emergency Call Assistance Service, or ECAS).⁵⁸ Dialing any of these codes connects the caller first to a recording and then (within 20 to 40 seconds) to a vendor-operated call center located in Canada.⁵⁹ Trained operators first ask for the caller's phone number, then instruct the caller how to use the handset to obtain his/her latitude and longitude coordinates, which the Globalstar system can determine to within 10 kilometers, 90% of the time (sometimes the accuracy may be higher or lower).⁶⁰ The operator enters the coordinates into a national PSAP database that finds the most appropriate PSAP based on the caller's location.⁶¹ Globalstar argues that ECAS, not terrestrial wireless variety E911, is the more appropriate model for MSS emergency calling, and expresses support for the routing of emergency satellite calls to central operators.⁶²

22. Discussion. We recognize that satellite carriers face unique technical difficulties (vis a vis terrestrial carriers) in implementing both basic and enhanced⁶³ 911 features. The inability of satellite carriers to provide even basic 911 service at the present time convinces us that emergency call centers would be an appropriate first step for satellite carriers. Globalstar informed staff that it receives an average of 12 satellite 911 calls per month.⁶⁴ We believe that low satellite 911 call volume further justifies a call center requirement, rather than E911, at this time. We did not obtain similar data from MSV, and it appears that other carriers currently do not offer emergency services. However, we suspect that those MSS systems that offer emergency service likely process a small volume of emergency calls because they often have no more than hundreds of thousands of subscribers. For this reason, we believe that an interim measure is warranted while we develop a more thorough (and updated) record on E911. To that end, we propose that all GMPCS licensees providing real-time, two-way, switched voice service that is interconnected with the public switched network establish national call centers to which all subscriber emergency calls are routed. We seek comment on the call center approach as a requirement to be effective one year after adoption and until E911 rules are adopted for all GMPCS systems.

⁵⁴ Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 4.

⁵⁵ Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 4-5.

⁵⁶ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁵⁷ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁵⁸ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2; see also *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2.

⁵⁹ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁶⁰ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2; see also *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 20.

⁶¹ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁶² *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2.

⁶³ The technical obstacles to provision of enhanced 911 are discussed in more detail below in paras. 28-41.

⁶⁴ In July 2001, Globalstar achieved a high of 22 satellite 911 calls. *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

23. We envision each carrier having one or more call centers to which 911 emergency calls would be routed.⁶⁵ Subscribers (located in the United States, including Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands) would reach the call center by dialing “9-1-1” on their handsets. This would be consistent with the 911 Act, which mandates that the Commission designate 911 as “the universal emergency telephone number within the United States for reporting an emergency. . . .”⁶⁶ Inmarsat points out that its terminals (approximately 250,000 are currently in use) are incapable of the three digit dialing needed to provide 911 service.⁶⁷ Even if Inmarsat’s mobile terminals in a given country cannot make short code calls to emergency services in that country,⁶⁸ we do not see this as an impediment to using short code dialing to access a carrier’s own call center. The ability of mobile earth terminals to access call centers by means of three digit dialing has been demonstrated by Globalstar and MSV.

24. We find that Globalstar’s and MSV’s method of having live operators ask the caller for his or her location and callback number (in the event of a disconnection) is sound in the context of typical MSS services already deployed and anticipate that other carriers will follow this model. While we do not believe a rule is warranted at this time to mandate call center answering protocols and procedures, we invite comment on the matter. We find merit in Globalstar’s use of a national PSAP database that operators use to determine which PSAP is nearest to the caller. We seek comment on whether there are any issues concerning the availability or accuracy of PSAP databases, for purposes of MSS call centers, that warrant Commission attention at this time. For instance, we seek comment whether guidelines would be useful in ensuring database accuracy. Globalstar’s customers, if calling 911 from locations in the Caribbean and Mexico, cannot access the ECAS call center; rather, the caller hears a recorded message saying that the network cannot process the call.⁶⁹ The reason given for this is that Globalstar does not have a PSAP database for these regions, and therefore would be incapable of connecting a subscriber to a PSAP.⁷⁰ The success of an emergency call center is dependent on complete PSAP information and therefore the Commission believes that carriers, for service within the United States, have an obligation to obtain or create a PSAP database that covers the United States, including Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.⁷¹

⁶⁵ We agree with NSARC that the dialing of 911 from a satellite handset should be a two step process (*i.e.*, dialing the access number then pressing <send>) to minimize false calls that could result from one-touch dialing. NSARC *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 2. The USCG also expressed concern about minimizing hoax calls. USCG *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 6.

⁶⁶ 911 Act at Section 3. *See also* 47 U.S.C. § 251(e)(3); Implementation of 911 Act; The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements, CC Docket No. 92-105, WT Docket No. 00-110, *Fourth Report and Order and Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 15 FCC Rcd 17,079 (2000) (implementing this mandate).

⁶⁷ Inmarsat Ventures plc *ex parte* at 2. Inmarsat points out that its terminals use the country code 870, giving them the ability to roam globally without using any one country’s national numbering scheme. As we understand it, a call to an Inmarsat terminal, even if located in the caller’s country, is nevertheless an international call because the 870 access code must be dialed first. Calls made from an Inmarsat terminal must also be preceded by a recognized country code; thus a “user *cannot* dial simply a national number (including short codes for emergency calls, e.g., 911, 112, 999).” *Id.* at 2.

⁶⁸ Inmarsat Ventures plc *ex parte* at 2. Inmarsat does say that users of its terminals can access a local PSAP provided the phone number and country code are known, although we find that dialing these numbers (even if known) would be cumbersome in a bona fide emergency.

⁶⁹ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁷⁰ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁷¹ *But see* discussion regarding completion of 911 calls when no PSAP has been designated by the state or local authorities, at para. 25 below. That situation is much different from when a carrier cannot complete a 911 call because of an incomplete PSAP database.

25. Several commenters have pointed out that MSS callers are likely to be located in remote areas where no PSAP may be available.⁷² In these instances, a database of local PSAPs would not provide a basis for connecting the caller with emergency personnel. We addressed this issue in the context of our proceeding to implement the 911 Act, where we stated that, in areas where no PSAP has been designated, carriers still have an obligation not to block 911 calls.⁷³ Specifically, by September 11, 2002 we required that, in areas where no PSAP has been designated, carriers must begin delivering 911 calls:

(a) to a statewide established default point; (b) if none exists, to an appropriate local emergency authority, such as the police or county sheriff, selected by an authorized State or Local entity; or, finally, (c) as a matter of last resort and to avoid the blocking of 911 calls, . . . to an appropriate local emergency authority, based on the exercise of the carrier's reasonable judgment, following initiation of contact with the State Governor's designated entity under section 3(b) of the 911 Act.⁷⁴

In taking these measures, we intended to eliminate or reduce occurrences of wireless "carriers furnishing intercept messages alerting callers that the emergency call cannot be completed" or is otherwise blocked.⁷⁵ We believe that satellite carriers should comply with the same requirements. However, we appreciate that a satellite carrier, having national coverage and the responsibility to determine appropriate emergency personnel for its entire nationwide footprint, may experience more difficulty than a locally-deployed wireless carrier in determining to which entity to send emergency calls in the absence of a PSAP. Thus we seek comment on whether GMPCS carriers should have an extended period within which to comply with this requirement. For example, if the call center requirement becomes effective one year after adoption, should a licensee be responsible, as of the effective date, for delivering 911 calls for all, or only a portion of, areas lacking PSAPs? What would be a reasonable time frame for requiring a satellite carrier to route all 911 calls from subscribers? The International Bureau has suggested that in some cases, "public safety needs may best be met by routing MSS emergency calls to someone other than a local PSAP, for instance to the Coast Guard."⁷⁶ NENA agrees that "calls from coastal waters" and certain other waterways might be better routed to the Coast Guard, but stresses that the call, while originating from water, should still use 911 as the dial code.⁷⁷ We are interested in learning if additional parties support this proposal. We note that vessels at sea already have access to the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System ("GMDSS") for distress and safety needs,⁷⁸ and therefore persons at sea may not have an expectation of 911 service with satellite handset phones.

26. We recognize that MSS call centers are not PSAPs themselves, but rather serve as an intermediary that refers emergency calls to PSAPs. Our inquiries regarding the intermediary role of telematics call centers are thus applicable to MSS call centers as well.⁷⁹ As we observe in our discussion

⁷² See APCO *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 2; NSARC *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 2. LGA, in its *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 18, noted that "MSS will provide coverage in areas where 9-1-1 service may not exist. . . ." Constellation noted that its MSS system "will cover the entire country, including large unpopulated areas where there may not be a designated agency to respond to emergency calls." Constellation *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 13.

⁷³ See *Fifth Report and Order* at para. 15.

⁷⁴ *Fifth Report and Order* at para. 15.

⁷⁵ *Fifth Report and Order* at para. 23.

⁷⁶ *Satellite E911 Public Notice* at 3-4.

⁷⁷ National Emergency Number Association (NENA) *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3.

⁷⁸ See 47 C.F.R. § 80 Subpart W.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., paras. 66-69.

below of telematics, we are concerned about delays that might result when call centers forward calls to PSAPs.⁸⁰ Globalstar indicates that it establishes a conference call link between a 911 caller and a PSAP without the use of trunks to selective routers.⁸¹ We seek comment regarding how other currently operating MSS call centers approach this issue, and whether any problems have been encountered.

27. We also seek comment on whether a satellite system's inherent location determination capabilities should be used to obtain a 911 caller's location and whether that information should be automatically transmitted to the call center, if technically feasible. As described above, callers using Globalstar can use their handsets to determine their approximate coordinates, then read this information to the emergency operator, who then uses it to ascertain the appropriate PSAP. The Iridium system, while not currently providing emergency call assistance, is capable of determining the location of a caller within an accuracy of approximately 10 to 20 kilometers.⁸² Clearly, the availability of latitude and longitude information can enhance the ability of a call center to match the correct PSAP, particularly when callers are lost or otherwise do not know where they are and cannot provide an address. We seek comment on the benefit to be gained in requiring satellite systems that are capable of determining caller locations to automatically transmit that information to the call center, either as the 911 number is dialed or shortly after the connection is made to the call center, if additional time is necessary for the handset to see enough satellites to determine location. The National Search and Rescue Committee ("NSARC") acknowledges that MSS systems do not have the same location precision as terrestrial wireless ones, but is nonetheless "confident that improvements are forthcoming," and believes that any ALI requirement for MSS systems should be based on their inherent capabilities.⁸³ We are interested in learning if other public safety organizations share NSARC's view. We recognize that the ability of satellite communications networks to determine a caller's precise location is constrained and cannot (with current equipment) reliably reach the level of accuracy that the Commission has set for handset and network-based solutions for terrestrial wireless.⁸⁴ However, the public interest may best be served by utilizing all resources available in aiding callers in an emergency. If we were to require carriers to relay automatically available location information to emergency call centers, we also seek comment on reasonably achievable accuracy standards we could establish for this location information.

(ii) Enhanced 911

28. In this section, we seek to develop further the record on implementation of enhanced 911 for satellite carriers. The record generated thus far in the GMPCS and 2 GHz MSS proceedings illustrates a fundamental difference of opinion as to whether requiring E911 for MSS is appropriate at this time. Satellite licensees generally oppose adoption of a rule requiring E911 for MSS, claiming it is premature and/or not economically and technically feasible, while public safety entities support E911, claiming it is in the public's interest.⁸⁵ NTIA argues that E911 is especially important for MSS terminals for callers

⁸⁰ See para. 69 *infra*.

⁸¹ Feb. 22 *Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

⁸² Feb. 22 *Ex Parte Memo* at 3. As a big LEO licensee, Iridium is required to be capable of locating the position of users of mobile transceivers in an effort to prevent interference with the radio astronomy service. See 47 C.F.R. § 25.213.

⁸³ NSARC *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 3.

⁸⁴ For network-based technologies, we require Phase II location accuracy to be within 100 meters for 67 percent of calls and 300 meters for 95 percent of calls. For handset-based technologies, we require Phase II location accuracy to be within 50 meters for 67 percent of calls and 150 meters for 95 percent of calls. See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(h).

⁸⁵ For satellite licensee and manufacturer comment, see, e.g., Inmarsat Ltd. *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 9-10, SIA *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 1, Motorola *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 13, Iridium LLC *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 13, ICO Global *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 3, TMI *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 7-8, Constellation *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 15, AMSC *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 16-17, LGA *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 19, Comsat *GMPCS NPRM*

(continued....)

located in areas not served by terrestrial wireless networks or callers who cannot otherwise identify their location.⁸⁶ Licensees, such as Inmarsat, respond that E911 features are too expensive and technically difficult to implement, and that the existence of a satellite handset (and the ability to use it anywhere) is a public benefit in and of itself.⁸⁷ While the Inmarsat position may be valid to a certain extent, we believe that, if the technology and cost permit, consumer expectations and the public interest support a requirement that MSS provide E911 services comparable to those of terrestrial wireless. However, the record thus far demonstrates that E911 requirements for satellite systems may be premature at this time, particularly with regard to the gateway architecture of satellite networks. In this section we intend to develop further the record for MSS enhanced 911 rules since we anticipate their eventual adoption. We also seek information regarding whether network technology has improved in any significant way since comments were last filed on these issues. We also seek information relevant to comparing the MSS and terrestrial wireless contexts, including with respect to the two phases in which we required terrestrial wireless carriers to implement enhanced 911—the first phase consisting of Automatic Number Information (“ANI”) and second phase consisting of Automatic Location Identification (“ALI”). These inquiries are also relevant to our request for comment in paragraph 55 below concerning basic and enhanced 911 compliance in the event satellite carriers are permitted to offer an ancillary terrestrial component to their satellite service.

(a) Network Design and LEC Interconnection

29. Background. The *Satellite E911 Public Notice* sought comment, generally, on whether there would be any need for special regulatory policies with regard to MSS licensee coordination with local exchange carriers (LECs) and PSAPs.⁸⁸ In the terrestrial wireless context, the Commission left the resolution of technical and operational decisions necessary for implementing E911 to the interested parties, including wireless and wireline carriers, PSAPs, state and local governments, manufacturers, and standard-setting groups.⁸⁹ This approach stemmed from a Commission belief that it should determine only the capabilities that must be achieved, rather than promulgate extensive technical standards.⁹⁰ We

(...continued from previous page)

comments at 13, Motient *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 1, ICO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2, Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments generally. The 2 GHz NPRM record contains similar comments on this subject: *see, e.g.*, Boeing 2 GHz NPRM comments at 19, ICO USA Service Group 2 GHz NPRM comments at 43, Constellation 2 GHz NPRM comments at 26, TMI 2 GHz NPRM comments at 10, Globalstar, L.P. 2 GHz NPRM comments at 40, ICO 2 GHz NPRM comments at 19, SIA 2 GHz NPRM comments at 2. However, satellite licensee Celsat supported E911 for 2 GHz MSS (*see* Celsat 2 GHz NPRM comments at 30), and suggested in its reply that the development of E911 rules should be deferred to a separate proceeding (Celsat 2 GHz NPRM reply at 27-28). Celsat did not file comments in response to the *Satellite 911 Public Notice*. For public safety comment and other entities supporting satellite E911, *see, e.g.*, NTIA GMPCS NPRM reply at 8, APCO GMPCS NPRM comments throughout, NSARC GMPCS NPRM comments at 2, USCG GMPCS NPRM comments throughout, NENA GMPCS NPRM comments at 2, APCO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2, NENA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 1, SCC *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2, Washington State *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2, APCO 2 GHz NPRM comments at 2, Bellsouth 2 GHz NPRM comments at 6, NTIA 2 GHz NPRM comments at 16, and USCG 2 GHz NPRM comments at 4-5.

⁸⁶ NTIA GMPCS NPRM reply at 8.

⁸⁷ Inmarsat GMPCS NPRM reply at 9; *see also* ORBCOMM GMPCS NPRM comments at 15; Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 9; Inmarsat Ventures plc *ex parte* at 2.

⁸⁸ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 6.

⁸⁹ *See Wireless E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18712-14; Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Second Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 14 FCC Rcd 20850 at para. 93 (1999) (“*Wireless E911 Second Recon Order*”).

⁹⁰ The issues the Commission left to interested parties to resolve included “standards necessary to implement and enable widespread wireless access to emergency communications and services, the specification of a required grade
(continued....)

continue to believe that this approach is preferred, although the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau recently initiated an inquiry into ongoing E911 implementation issues concerning LEC and PSAP readiness.⁹¹ As we observed above in our call center discussion, satellite network architecture, by design, has few public switched network interconnection points, making the automatic routing of even basic 911 calls to PSAPs difficult.

30. The record shows that high costs are associated with modifying satellite network infrastructures to accommodate enhanced emergency call information and route it to appropriate PSAPs. Some carriers argue that network modifications are necessary to forward ANI and ALI data, such as retrofitting switches throughout the network and making costly private trunking arrangements between earth stations and PSAPs.⁹² ICO suggests that the retrofit costs could be reduced if (i) a single, central emergency call service could receive calls for the nation or (ii) each of the 50 states has a single point of emergency contact.⁹³ In addition, without a nationally-coordinated PSAP program, “MSS operators must work with the PSAPs on a state-by-state, locality-by-locality basis, which would create enormous administrative costs. . . .”⁹⁴

31. Discussion. We seek comment whether E911 requirements for satellite carriers should be delayed until these network issues are resolved. We seek comment on alternative methods of facilitating LEC interconnection and PSAP routing. For example, call centers might be capable of receiving ANI and ALI information, which operators could forward, along with the emergency call, to the appropriate PSAP. While ICO’s proposal for the establishment of national PSAP referral center or central PSAP office for each of the 50 states may resolve coordination issues, we believe that states and localities are best equipped to design PSAP infrastructure. In the terrestrial wireless E911 proceeding, the Commission recognized that because selective routing of wireless 911 calls to the appropriate PSAP is complicated by the fact that the caller is often moving, carriers would need to coordinate with state and local governments to determine the PSAPs that are appropriate to receive wireless 911 calls.⁹⁵ The Commission indicated that until a state or local governmental entity develops a routing plan for wireless 911 calls within its jurisdiction, covered carriers could comply with the E911 rules by continuing to route 911 calls to the

(...continued from previous page)

of service [in terms of call blocking probability], the mapping required to develop the coordinates of latitude and longitude necessary for location identification, and the exact interface between the several components of the total network” (i.e., signaling and switching capabilities). *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 73. We note that the Commission had a fair degree of confidence that the relevant parties would resolve these matters, since many were part of, or represented on, a Consensus Agreement on E911 issues between several public safety and wireless industry entities. The Commission required the signatories to the Consensus Agreement, PCIA, and the Consumers First and the Ad Hoc Alliance for Public Access to 911 to submit status reports to the Commission at regular intervals. *See E911 First Report and Order* at para. 75.

⁹¹ *See* Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Seeks Comment on Report on Technical and Operational Wireless E911 Issues, WT Docket No. 02-46, *Public Notice*, DA 02-2666 (rel. Oct. 16, 2002).

⁹² *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 3-4. ICO maintains that if E911 is adopted, the costs to modify its handsets and network would be “enormous.” *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 7. *See also* discussion of Globalstar’s need for an American National Standards Institute ISDN User Part connection to the PSTN in para. 33 *infra*. Globalstar says “automatic routing of basic 911 calls would be cost prohibitive unless PSAPs themselves are financially responsible for the distance-sensitive trunk connections between. . . gateways and the many LEC selective routers nationwide” and also notes that due to its few number of gateways, PSAPs would need to interconnect not only with LECs, but with interstate and international carriers as well to receive 911 calls. *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 23.

⁹³ *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 6.

⁹⁴ *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 7.

⁹⁵ *Wireless E911 First Recon Order* at paras. 98-99.

PSAPs designated by local authorities to answer wireless 911 calls.⁹⁶ We encourage satellite carriers to confer with state governments regarding their designated wireless PSAPs.⁹⁷

32. We seek further comment on costs to transport enhanced call information. ICO and Globalstar note that PSAPs would need to make modifications to their equipment in order to receive E911 call data from a satellite network, and both express uncertainty whether the PSAPs have begun making these modifications.⁹⁸ We seek comment on this issue, particularly whether a PSAP that is configured to receive terrestrial wireless E911 data can also receive E911 data from a satellite licensee, or whether PSAPs would have to make additional modifications. We seek additional comment on the need (as Globalstar and ICO assert) for costly trunk arrangements for transporting enhanced 911 calls from satellite gateway stations to PSAPs. As noted above, Globalstar's emergency service does not use such trunks when forwarding calls from the call center to PSAPs.⁹⁹

(b) Provision of Automatic Number Identification

33. Background. In the *Satellite E911 Public Notice*, the International Bureau asked whether the Commission should implement ANI for satellite 911 calls, and if so what would be an appropriate implementation schedule.¹⁰⁰ The International Bureau also asked whether provision of ANI would be more problematic for MSS providers than for covered wireless providers.¹⁰¹ Public safety entities such as the Coast Guard and NENA support ANI for satellite carriers,¹⁰² but the limited record on this issue reflects that the infrastructure of some currently operational carriers, including AMSC and Iridium, is not capable of receiving and transmitting ANI information.¹⁰³ Globalstar maintains that its gateway stations are incapable of accepting ANI information, and moreover Globalstar is unsure whether PSAP and LEC

⁹⁶ *Wireless E911 First Recon Order* at para. 99. See also 47 C.F.R. § 20.3 (defining a PSAP as a “[p]oint that has been designated to receive 911 calls and route them to emergency service personnel).

⁹⁷ See, e.g., *Fifth Report and Order*, 16 FCC Rcd 22264 at para. 27 (addressing the need for carriers to contact the entity to be designated by the State's Governor pursuant to section 3(b) of the 911 Act).

⁹⁸ *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 6-7; *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 17.

⁹⁹ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2. NENA observes that Globalstar's ability to route 911 calls from its call center to PSAPs refutes Inmarsat's argument that MSS systems cannot use existing facilities to route calls to PSAPs. NENA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 3.

¹⁰⁰ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 5.

¹⁰¹ We require terrestrial wireless licensees to provide ANI to PSAPs as Phase I of enhanced 911 service. ANI consists of the caller's telephone number and the location of the cell site or base station that received the 911 call. See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(d). In the satellite context, we understand that lack of terrestrial base stations (other than the small number of gateway stations) limits ANI to the caller's telephone number. Also, we recognize that requiring satellite carriers to implement ANI prior to ALI (as Section 20.18 requires for covered terrestrial carriers) may be impractical, because a satellite 911 call cannot be automatically routed to a PSAP without first determining a caller's precise location. See *infra* para. 83.

¹⁰² NENA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 2-3; USCG *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 6. The Coast Guard also argues that having the callback number will assist in tracking down hoax callers. Due to the costs involved in investigating calls that are revealed to be hoaxes (as the Coast Guard has demonstrated), we are persuaded that identification and prosecution of hoax callers provides additional basis for an ANI requirement.

¹⁰³ In response to the more general inquiries of the *GMPCS NPRM*, Motorola observes that “[d]ue to differences in telephone and radio system dialing protocols, it is not yet feasible to provide ANI on the Iridium system.” Motorola *GMPCS NPRM* comments at n.33. AMSC similarly notes that its network could not (as of 1999) provide ANI or ALI, and that reconfiguring the network would cost approximately hundreds of millions of dollars. AMSC *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 16-17.

trunking facilities (including those in Canada) can transport the ANI.¹⁰⁴ Globalstar estimates that the cost of the necessary equipment to provide ANI (*i.e.*, an American National Standards Institute ISDN User Part connection to the PSTN) would be \$1,000,000, exclusive of trunking costs.¹⁰⁵ Globalstar argues that the cost of establishing trunks between its gateways and each PSAP would be prohibitive, and that “given the low number of 911 calls over [Globalstar’s satellite network], the costs of imposing a ‘Phase I’ [*i.e.*, Phase I as defined in the terrestrial wireless rules] ANI obligation are not justified.”¹⁰⁶

34. Discussion. We agree with commenters such as NENA and the Coast Guard that the availability of the caller’s number will serve the public interest by enabling PSAPs to reconnect to callers in the event of a disconnection and to track down hoax callers. Accordingly, we seek further comment regarding the feasibility of transmitting a caller’s phone number to the PSAP. For example, we seek comment whether satellite network technology has improved in the time since comments were last filed, thus enabling the generation of ANI data. Are Globalstar’s concerns regarding LEC and PSAP readiness well-founded, especially as these entities work to accommodate ALI and ANI from terrestrial wireless carriers? Do other currently operational MSS licensees face hurdles similar to Globalstar’s with regard to network retrofits? What costs do other carriers anticipate incurring to reprogram current equipment or acquire new equipment? Could accommodation of ANI be facilitated if imposed on future generations of systems currently operating? We welcome comment from all interested parties on these matters.

(c) Provision of Automatic Location Information

35. Background. In the *Satellite E911 Public Notice*, the Bureau sought input on a variety of issues pertaining to satellite system provision of ALI. In particular, the Bureau asked if implementation of handset-based ALI for MSS licensees would be any more problematic than it has been for terrestrial wireless carriers.¹⁰⁷ The Bureau also asked if technologies already developed for terrestrial purposes would be readily adaptable to MSS, or at least be available at prices comparable to those charged to terrestrial carriers.¹⁰⁸ The Bureau solicited comment on the costs associated with implementing handset-based ALI, both with regard to handsets and any other related expenses. As an alternative, the Bureau asked whether ALI can be achieved without the need for GPS receivers in handsets, and if so what level of accuracy could be attained, and at what cost.¹⁰⁹

36. We received a range of comments on the feasibility of providing accurate location information for MSS subscribers. Several licensees indicated that their constellations are incapable of ascertaining a caller’s position, rendering only GPS as an ALI solution.¹¹⁰ Some carriers can and do

¹⁰⁴ Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 17.

¹⁰⁵ Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 17-18.

¹⁰⁶ Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 18.

¹⁰⁷ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 5. The terrestrial wireless Phase II accuracy standards for handset-based technologies are 50 meters for 67 percent of calls and 150 meters for 95 percent of calls and for network-based technologies are 100 meters for 67 percent of calls and 300 meters for 95 percent of calls. See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(h).

¹⁰⁸ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 5-6.

¹⁰⁹ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 6.

¹¹⁰ See, e.g., Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3 (Inmarsat’s use of a four GSO satellite network “makes it impossible” to provide ALI without including GPS components in the handset); ICO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3-4 (ICO’s MSS network uses 12 satellites with large spot beams to cover the entire United States, with all calls routed to a single gateway station. ICO asserts that this architecture makes provision of ALI too difficult, leaving GPS as the only viable option.); Motient *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3 (Motient says that its network consists of five beams, each covering thousands of square miles, but adds that these beams cannot determine a caller’s position with the accuracy required by Section 20.18).

ascertain a caller's position but the degree of accuracy is not commensurate with our terrestrial wireless standards, and they too submit that only GPS would meet the terrestrial wireless Phase II standards.¹¹¹ The Coast Guard urges the Commission to require an ALI standard for GMPCS that is "at least as accurate as the 125-meter RMS [root mean square] standard" contained in the then-current terrestrial wireless rule (the 125-meter RMS standard was later replaced with differing standards for handset-based and network-based solutions).¹¹² The Coast Guard says that terrestrial wireless Phase II-type location accuracy is "mandatory" because otherwise rescue delays will inevitably occur, and knowledge of the caller's location will assist in the identification and prosecution of hoax callers.¹¹³

37. Public safety advocates generally believe that GPS components can be integrated into MSS handsets, but carriers are less optimistic. SCC Corp. recognizes the technical limitations faced by satellite carriers, and argues that GPS technology "offers an independent and proven means of meeting Phase II location standards. . . ."¹¹⁴ Inmarsat and ICO argue that the use of GPS chipsets adds too much expense to the cost of handsets; ICO in particular notes that the per unit cost for incorporating GPS into one of its handsets is \$30.¹¹⁵ With regard to other GPS technical considerations, ICO comments that GPS hardware would reduce a handset's battery life from 180-200 hours to about 20 hours.¹¹⁶ NTIA points out that "filters with an extremely steep roll-off would be required" for GPS and MSS components to work simultaneously, due to band proximity.¹¹⁷ Globalstar maintains that its network and GPS transmit/receive functions cannot operate simultaneously because of interference issues.¹¹⁸ NTIA observes that simultaneous operation problems could be minimized through time-sharing, "e.g., [the] GPS receiver is turned off while [the] MSS handset is transmitting."¹¹⁹

38. Discussion. While we recognize the value in establishing strict accuracy standards, as the Coast Guard advocates, we are persuaded based on the existing record that presently the only way of achieving such standards is via GPS. In the terrestrial wireless proceeding, we stressed the importance of maintaining technical neutrality in the selection of ALI technology¹²⁰ and we intend to continue that policy with satellite systems. Thus we seek comment on whether we should allow ALI to be provided by

¹¹¹ See *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 12 (10 kilometer accuracy 90% of time); *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 3 (Iridium Satellite can determine the location of a caller with an accuracy of 10 to 20 kilometers). Orbcomm, a Little LEO licensee, estimates that its system can ascertain the location of a stationary user terminal within 10 minutes with 500-meter accuracy 95% of the time, using calculations based on Doppler variations in the signals received from its low-orbit satellites. Additional time will allow more satellite passes and thus refined accuracy (approximately 350 meters within 30 minutes). ORBCOMM *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 12-13.

¹¹² USCG *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 6-8.

¹¹³ *Id.*

¹¹⁴ *SCC Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3-4.

¹¹⁵ *Inmarsat Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3-4; *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 4-5.

¹¹⁶ *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 4.

¹¹⁷ *NTIA Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 10.

¹¹⁸ *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments 19. Globalstar also points out that handset-based ALI solutions have network infrastructure consequences, including the need for "a switch-based network component that may not be readily interposed on an MSS gateway facility" and gateway upgrades to provide network assistance to the handset, requiring additional servers (a "significant undertaking"). *Id.* at 19-20.

¹¹⁹ *NTIA Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 10.

¹²⁰ *Wireless E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18714 (emphasizing the intention to adopt general criteria rather than technical standards); *Wireless E911 First Recon Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 22665, 22724-5 (in setting deadlines and benchmarks for ALI, Commission policy has been to be technologically and competitively neutral); *Wireless E911 Third Report and Order*, 14 FCC Rcd 17388 at para. 14.

a carrier's inherent capabilities, or whether we should require all satellite carriers to implement a handset-based solution that incorporates GPS. If we were to allow licensees to choose their technology, would the public interest be served by allowing a relaxed accuracy standard for network-based solutions (e.g., a theoretically best accuracy of 1 kilometer, 90 percent of the time¹²¹)? We seek comment on acceptable alternative location accuracy standards. Particularly, we are interested in whether carriers that can pinpoint caller location to within 10 to 20 kilometers (such as Iridium and Globalstar) should be required to convey those coordinates to a PSAP when connecting 911 calls. We seek comment on the public benefit of using existing/inherent satellite location technology to determine the appropriate PSAP to call and whether to transmit the caller's coordinates to the PSAP. We also seek comment on whether other technology is available or will be available in the near future that MSS carriers can use to provide similar or better ALI data as compared to GPS. If relaxed standards are unacceptable, should we delay implementation of a GPS solution until costs and engineering issues have been resolved substantially, or would a relaxed standard suffice until such time as issues with a GPS solution are resolved?

39. We understand from the Coast Guard that inaccurate coordinates may be of limited value when conducting maritime searches, but we seek comment from other entities whether available location technology, in concert with information gleaned from callers themselves, still serves the public interest. If not, we seek comment on whether implementation of wireless-comparable ALI standards should be delayed for MSS until economies of scale exist that bring costs down to levels proportional to those that wireless carriers have achieved (recognizing that such a delay might add several years to satellite E911 becoming effective).

40. We also seek comment on certain interference issues. Globalstar maintains that its transceiver units, if equipped with GPS functions, cannot transmit and receive at the same time due to interference issues.¹²² We recognize this limitation as a valid concern and thus seek further comments on ways to mitigate this interference, and also whether this is an issue other MSS operators will encounter. In addition, we seek comment on non-simultaneous use of the transceiver unit for transmitting and receiving a GPS signal.¹²³ Further, we seek comment on the impact the non-simultaneous functions would have on GPS acquisition time (i.e., the time interval to synchronize the mobile transceiver with the GPS constellation) and position determination of the transceiver. We also seek comment on call set-up time for such non-simultaneous uses. Globalstar notes that a GPS receiver in a handset "could take several minutes to successfully access the GPS satellites to determine its position," which contrasts with the "few seconds" needed to establish a Globalstar call.¹²⁴ At the time Globalstar prepared its comments, we believe Globalstar was correct in its assessment; however, based on current GPS technology we believe this is no longer the case. We invite comment on the use of adequate filtering, as suggested by NTIA, as a way of minimizing interference.¹²⁵ We believe that proper filtering will address interference concerns, but we are interested in comment on the estimated costs of such a solution.

41. We acknowledge the fact (as ICO and Inmarsat point out) that incorporating GPS technology into handsets may alter the weight, size and power consumption of the mobile transceiver unit and also

¹²¹ See *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 20.

¹²² *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 19.

¹²³ NTIA in its comments proposes non-simultaneous use of the transceiver unit as a means for avoiding interference to the receive GPS signal on an MSS transceiver equipped with GPS receive capability. NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 10.

¹²⁴ *Globalstar Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 19.

¹²⁵ NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 10 (suggesting that in order for MSS handsets to transmit simultaneously during GPS operation, "filters with an extremely steep roll-off would be required," with impractical cost, weight, and power concerns).

increase the cost per unit. However, based on our understanding of the current trends in technology, in particular ALI using GPS technology, we believe that the record before us is somewhat stale and that costs and battery size have come down somewhat. Therefore, we seek updated information on the costs associated with weight, size and power consumption of these terminals when equipping mobile satellite transceiver units with GPS technology. We also seek comment on the cost associated with upgrading current satellite networks to accommodate that transmission of GPS data, and the costs associated with incorporating GPS into the designs of future MSS networks, in particular information pertaining to routing and processing of E911 calls. We seek input regarding whether advances made thus far in the provision of E911 for terrestrial wireless are in any way applicable to satellite networks.

(d) Implementation Schedules

42. Discussion. We believe the record would benefit from additional information concerning implementation schedules for satellite E911. A variety of factors distinguish satellite E911 implementation from its terrestrial counterpart. First, due to network architecture, an MSS gateway requires the specific location of the caller first in order to connect the call to a PSAP. Knowledge of the caller's specific location constitutes ALI, and without this information a satellite call cannot be routed to a PSAP. Therefore, unlike terrestrial wireless, where implementation of ANI preceded implementation of ALI, we do not believe that ANI can be implemented prior to ALI for MSS. We seek comment on whether, instead of phasing in ANI and ALI separately, we should require satellite carriers to provide ANI and ALI simultaneously. If we should proceed with a unified ANI/ALI requirement, how soon after adoption of this requirement should currently operational and design-stage carriers become compliant? Can design-stage MSS systems be re-engineered and compliant with E911 requirements upon inception of service? For example, we invite comment concerning the ability of a licensee that has already met its first milestone (e.g., by entering a non-contingent contract for the manufacture of the first satellite in the system) at the time any E911 requirements become effective to comply with those requirements. With respect to currently operational systems, we seek comment whether ANI/ALI services should be required for second or third generation satellite systems. Conversely, if provision of ANI/ALI services demands modifications in handsets and gateway stations, rather than satellites, we seek comment on whether E911 is feasible with the current satellite generation. We seek comment on the predicted costs of implementing ANI/ALI and solicit input on possible subscribership levels that we could set as triggers for compliance with any such rule.¹²⁶ While SCC Corp. asks that the Commission establish firm deployment schedules,¹²⁷ we are not prepared to do so without additional information.

43. Several satellite carriers have pointed out that they have relatively few customers in comparison to terrestrial wireless companies, and as a result are unable to distribute the costs of enhanced 911 services as easily to subscribers.¹²⁸ If MSS systems can only recover the costs of enhanced 911 services through additional charges to their existing subscribers, they likely will be forced to increase their subscriber rates by a substantial amount. Such increased rates may decrease the demand for their services, which means that fewer potential subscribers will purchase MSS services, whether or not it offers E911 features. Therefore, we request comment on whether an E911 requirement should be triggered only when a licensee has achieved a certain benchmark in subscribership.

¹²⁶ See also *supra* para. 24.

¹²⁷ See *SCC Satellite 911 Public Notice ex parte* letter (April 10, 2001).

¹²⁸ For example, ICO noted that (as of 1999), MSS subscribership numbered approximately 500,000, whereas wireless subscribership was 44 million when the Commission adopted E911 rules in 1996 (and by 1999 subscribership reached approximately 86 million). *ICO Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 6. The Commission has said that "CMRS carriers are not subject to rate regulation, and may adjust their rates to reflect the cost of providing E911 services without [Commission] intervention." *Wireless E911 Second Recon Order*, 14 FCC Rcd 20850 at para. 49 (1999).

44. *Grandfathering.* The terrestrial wireless rules provide equipment phase-in schedules for handset-based location technologies.¹²⁹ Inmarsat argues that in the event that the Commission adopts a location monitoring requirement for MSS, “these requirements [should] be applicable on a prospective basis only and that existing terminals be grandfathered against such requirements.”¹³⁰ Inmarsat maintains that even though it intends to incorporate GPS into its next generation of MSS earth stations, it currently serves approximately 200,000 user terminals worldwide.¹³¹ Do MSS licensees other than Inmarsat have a significant number of mobile earth terminals that would be costly to retrofit? We are concerned about this issue as well and seek comment whether pre-existing mobile terminals in use at the time any E911 rules are adopted and effective should be grandfathered from compliance. In order to determine the impact of a grandfathering provision, we also seek comment concerning whether satellite licensees expect significant terminal churn with regard to current customers.¹³²

(e) Carriers and Services Required to Offer E911

45. Background. In the *Satellite 911 Public Notice*, the Bureau asked if 911 rules for satellite services should be limited to the same extent the rules are limited for terrestrial wireless carriers (*i.e.*, to carriers that provide real-time, two-way switched voice service that is interconnected to the PSTN). The International Bureau also asked whether any MSS services are analogous to the maritime and aeronautical services that are exempt from the terrestrial wireless 911 rules.¹³³ The Commission excluded maritime and aeronautical services from the terrestrial wireless 911 rules, despite their being two-way voice services, because passengers and crews of ships at sea rely on Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (“GMDSS”) for emergency and distress, while passengers and crews of airplanes use other radiocommunication channels for emergency assistance.¹³⁴

46. The record reflects a range of positions concerning carriers that should be subject to 911 requirements. ORBCOMM, a little LEO licensee, and NTIA argue that E911 requirements should not be imposed on non-voice MSS systems.¹³⁵ NTIA believes that the 911 Act requires only “telephony” services, *i.e.*, “the transmission of voice over a communications network,” to provide 911, thereby excluding non-voice MSS.¹³⁶ NENA suggests that the 911 Act requires maritime MSS to provide 911 access, while the Washington State E911 Program office asserts that a Washington 911 statute makes no “operational distinctions when mandating enhanced 911, statewide” and therefore any telephone system (including GMPCS) “must be designed to interface to existing E911 systems if it is to meet the intent of [sic] Washington statute.”¹³⁷ Boeing argues that nothing in the 911 Act’s legislative history indicates that

¹²⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(g).

¹³⁰ Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 4.

¹³¹ Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3.

¹³² We note that replacement phones accounted for 23 percent of the terrestrial wireless handset market in 2001. See “Is Nokia Missing an Important Call? While the No. 1 Wireless Handset Maker Dawdles, its Rivals are Rolling Out Advanced Models in the U.S.,” Roger O. Crocket, *BusinessWeek Online* (March 27, 2002).

¹³³ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 4 (citing *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 82).

¹³⁴ *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 82; see also 47 C.F.R. § 80, Subpart W.

¹³⁵ ORBCOMM *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 12; FA/ORBCOMM *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2; NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 11-12. See also NENA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 4 (concurring with ORBCOMM’s position).

¹³⁶ NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 11-12.

¹³⁷ NENA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 3 and reply at 4; Washington State *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 1. NENA maintains that although “Congress ordained the use of these digits [*i.e.*, 911] for all wireless

the Congress intended the statute to apply to MSS or aeronautical services.¹³⁸

47. Discussion. We tentatively conclude that only GMPCS carriers providing real-time, two-way switched voice service that is interconnected to the PSTN should be required to provide E911 services. This is consistent with our approach to terrestrial wireless services. We also tentatively conclude that maritime and aeronautical MSS services should be excluded from any 911 requirements, for the same reasons they are excluded from the terrestrial wireless requirements. While the Commission has found no public safety need for E911 on terrestrial two-way, non-voice services,¹³⁹ the Coast Guard argues that any E911 requirements “should apply to all two-way voice and data systems which fall under the classification of GMPCS.”¹⁴⁰ Although we are not inclined to extend any satellite 911 requirements to non-voice systems, we welcome additional comment on the Coast Guard’s proposal. ORBCOMM indicated in 1999 that it “recognizes that some subscribers will want to use their communicators to send 911-type messages, and ORBCOMM intends to address the needs of these potential users by providing the appropriate” PSAP with information necessary to respond.¹⁴¹ If ORBCOMM and/or any other non-voice systems currently provide this sort of emergency service, we seek comment regarding its implementation and use.

48. We agree with Globalstar that we must reject Washington State’s implication that all GMPCS providers must provide 911 service to comply with a Washington statute.¹⁴² The Commission observed in the wireless E911 proceeding “that state actions that are incompatible with the policies and rules adopted in this Order are subject to preemption.”¹⁴³ Moreover, the Commission stated that Federal preemption of state E911 regulation “may be necessary to ensure the achievement of various inseverable, nationwide aspects of E911 operations,” including nationwide E911 operational compatibility.¹⁴⁴ These principles are as applicable to satellite CMRS as they are to terrestrial CMRS. The only 911 requirements satellite carriers must follow are those that the Commission adopts, to the extent it adopts any.

(iii) International Issues

49. Background. Rules requiring satellite carriers to provide emergency call centers and E911 services raise international issues, including the use of different emergency access codes across the globe¹⁴⁵ and differing standards for the transmission and routing of enhanced call information. Iridium

(...continued from previous page)

telephone calls originating in the U.S.,” the 911 Act “tolerates exemption” for aeronautical MSS. NENA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 2-4.

¹³⁸ Boeing *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 1-2.

¹³⁹ *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 82.

¹⁴⁰ USCG *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 8. The Coast Guard also proposes that store-and-forward systems use the International Maritime Organization’s “Criteria for Use when Providing Inmarsat Shore-based Facilities” to address the reliability of delivering emergency messages. See USCG *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 8-9.

¹⁴¹ ORBCOMM *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 16.

¹⁴² Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 7 (noting that Washington State “seems to imply that its state law somehow supersedes the Commission’s rules”).

¹⁴³ See *E911 First Report and Order* at paras. 104-105.

¹⁴⁴ See *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 104.

¹⁴⁵ By way of example, the emergency dial code for many European countries is 112; Argentina uses 101 for ambulance and police and 107 for fire; Brazil uses 192 for ambulance, 190 for police, and 193 for fire; China uses 120 for ambulance, 110 for police, and 119 for fire; Japan uses 119 for ambulance and fire and 110 for police. See <http://www.globaltelecom.org/telecom.htm> (visited 5/14/02).

LLC points to the existence of competing access codes as evidence of the need for an international forum to establish standards to adopting any E911 rules for satellite.¹⁴⁶ A variety of commenters urge that all international issues be resolved on the international stage, such as through the International Telecommunication Union-Radiocommunication Bureau (“ITU-R”).¹⁴⁷

50. Discussion. When the Commission initially declined to require MSS licensees to comply with any 911 rules, it identified the need to coordinate with international standards bodies for completion of international calls as one of the several factors distinguishing MSS from covered CMRS carriers.¹⁴⁸ In the *Satellite 911 Public Notice*, the International Bureau asked if the public safety community and MSS industry participants had done anything “to continue their efforts to develop and establish standards [for emergency calling] along with the international standards bodies.”¹⁴⁹ The comments received in response to this inquiry did not differ substantially from the comments received nearly a year and half earlier in response to the *GMPCS NPRM*. In both cases, commenters stress the need to develop standards on the international stage prior to adoption of any E911 rules, but do not indicate that any progress had been made in this regard.¹⁵⁰ We seek comment as to whether resolution of international standards issues should in any way further delay adoption of a call center requirement or E911 rules.

51. NTIA suggests that the ITU-R would be an “effective forum” for developing global standards, particularly under the aegis of a new Study Group 8 question developed by the U.S. Coast Guard, NTIA, and “MSS participants.”¹⁵¹ This question addresses a number of issues critical to global implementation of emergency services, including the preferred capabilities of MSS systems, preferred requirements for automatic location determination, aspects of routing MSS emergency calls that must be compatible with international routing procedure, and the enhanced information to be forwarded with emergency calls.¹⁵² NTIA reports that no comments were submitted in the Study Group 8 question during the study cycle preparing for the 2003 World Radio Conference.¹⁵³ We understand that to date no recommendation has resulted from this question. We agree with NTIA that “technical studies that are performed in response to this question can be used as the basis for developing ITU-R Recommendations.”¹⁵⁴ We strongly encourage all licensees, equipment manufacturers, public safety organizations, and any other interested parties to participate in the discussion of ITU-R Question 227/8. We are concerned that carriers have often cited the need to develop international standards for emergency calling as a prelude to rule adoption, but apparently fail to initiate or participate in the necessary global

¹⁴⁶ Iridium LLC *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 14.

¹⁴⁷ See ICO Global *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 6-7; SIA *GMPCS NPRM* comments and reply at 5; Comsat *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 14; USCG *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 9-10; Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications of Japan *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 1 (emphasizing that the use of ALI for emergency purposes should first be studied at the ITU-R). See also ICO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2; NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 8.

¹⁴⁸ *E911 First Report and Order* at para. 83.

¹⁴⁹ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 7, citing *Wireless E911 First Recon Order* at para. 89.

¹⁵⁰ See, e.g., Iridium LLC *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 14; ICO Global *GMPCS NPRM* comment at 6-7; SIA *GMPCS NPRM* reply at 2; Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications of Japan *GMPCS NPRM* comment at 1. Comment in response to the *Satellite 911 Public Notice* on this issue was similar. See, e.g., ICO *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 8; Inmarsat *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 2.

¹⁵¹ NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 8. The question is identified as ITU-R 227/8, “Technical and Operational Characteristics of Emergency Communications in the Mobile Satellite Service.”

¹⁵² NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 8.

¹⁵³ NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 9.

¹⁵⁴ NTIA *Satellite 911 Public Notice* reply at 8.

discussions.

52. We seek comment on issues raised by use of emergency access codes other than 911. We understand that Globalstar has programmed its handsets to recognize a variety of emergency access codes (such as Europe's 112), and connects all such calls to an ECAS operator.¹⁵⁵ This suggests that resolution of at least some standards in the international arena is unnecessary, as a result of software modifications. While network recognition of multiple emergency numbers would facilitate subscriber access to call centers, we appreciate that inconsistent international standards with regard to ALI and ANI may cause more significant implementation issues (*e.g.*, PSAPs in different nations may use incompatible equipment for processing E911 data). We invite comment on other methods for promoting satellite service emergency access without first resolving international standards concerns.

53. We also seek comment on liability issues in connection with recognition of multiple emergency access codes. Globalstar notes its liability concerns stemming from the fundamental differences between its global system and localized terrestrial wireless systems.¹⁵⁶ The 911 Act requires that "911" serve as the universal emergency telephone number within the United States. Wireless carriers providing 911 emergency service are afforded liability protection to the same extent as that which wireline carriers receive on 911 calls.¹⁵⁷ If a satellite carrier allows subscribers to dial 112 (or any other emergency code) in the United States in order to place an emergency call, that carrier is arguably in violation of the 911 Act and might be excluded from the liability protection that the statute provides (at least with regard to emergency calls placed by dialing codes other than 911). Furthermore, unless the satellite handset is programmed to recognize all international emergency access codes, a probability exists that a non-U.S. citizen using a handset in the United States may dial his or her native emergency code and will be unable to reach a call center or PSAP because the particular code is not known. We seek comment concerning whether the capability of satellite systems to recognize a multitude of emergency dial codes violates provisions of the 911 Act. In this regard, we ask whether, if software in a handset converts any internationally recognized emergency access code into "911" at the moment the call is initiated, the carrier would preserve its liability protection under the 911 Act because the phone would be dialing 911 regardless of the user's number selection. We seek comment concerning possible methods of protecting satellite carriers from liability in the event that a non-911 code is dialed in an emergency, and how we could implement them.

54. In the *Satellite 911 Public Notice*, the International Bureau asked a number of questions concerning the specific effects, if any, that adoption of E911 rules would have on the international compatibility of terminal equipment. We hereby incorporate by reference that section of the *Satellite 911 Public Notice* for the purpose of collecting new information.¹⁵⁸

(iv) Integration of Ancillary Terrestrial Component

55. Discussion. The Commission initiated IB Docket No. 01-185 to consider whether to allow flexibility in the delivery of MSS communications in the 2 GHz, L-band, and Big LEO bands. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in that docket largely explores issues concerning MSS licensees' integration of an ancillary terrestrial component ("ATC") with their networks using assigned MSS frequencies. We do not intend to pre-judge here any of the myriad issues involved with provision of ATC. We recognize that the issues raised in the ATC proceeding could have an effect on satellite

¹⁵⁵ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 2.

¹⁵⁶ *Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo* at 3.

¹⁵⁷ 911 Act at Section 4.

¹⁵⁸ *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 7.

carriers' ability to implement both basic and enhanced 911 (e.g., MSS carriers with ATC would likely have access to ground-based interconnection points in a manner similar to that of cellular and PCS licensees, critical to routing 911 calls to the nearest PSAP). We seek comment on whether implementation of ATC would affect the Commission's analysis of MSS under its proposed general criteria for compliance with basic and enhanced 911 requirements. For example, we seek comment concerning consumer expectations for emergency services associated with a satellite service having a terrestrial component. We seek comment on how the network architecture of an MSS system with an ancillary terrestrial component may change the analysis of MSS deployment of E911 services consistent with our rules. We seek comment generally concerning how any form of ATC would affect implementation of E911 for MSS, including technology considerations and roll-out schedules.

(v) **Other Issues**

56. Background and Discussion. The *Satellite 911 Public Notice* sought comment on several additional issues, and we take this opportunity to seek additional comment on them.¹⁵⁹ For example, Globalstar noted that while it routes "911 calls from all users – authorized or unauthorized" to its call center, it cannot route calls from non-initialized phones since they lack "an identifiable international mobile subscriber identity."¹⁶⁰ We invite comment concerning whether other carriers have or would have similar capabilities and limitations, and whether we should consider treating satellite and terrestrial wireless carriers differently as a result.¹⁶¹ We also remain interested in consumer expectations concerning the emergency call features of satellite phones.¹⁶² We invite comment concerning measures that carriers may take, such as labeling, to communicate these features to subscribers.¹⁶³ We also invite comment concerning any other issues that interested parties find relevant to implementation of 911 services for mobile satellite services.

2. Telematics Service

57. Summary. Currently, there are approximately two and a half million vehicles with telematics systems on the Nation's highways.¹⁶⁴ Trade press reports predict that by 2006, there will be over 20 million telematics-enabled cars and light trucks in the United States,¹⁶⁵ and by 2008, approximately 42 percent of all vehicles sold will have telematics systems.¹⁶⁶ In view of the current installed base of telematics equipment and the expectation for future growth, we seek comment generally on the

¹⁵⁹ See *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 6-7.

¹⁶⁰ Globalstar *Satellite 911 Public Notice* comments at 13.

¹⁶¹ See, e.g., Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems; Non-initialized Phones, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Report and Order*, 17 FCC Rcd 8481 (2002); *Order*, DA 02-2423 (rel. Sept. 30, 2002) (granting a stay of the effective date of rules adopted in the *Report and Order*).

¹⁶² See *Satellite 911 Public Notice* at 7.

¹⁶³ The Coast Guard, for example, supports a labeling requirement for equipment that cannot be used for emergency purposes. USCG *GMPCS NPRM* comments at 11.

¹⁶⁴ See P. Hansen, "Special Report on Telematics Content and Services," as reported in *Telematics Update Magazine* (July 15, 2002), <http://www.telematicsupdate.com>, visited Nov. 5, 2002. Ex Parte Presentation of ATX Technologies, Inc. (ATX), WT Docket No. 01-108 (July 9, 2002), at p. 4 (enclosure of ATX Comments in ET Docket No. 02-135, submitted to Commission staff in response to Public Notice of the Spectrum Task Force).

¹⁶⁵ See P. Leroux, "Creativity, Reliability to Drive Telematics," ZDNet (Aug. 20, 2002) <http://zdnet.com.com/2100-1007-954488.htm>, visited Sept. 26, 2002.

¹⁶⁶ J. Wrolstad, "IBM Teams with Honda on Telematics," *Wireless NewsFactor* (July 29, 2002) <http://wireless.newsfactor.com/perl/printer/1879>, visited Sept. 26, 2002 (attributing forecast to Phil Magney of Telematics Research Group).

Commission's current regulatory approach to such services and possible future approaches.¹⁶⁷

58. Background. Telematics can be generally defined as the integrated use of location technology and wireless communications to enhance the functionality of motor vehicles.¹⁶⁸ Telematics services provide a number of automotive and mobile applications including safety and concierge services through integrated vehicle communications and navigation systems that employ Global Positioning System (GPS) technology to provide directions, to track a vehicle's location, and to obtain emergency assistance in the event of an accident.¹⁶⁹ Telematics systems may include automatic crash notification (ACN) systems that have the capability to automatically call an emergency services dispatcher for help in the event of a car accident.¹⁷⁰

59. In offering these services, telematics providers rely on the service of mobile wireless providers by contracting with them for minutes of mobile telephony use. The particular services provided may vary, depending on the package or level of service that the car owner purchases, and may also include voice CMRS that is resold as an additional or premium service option to the customer.¹⁷¹ A majority of telematics services, including the resold voice service, currently rely on analog cellular systems deploying the Advanced Mobile Phone Service (AMPS) compatibility standard. Some digital systems are being either deployed or developed.¹⁷²

60. Telematics providers may offer their services using original equipment manufacturer (OEM) equipment embedded in new vehicles. Auto manufacturers may contract with various equipment or platform vendors in offering telematics services to purchasers, and aftermarket equipment or accessories are becoming available.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁷ We note at the outset that OnStar Corporation (OnStar) recently filed a petition for a ruling that in-vehicle, embedded telematics devices operating on wireless carrier networks utilizing handset-based 911 Phase II solutions are not "handsets" as that term is used in current Commission rules adopted in CC Docket No. 94-102. *See Ex Parte Submission, In the Matter of Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems*, CC Docket No. 94-102, from K. Enborg, Vice President and General Counsel, OnStar, to T. Sugrue, Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission (Dec. 3, 2002) (also petitioning for ruling that those devices are not included in the carrier subscriber base referenced in the orders in that proceeding). Comment will be sought on the specific issue raised in this *ex parte* petition in a separate Public Notice in CC Docket No. 94-102. OnStar is a member of the National Emergency Number Association's (NENA) Non-Traditional Technical Committee and that committee's Automatic Crash Notification (ACN) subcommittee.

¹⁶⁸ In the Matter of Year 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review – Amendment of Part 22 of the Commission's Rules to Modify or Eliminate Outdated Rules Affecting the Cellular Radiotelephone Service and other Commercial Mobile Radio Services, WT Docket No. 01-108, *Report and Order*, FCC 02-229 (rel. Sept. 24, 2002) (*Biennial Review Report and Order*), at para. 18, n.56.

¹⁶⁹ *Seventh Wireless Competition Report*, at 13061-62. *See also, Biennial Review Report and Order*, at para. 18, n.56.

¹⁷⁰ *See Biennial Review Report and Order*, at para. 18, n.56.

¹⁷¹ *See, e.g., OnStar, What is OnStar: Services*, http://www.onstar.com/visitors/html/ao_features.htm, visited Sept. 13, 2002.

¹⁷² *E.g., the Ford Vehicle Communications Systems (VCS) requires a service contract with Sprint PCS. Daimler-Chrysler is developing a telematics offering that is based on WLAN technology that does not require reliance on the public switched telephone network (PSTN).*

¹⁷³ "Virtual Wave, Airbiquity Offer Wireless Location-Based Services," CTIA Daily News (Sept. 19, 2002) (attributing report to Instant Messaging Planet) ctiadailynews+647290.51471663.1@reply-wow-com.com. *See www.roadstargps.com*.

61. *Provision of Emergency Services through Telematics Services.* Telematics service providers generally process emergency calls from vehicle occupants in two ways. First, customers can make emergency calls by pressing a “hot button” installed in the vehicle or in the handset associated with the vehicle’s telematics unit.¹⁷⁴ Pressing the “hot button” is not the same as dialing 911 to make an emergency call. A telematics-based emergency communication, or “hot button” call, is routed over the network of the underlying carrier to a national call center operated by the telematics service provider. If available, location data from a satellite-based GPS capability integrated with the telematics equipment in the vehicle can be transferred to the call center, where the caller’s location can be computed.

62. In the event the telematics-based emergency communication is disconnected, the call center representative can call back the vehicle to get more information about the emergency. The call center advisor also can orally relay pertinent emergency information, including location and call-back number, to a PSAP or other appropriate local emergency authority, such as a sheriff’s office. Further, the call center also has the capability to contact and request the dispatch of emergency assistance from various emergency authorities.¹⁷⁵

63. For those telematics customers who also subscribe to a jointly packaged mobile voice service, the customer can choose to dial 911, rather than using the telematics-based emergency communication option. The 911 call then is routed over the network of the underlying wireless carrier and is delivered directly to a PSAP or other appropriate local emergency authority, consistent with current requirements of Commission rules.¹⁷⁶ The telematics system will not block transmission of the call-back number information. However, location information on direct-dialed 911 calls is only available if the underlying wireless carrier employs a network-based ALI system, because the GPS tracking used by telematics is a satellite-based transmission that requires coordinated processing of data between the installed unit, the GPS satellites, and the telematics call center.

64. Discussion. We begin our inquiry by asking what, if anything, should be required of telematics services in light of their “hot button” and resold CMRS service capabilities. We then ask what expectations customers have with regard to emergency services offered through telematics systems. We also ask about current technical issues related to the provision of emergency services through telematics services. Commenters are also asked to address matters associated with Automatic Crash Notification (ACN). Finally, we seek comment on the Commission’s legal authority to address telematics providers and equipment manufacturers.

65. *Appropriate Model for Access to Emergency Services via Telematics Systems and Customer Expectations.* In addition to 911 calls placed through a jointly packaged mobile voice service, telematics services currently provide access to PSAPs through an intermediary: the telematics call-center advisor. The Commission’s rules currently contemplate situations in which CMRS customers receive service through an intermediary, specifically, a dispatcher.¹⁷⁷ In light of the specific nature of telematics services

¹⁷⁴ Older telematics units place the “hot button” feature in the wireless handset. In newer, built-in units, the “hot button” is usually placed in the dashboard or overhead near the rear view mirror in the vehicle. The “hot button” typically displays a symbol (e.g., “Red-Cross” shaped character) or letters (e.g., “SOS”) that signify that the button is to be pressed in case of emergency. See http://www.onstar.com/visitors/html/ao_emergency.htm; <http://www.lincolnvehicles.com/vehicles/interior/asp?sVehi=LS>.

¹⁷⁵ OnStar, *What is OnStar: Services* (visited Sept. 13, 2002) <http://www.onstar.com/visitors/html/ao_features.htm>.

¹⁷⁶ See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(b); 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.3001, 64.3002.

¹⁷⁷ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(k) (stating that “a service provider covered by [Section 20.18] who offers dispatch service to customers may meet the requirements of this section by either complying with the requirements set forth in paragraphs (b) through (e) of this section or by routing the customer’s emergency calls through a dispatcher. If the

(continued....)

and the expectations of its purchasers, should some form of this model (*i.e.*, emergency service through an intermediary accessible through a telematics “hot button”) be the primary manner in which emergency services are offered to users of telematics systems?

66. We note that this approach may well provide certain benefits to PSAPs by taking advantage of the ability of such call centers to act as an information filter to address a variety of circumstances and information needs. For instance, with the capability of call center representatives to call back the vehicle, call centers may serve as a screen for non-emergency calls, thus alleviating the burdens that PSAPs face in administratively handling their increasing wireless emergency call volume.¹⁷⁸ This call-back capability also allows call centers to screen for the particular type of emergency faced or type of assistance needed. Thus, they can aid in determining the appropriate response and emergency services provider to be deployed, based on the circumstances of each incident.

67. In addition to acting as a filter for non-emergency calls, telematics services also have the potential to offer additional information to PSAPs that would not be available through a “typical” 911 call. For example, there are programs currently being tested on a regional or local basis that entail a relay of the information electronically from the telematics units to a PSAP and/or emergency service providers.¹⁷⁹ These programs depend on the capability of some call centers to pass the geographic location information to another message processing unit operated by some emergency authority or provider.¹⁸⁰ We seek comment on plans for the integration of the systems of PSAPs and telematics providers. We seek comment on these and other possible advantages telematics providers may provide to PSAPs.

68. Certain issues do arise, however, using the dispatch model for emergency service access. For instance, call centers would decide to which PSAP, local emergency authority, or emergency service provider they route the emergency information. We seek comment on how we might address issues arising from this role, particularly with regard to relaying or routing information, including callback and location information. We also seek comment on the relationships between telematics providers, their call centers, PSAPs, emergency service providers, and state and local law enforcement agencies.

69. Another issue would be the timeliness of the delivery of calls to a PSAP or other appropriate

(...continued from previous page)

service provider chooses the latter alternative, it must make every reasonable effort to explicitly notify its current and potential dispatch customers and their users that they are not able to directly reach a PSAP by dialing 911 and that, in the event of an emergency, the dispatcher should be contacted.” Paragraph (b) covers basic 911 Service requirements; paragraph (c), TTY access to 911 services; paragraph (d) Phase I E911 requirements; and paragraph (e), Phase II E911 requirements. See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(b)-(e).

¹⁷⁸ See CTIA’s 1994 Wireless 9-1-1 and Distress Calls Statistics; NENA, Statistics for Year Ending Dec. 31, 1999, Report Card to the Nation (Sept. 11, 2001).

¹⁷⁹ For example, an Integrated ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) Public Safety System is currently being deployed in Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley that automates and coordinates the interactive responses of technology providers, public safety and medical professionals, emergency service personnel, and transportation experts to vehicle accidents. This system uses an “Intelligent Message Broker” (IMB) that integrates geographic information and routes data based on operational rules to which participating agencies have agreed in advance. See John Erich, EMS Magazine, *Information Integration: Virginia Crash Response System*, (visited Sept. 6, 2002) http://www.comcare.org/research/news/comcare_inthenews//020607emsmagazine.htm (Virginia IITS Public Safety System).

¹⁸⁰ See, e.g., Virginia IITS Public Safety System; *Intrado, Ford and the Greater Harris County, Texas, 9-1-1 Emergency Network Join Forces*, Telematics Update Magazine, Sept. 9, 2002 (visited Sept. 9, 2002), <http://www.telematicsupdate.com/print.asp?news+31649> (concerning Harris County, Texas ACN/telematics program for police vehicles).

local emergency authority. The delivery of the call-back number to a PSAP may be affected, because even though the call-back number is displayed on the call center's terminal screen for oral relay, that number may not be delivered directly to a PSAP. Achieving such capability may not be technically feasible in terms of modifying the systems that telematics providers are currently deploying. We therefore seek comment on these aspects regarding the timely provision of emergency services to telematics users.

70. Another issue of concern is notice to consumers regarding the manner in which "hot button" calls are processed. Section 20.18(k) of the Commission's rules currently require that if emergency calls are routed through a dispatcher, then the system must "make every reasonable effort to explicitly notify its . . . customers . . . that they are not able to directly reach a PSAP . . ." ¹⁸¹ Commenters should address what may be reasonable notification in the context of a telematics "hot button" call, compared to a 911 dialed call. In that regard, we invite comment on what approaches would be most useful for telematics providers to give notice to their customers through equipment labels, instruction manuals, etc. of any current limitations of telematics service in directly transmitting emergency information to a PSAP. ¹⁸²

71. In light of the above observations and questions, we seek comment on how we might amend Section 20.18(k) to account for telematics systems.

72. We also seek comment on implementation issues that may apply to the provision of emergency services information through telematics services. For example, some telematics providers are, or will soon be, planning and deploying a transition from an underlying analog-based system to a digital one. ¹⁸³ We seek comment on the impact that this transition might have on the implementation of any potential requirements or guidelines. We also seek comment on whether the pace of deployment among PSAPs in requesting E911 Phase I and Phase II capability from wireless carriers would have any effect on approaches we might take were we to impose those requirements on telematics providers. Further, we invite comment on how life cycle development factors for both vehicles and the telematics systems to be installed may affect any implementation time frames to be considered. Commenters should address whether general time frames proposed above should apply or whether we would need to modify them significantly to account for the lead-in times due to life cycle development. ¹⁸⁴

73. Finally, we seek comment on what, if any, emergency service can be requested from a non-service initialized telematics device. For vehicle owners who have let their telematics subscriptions lapse or who are driving vehicles with telematics units that have not been activated by the automobile dealer, will emergency assistance be available over a "hot button" or through the resold CMRS voice service?

¹⁸¹ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(k).

¹⁸² For example, we seek comment on whether there should be labels to indicate that dialing 911 will connect the caller to a PSAP or other local emergency authority rather than the telematics provider's call center or advisor.

¹⁸³ See generally, *Biennial Review Report and Order*, at paras. 18-20 (discussing the elimination of the analog cellular compatibility standard in regard to telematics providers and concluding that a five year transition period of the requirement is sufficient for telematics providers to be able to deploy their service offerings on carriers' digital networks).

¹⁸⁴ For example, the development life cycle for automobiles may be 5-7 years, but for telematics systems that are integrated, the life cycle planning involved may be 3 years before the model is launched. Such systems may also be affected by considerations of potential technological obsolescence. See, e.g., S. Bhagavatula, "The Bigger Picture – How Important Is Telematics for Moving the Auto Industry as a Whole," *Telematics Systems 2002*, Gothenburg Sweden, *TelematicsUpdate Magazine*, www.telematicsupdate.com. See also, *Biennial Review Report and Order*, at paras. 18-20 (addressing significant impacts, e.g., development cycles of vehicles, hardware and technology programs, which would be mitigated by reasonable transition period of five years for elimination of Commission requirement for analog compatibility standard).

74. *Automatic Crash Notification (ACN)*. ACN functionality allows for the transmission of crash information (*i.e.*, whether the vehicle rolled over, the measured deceleration of the vehicle at the time of the crash, the principal direction of force) to the telematics provider, and possibly to emergency responders. We seek comment on what, if any, role the Commission should play regarding delivery of ACN data from telematics providers. We note that requiring delivery of ACN to PSAPs may pose significant problems of technical feasibility and implementation not only with regard to the current state of ACN, but also with regard to the current capability of many PSAPs that are not yet even ready to handle and process Phase I and Phase II data. We seek comment on these technical difficulties.

75. In addition, with the latest ACN technologies yet to occur, we realize that direct delivery of emergency location and other information may be achieved only after affected parties agree it is technically and operationally feasible. The prospect of Advanced Automatic Crash Notification (AACN) in the near term also may pose additional issues that we need to consider.¹⁸⁵ We seek comment on all aspects of potentially extending our E911 rules to include required delivery of ACN data by telematics providers to PSAPs.

76. *Legal Authority*. We ask commenters to address the legal authority of the Commission to place basic and enhanced 911 requirements, or similar requirements, on telematics service providers, both for telematics-based emergency communication services and resold mobile voice service. We also invite comment on the Commission's authority to impose requirements needed to deliver enhanced 911 service on equipment manufacturers.

77. We seek comment on the particular application of the statutory authority on telematics providers.¹⁸⁶ Specifically, the authority the Commission has pursuant to section 201(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act),¹⁸⁷ extends to commercial mobile services by operation of section 332 of the Act.¹⁸⁸ "Commercial mobile service" is defined as "any mobile service (as defined in section (3) that is provided for profit and makes interconnected service available (A) to the public or (B) to such class of eligible users as to be effectively available to a substantial portion of the public."¹⁸⁹ Therefore, at least, insofar as telematics service providers offer a mobile service to the public for profit or offer a functionally equivalent service to the public, it appears that they are to be treated as a commercial mobile service provider.¹⁹⁰ Currently, the Commission's rules require *licensees* to comply with its E911 requirements.¹⁹¹ We ask commenters to address whether we should extend these requirements to telematics services providers and what criteria we should adopt to apply them.

78. We next seek comment on whether the *911 Act* can be read to include telematics service

¹⁸⁵ In the Matter of Year 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review – Amendment of Part 22 of the Commission's Rules to Modify or Eliminate Outdate Rules Affecting the Cellular Radiotelephone Service and other Commercial Mobile Radio Services, WT Docket No. 01-108, *Ex Parte* Letter to M. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission from J. Cooney *et al.*, General Motors Safety Communications (Aug. 1, 2002) (concerning the planned deployment of AACN, based on AMPS, in selected OnStar equipped 2004 model vehicles).

¹⁸⁶ See *infra* Resold Cellular and PCS Service, III.B.4 (para. 96).

¹⁸⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 201(b) (providing that the Commission "may prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of [the Telecommunications] Act.>").

¹⁸⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 332 (stating that providers of commercial mobile services are to be treated as common carriers for purposes of section 201).

¹⁸⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 332(d)(1).

¹⁹⁰ See *infra* Resold Cellular and PCS Service, III.B.4 (para. 96).

¹⁹¹ 47 C.F.R. §§ 20.18 (b)-(i).

providers.¹⁹² In the *911 Act*, Congress stated that its purpose in adopting the Act was to encourage and facilitate the prompt deployment of a seamless, ubiquitous, and reliable end-to-end infrastructure for communications to meet the Nation's public safety and other communications needs.¹⁹³ Congress found that *emerging technologies* could be a critical component of such an end-to-end infrastructure.¹⁹⁴ We seek comment on whether the *911 Act* provides a jurisdictional basis for requiring compliance with our E911 rules or other similar requirements by telematics service providers.

79. Concerning equipment manufacturers, we note that the Commission has previously used the authority granted by Sections 151 and 154 of Act to regulate telecommunications equipment manufacturers.¹⁹⁵ To the extent that either embedded or aftermarket telematics equipment are "customer premises equipment," the Commission has jurisdiction to regulate such "instrumentalities" based on sections 151 and 154.¹⁹⁶ We seek comment on our jurisdictional basis for requiring manufacturers of such equipment to comply with our E911 rules, by requiring them, for example, to ensure that their equipment is capable of delivering call-back and location information to the appropriate PSAP.¹⁹⁷

80. In addition, we seek comment on what limitations might exist on the Commission's authority to impose requirements (1) on telematics service providers for the purpose of ensuring that their subscribers can have either 911-dialed calls or telematics-based emergency communications delivered to the appropriate local emergency authority, and (2) for ensuring compliance with the requirements of the Commission's E911 Phase I and Phase II Rules.

3. Multi-Line Telephone Systems

81. Summary. Below, we seek comment on whether we should require multi-line systems, including wireline, wireless and Internet Protocol-based systems, to deliver call-back and location information. In this regard, we seek comment on the appropriate role for the Commission in this matter. We then seek comment on various proposals that have been brought to our attention by interested parties.

82. Background. A key feature of multi-line systems is that they allow multi-line businesses and multi-tenant building managers to align their external telecommunications traffic needs with demand from their internal users, which eliminates the need for an external line for each telephone within their operation. As such, while each telephone within the organization has a unique telephone number that the multi-line systems recognizes for directing internal traffic and inbound external calls, outbound external calls may not have a unique telephone number since they would be carried over lines capable of being used by any telephone set within the multi-line systems.¹⁹⁸ Over time these systems have developed to include wireless systems and IP-based private networks.

83. The Commission initially sought comment on whether to require multi-line systems to

¹⁹² *911 Act*, Pub. L. No. 106-81, 113 Stat. 1286.

¹⁹³ 47 U.S.C. § 615 note (emphasis added).

¹⁹⁴ *See id.*

¹⁹⁵ 47 U.S.C. 151(a). 47 U.S.C. 154 (i). *See e.g.*, 47 C.F.R. Part 68.

¹⁹⁶ *See infra* Multi-Line Telephone Systems, III.B.3 (para. 91).

¹⁹⁷ We also note that Section 255 requires that customer premises equipment be accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities, if readily achievable. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 255(b).

¹⁹⁸ Calls made from outside the multi-line systems to persons in the multi-line systems are made to the unique number assigned to that person in the multi-line systems and are directed accordingly.

comply with our Part 68 rules in 1994.¹⁹⁹ In the *1994 Notice*, the Commission sought comment on a range of issues, including:

- (1) the multi-line systems technical standards needed to ensure compatibility with the E911 network;
- (2) the extent to which each telephone station should be capable of being identified;
- (3) whether attendant notification capability should be required of each multi-line system;
- (4) whether verification procedures are needed to ensure the proper functioning of a multi-line systems owner's E911 capability;
- (5) whether current database management arrangements concerning the accuracy and timely transmission of ALI are adequate;
- (6) whether standards are needed for information transmitted to be displayed on a PSAP attendant's screen;
- (7) whether standards are needed regarding direct multi-line systems access to the ALI database;
- (8) what services should incumbent LECs provide to ensure multi-line systems connection with the E911 network;
- (9) privacy and liability issues; and
- (10) issues regarding access for people with disabilities.

84. As the Commission discussed in the *1994 Notice*, some state and local governments have passed regulations and ordinances that require multi-line systems equipment to be compatible with the 911 systems deployed in the given state or locality.²⁰⁰ Based on an informal staff survey of state regulations, it appears that seven states or similar jurisdictions have regulations requiring the delivery of call back and location information by multi-line systems.²⁰¹ Eleven states have passed legislation that provides municipalities with authority to adopt specific E911 requirements.²⁰² We note, however, that a large number of states apparently have yet to adopt E911 regulations for multi-line systems.

85. Organizations such as National Emergency Number Association (NENA) have provided critical support to assist manufacturers, states, and telecommunications providers develop "best practices" and technical standards to assist in developing E911-capable multi-line systems.²⁰³ Furthermore, manufacturers such as Proctor, Teltronics, and Truecomm have developed equipment that is capable of providing some form of call-back or location information through either new PBXs or add-ons to retrofit existing PBXs.²⁰⁴ These private associations and entities have fostered the development of a market for multi-line systems that provide critical E911 callback and location information in the absence of a federal

¹⁹⁹ Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 9 FCC Rcd 6170 (1994) (*1994 Notice*). More specifically, in that *Notice* the Commission only considered PBX systems. We seek comment on the broader category of multi-line systems in this proceeding to address these similarly-situated services.

²⁰⁰ *1994 Notice*, 9 FCC Rcd. at 6177 para 11.

²⁰¹ The following states have adopted legislation that requires some form of callback and location information requirements for multi-line telephone systems: Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, Texas, Vermont, and Washington. Our count of the number of states with regulations includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

²⁰² These states are: Alabama, Alaska, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Washington.

²⁰³ See <<http://www.nena.org>> (visited Oct. 2, 2002).

²⁰⁴ See <<http://www.proctronic.com>> (visited Oct. 2, 2002); <<http://www.teltronic.com>> (visited Oct. 2, 2002); <<http://www.truecom.com>> (visited Oct. 2, 2002).

directive.

86. Discussion. We reiterate here our previous conclusion that the delivery of accurate location information and callback numbers is vital for a local emergency response service to be effective and is clearly in the public interest. We are aware that public safety representatives have concerns that callback and individual station location information is not automatically available today when 911 calls are made from behind multi-line systems and from individual stations in IP-based private network. In the absence of requirements from either federal, state, or local governments, however, some entities may opt not to deploy the updates to their multi-line systems necessary to provide the prompt delivery of accurate callback and location information. There also may well be technical issues involved in providing such information from IP-based private networks. We are seeking comment both specifically and generally on whether the Commission should be taking action on these issues.

87. We first seek comment on whether actions by state and local governments, associations, and private entities have adequately developed regulations, best practices, and devices that are capable of providing callback and location information for multi-line systems. If commenters believe that state and local governments and the private sector actions are not sufficient, we ask that they propose actions that this Commission could take to facilitate the deployment of multi-line systems that are capable of delivering call-back and location information to PSAPs. If commenters contend that a lack of uniformity in state regulations presents a problem that must be solved by overlaying a federal standard, we seek specific comment on how best to clarify such a federal standard.²⁰⁵ As the Commission has noted in other proceedings, because of the local nature of a majority of emergency calls, states and localities have an important role to play in developing policies concerning 911 calls.²⁰⁶ Individual state and local communities may be better able to determine their E911 needs and tailor their laws to better reflect the needs of the particular communities that they affect.²⁰⁷ We also seek comment on whether there are any workplace safety regulations or regulations of other agencies, state or federal, that should affect our consideration of access to emergency services from multi-line systems. Commenters can also address the Model Legislation proposed by NENA; as well as a consensus proposal put forward by the “E911 Consensus Group.”²⁰⁸

88. NENA Model Legislation: NENA has proposed model legislation that would allow states, through state legislation, to adopt many of the standards and protocol associated with delivering E911 services through multi-line systems.²⁰⁹ Their proposal recognizes that states should establish their own E911 standards to accommodate the introduction of new technologies.²¹⁰ NENA’s model legislation would have the Commission modify portions of its Part 68 rules to codify certain changes and encourage

²⁰⁵ See e.g., GE Comments at 13-14.

²⁰⁶ *Policies and Rules Concerning Operator Service Providers*, CC Docket No. 90-313, Report and Order, 6 FCC Rcd. 2744 para. 69 (1991) (*TOCSIA*).

²⁰⁷ We note that in the *TOCSIA* proceeding the Commission ultimately adopted a minimum federal standard that it limited by explicitly stating that the standard was not intended to preempt any state requirements. *TOCSIA*, 6 FCC Rcd. at 2744 para. 69.

²⁰⁸ The E911 Consensus Group consist of representatives from National Emergency Number Association (NENA), Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials – International, Inc. (APCO), National Association of State 9-1-1 Administrators, Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Committee, and MultiMedia Telecommunications Association.

²⁰⁹ See *NENA Technical Information Document on Model Legislation: Enhanced 9-1-1 Multi-line Telephone Systems*, available at <<http://www.nena.org>> (visited Oct. 2, 2002) (*NENA Model E911 Legislation*).

²¹⁰ See *id.* at § 6.

industry to develop generally applicable standards for states to adopt.²¹¹ We welcome comment on the specific aspects of the *NENA Model Legislation*. In considering their proposal, we encourage commenters to discuss the technical and operational feasibility of multi-line systems being able to comply with their proposal. We also encourage commenters to address the implementation schedule as set out in the *NENA Model Legislation*.

89. *E911 Consensus Group Proposal*: In April 1997, the Commission sought comment on a consensus proposal regarding multi-line systems and delivery of call-back and location information to an appropriate PSAP.²¹² Three commenters responded, only one of which was not part of the E911 Consensus Group.²¹³ While the commenters agreed that the *Consensus Proposal* was a reasonable approach, we seek to refresh the record of that proceeding and below outline the contents of that proposal.²¹⁴

90. The E911 Consensus Group put forth a comprehensive plan that would require multi-line systems operators to comply with certain requirements for the delivery of ANI and ALI to an appropriate PSAP. The *Consensus Proposal*, if adopted, would be implemented by the Commission and would preempt inconsistent state and local regulations.²¹⁵ The proposal recognizes the different uses for multi-line systems, such as business multi-line systems, shared residential multi-line systems, and hotels and motels and proposes differing requirements for these systems.²¹⁶ The proposal also addresses issues concerning compliance dates, technical capabilities, exemptions, waivers, and dialing patterns. We welcome comment on the specific aspects of the *Consensus Proposal*, not necessarily mentioned here, e.g., requirements for assigning a unique ANI/ALI for each 40,000 square feet in a building and implementation schedules.²¹⁷

91. *Legal Authority*: We also seek comment, generally, on the Commission's authority to require compliance with its E911 rules by manufacturers of multi-line systems. Section 151 of the Act grants the Commission broad authority to regulate the facilities used in conjunction with providing interstate communications and enumerates specifically that such authority extends to regulation of these facilities "for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communications."²¹⁸ Moreover, section 154 states that "the Commission may perform any and all acts, make such rules and regulations, and issue such orders, not inconsistent with this Act, as may be necessary in the execution of its functions."²¹⁹ We note that the Commission has previously used the

²¹¹ See *id.* at § 6. Illinois has adopted a statute that appears to be modeled on the NENA proposal. 50 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 750.

²¹² See *Letter from* James S. Blaszk, Counsel for the Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Group, to William F. Caton, Acting Secretary, Federal Communications Commission (Apr. 1, 1997) (*Consensus Proposal*). The Consensus Agreement is available on the Commission's website at <http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi>. See also *NENA Technical Information Document on Model Legislation: Enhanced 9-1-1 Multi-line Telephone Systems*, available at <<http://www.nena.org>> (visited Oct. 2, 2002) (*NENA Model E911 Legislation*).

²¹³ See comments of Lucent Technologies Inc.

²¹⁴ See comments of Lucent Technologies Inc. at 2.

²¹⁵ See *Consensus Proposal* at 2, 5.

²¹⁶ See generally *Consensus Proposal*. For example, some business users have converted their multi-line systems to IP telephony-enabled systems.

²¹⁷ See *supra* n. 212.

²¹⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 151(a).

²¹⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 154(i).

authority granted by these sections to regulate telecommunications equipment manufacturers.²²⁰ Additionally, to the extent that multi-line systems are “customer premises equipment,” the Commission has jurisdiction to regulate such “instrumentalities” based on sections 151 and 154.²²¹ We seek comment on our jurisdictional basis for possibly requiring telecommunications equipment manufacturers to comply with our E911 rules (e.g., requiring manufacturers of multi-line systems to ensure that their equipment is capable of delivering call-back and location information to the appropriate PSAP).

4. Resold Cellular and PCS Service

92. Summary. We next seek comment on any issues that arise when consumers buy service from carriers and other service providers that resell minutes of use on facilities-based wireless carriers’ networks. In particular, we seek comment on whether we should impose our 911 requirements or similar requirements, on resellers. We also seek comment on whether we should impose a more express obligation on either the reseller or the underlying licensee to ensure compliance with our E911 rules in these situations.

93. Background. Resellers offer wireless voice service to consumers by purchasing airtime at wholesale rates from facilities-based providers and reselling it at retail prices.²²² The Commission’s E911 rules do not apply directly to resellers, rather they only directly apply to licensees. Thus, in a resale situation, the underlying facilities-based licensee is obligated to deploy E911 capabilities in the network used by the reseller. As of 2001, the resale sector accounted for approximately five percent of all mobile telephone subscribers.²²³

94. Discussion. We seek comment on whether resellers meet the general criteria we set out above and therefore should be required to provide access to E911.²²⁴ We also seek comment on possible obstacles that resellers face in ensuring the delivery of basic and E911 services.

95. We also seek comment on whether we should impose a more express obligation on either the reseller or the underlying licensee to ensure compliance with our E911 rules in these situations. Currently our rules squarely place E911 compliance on the *licensee*. When the Commission had in place rules governing resale of CMRS, it refrained from imposing specific obligations concerning the agreements

²²⁰ See e.g., 47 C.F.R. pt. 68. See also Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility With Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, CC Docket No. 94-102, RM 8143, *Second Report and Order*, 14 FCC Rcd. 10954 (1999) (requiring handset manufacturers to incorporate procedures into the handset to recognize when a 9-1-1 call is made and to override any programming in the mobile unit that may prevent that call from being carried by another carrier) (codified at 47 C.F.R. § 22.921).

²²¹ Section 151 states that the Commission is to exercise its authority to promote “safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communications.” See 47 U.S.C. § 151. Section 153 (33) defines “radio communication” as “transmission by radio of writing, signs, signals, pictures and sounds of all kinds, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus, and services ... incidental to such transmission. See 47 U.S.C. § 153(33). Section 153 (52) defines “wire communication” as “transmission of writing, signs, signals, pictures and sounds of all kinds by aid of wire, cable, or other like connection between the points of origin and reception of such transmission, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus, and services ... incidental to such transmission. See 47 U.S.C. § 153(52). See also, *Computer and Communications Industry Association v. FCC*, 693 F.2d 198, 213 (D.C. Cir. 1982), cert. denied *Louisiana Public Service Commission v. FCC*, 461 U.S. 938 (1983) (*holding* that the Commission had ancillary jurisdiction over customer premises equipment based on 151 and the definition of wire and radio communication).

²²² See *Seventh Report on Wireless Competition* at 40.

²²³ See *id.*

²²⁴ See *supra* para. 13.

between resellers and facilities-based CMRS providers. Rather, the Commission only required that similarly situated customers receive similar pricing, terms, and conditions, and that the facilities-based CMRS provider not directly or indirectly restrict resale.²²⁵ We seek comment on whether we should require the reseller of cellular and PCS service to ensure compliance with our basic and enhanced 911 rules should we decide to extend our rules to these providers. Alternatively, we could require the underlying facilities-based licensee to ensure that its resellers offer basic and E911 service compatible with its method of providing these services. In discussing upon whom the obligation should be placed, commenters are encouraged to discuss operational issues that may arise. For example, if the obligation is placed on the underlying facilities-based licensee, and that licensee has chosen to meet its obligation through deploying a handset-based solution, should the reseller's handsets be counted towards the licensee's compliance obligations as detailed in our rules?²²⁶ Moreover, commenters should discuss how these issues are currently resolved between the parties. For example, does the underlying licensee require the reseller to inform its customers that it, the reseller, is wholly responsible for providing E911 service?

96. *Legal Authority and Implementation Issues.* We next seek comment on our authority to require compliance with the E911 rules by wireless resellers. The Commission has jurisdiction over interstate telecommunications and the providers of such services.²²⁷ Specifically, section 201(b) provides that the Commission "may prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of [the Communications] Act."²²⁸ Such authority extends to commercial mobile services by operation of section 332 of the Act.²²⁹ That section states that providers of commercial mobile services are to be treated as common carriers for purposes of section 201, and section 332 prohibits the Commission from specifying any provision of section 201 as inapplicable.²³⁰ Further, as the definition of "private mobile wireless" indicates, even private mobile service providers are to be treated as commercial mobile service providers to the extent that the services they offer fit within the definition of commercial mobile service.²³¹ "Commercial mobile service" is defined as "any mobile service (as defined in section 3) that is provided for profit and makes interconnected service available (A) to the public or (B) to such class of eligible users as to be effectively available to a substantial portion of the public."²³² Therefore, to the extent that wireless resellers offer their mobile service to the public for profit or offer a functionally equivalent service to the public, they are to be treated, as section 332(c)(1) requires, as a common carrier. As such, the Commission has jurisdiction to require compliance with our E911 rules. We seek comment on this analysis of our jurisdictional basis for possibly requiring wireless resellers of CMRS to comply with our E911 rules. We also note that currently our rules clearly state that *licensees* are required to comply with our E911 requirements.²³³ Should the Commission extend these requirements to resellers as well?

97. Lastly, we seek comment on developing appropriate time frames for compliance should we

²²⁵ See Interconnection and Resale Obligations Pertaining to Commercial Mobile Radio Services, *First Report and Order*, CC Docket No. 94-54, 11 FCC Rcd 18455, 58-59 paras. 12-14.

²²⁶ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(g).

²²⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 201.

²²⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 201(b).

²²⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 332.

²³⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(1).

²³¹ 47 U.S.C. § 332(d)(3). "Private mobile service" is defined as "any service that is not a commercial mobile service or its *functional equivalent*."

²³² 47 U.S.C. § 332(d)(1).

²³³ 47 C.F.R. §§ 20.18 (b)-(i).

decide to include resellers in our E911 rules. Given the fact that many, if not all, resellers currently offer some level of 911 service to their customers, and that their service offerings to the public rely on the network of licensees that are required to comply with our E911 rules, we believe that should we decide to impose requirements on resellers to comply with our rules, only a short transition appears necessary. We also recognize, however, that a reseller's ability to comply with our rules is directly related to the underlying licensee's compliance. We therefore seek comment on whether it would be more appropriate for the Commission to clarify that while resellers are obligated to provide E911 service to their customers, they are only obligated to the extent that the underlying licensee has met its obligation.

5. Pre-paid Calling

98. Summary. In this section, we seek comment on whether there is any need to impose any new requirements to access to emergency services by consumers of pre-paid offerings. As with resold service, the underlying licensee is subject to our basic and enhanced 911 rules.²³⁴ We seek comment on whether we should impose E911 requirements directly on pre-paid calling providers that are not also licensees, and whether the underlying licensee should be required to ensure compliance with our E911 rules by the pre-paid calling provider.

99. Background. Pre-paid service, in contrast to post-paid service, requires customers to pay for a fixed amount of wireless service minutes prior to making calls.²³⁵ There are two sets of providers in this arrangement, CMRS providers primarily offering post-paid calling plans; and independent third parties. For example, Verizon Wireless offers both a post-paid option and a pre-paid option.²³⁶ Additionally, independent third parties offer customers pre-paid calling cards for use on the wireless networks of Sprint PCS, AT&T, and Verizon, for example, through retail locations such as 7-11. Analysts estimate that approximately 8 to 10 percent of wireless phone users in the U.S. subscribed to pre-paid plans in 2001.²³⁷

100. Discussion. The same issues that arise in the context of resold cellular and PCS service also relate to pre-paid calling, and we encourage commenters to address those issues. For example, as with resellers, independent pre-paid calling providers offer service over an underlying licensee's network. We first ask commenters to inform our understanding of how the provision of access to 911 service is currently resolved between the parties. Therefore, the question also arises in this context as to how best to structure the obligation to ensure compliance with our rules: do we obligate the provider of the pre-paid calling plan or the underlying licensee. We also ask commenters generally about how best to structure E911 obligations in this context. In addition, we seek comment on whether we need to address these issues any differently when the pre-paid calling provider is the underlying licensee or affiliate, as opposed to an independent entity.

101. *Legal Authority and Implementation Issues.* As with resellers, many independent pre-paid calling service providers offer some level of 911 service to their customers, and their service offerings rely on the network of carriers that are required to comply with our E911 rules. Moreover, the ability of a pre-paid calling service provider to comply with our rules is directly related to the underlying facilities-based licensee's compliance. We therefore seek comment on whether it would be more appropriate for the Commission to clarify that while independent pre-paid calling service providers are obligated to provide E911 service to their customers, they are only obligated to the extent that the underlying licensee has met its obligation.

²³⁴ See 47 C.F.R. §20.18(a).

²³⁵ *Seventh Report on Wireless Competition* at 30. In addition there is typically a need to obtain a handset that is compatible with a particular pre-paid calling provider's service.

²³⁶ See <<http://www.freeup.com/>> (visited Nov. 12, 2002).

²³⁷ *Id.*

102. Finally, we seek comment on developing appropriate time frames for compliance should we decide to include pre-paid calling service providers in our E911 rules. As with resellers, we believe that should we decide to require pre-paid calling service providers to comply with our rules, only a short transition appears necessary.

6. Disposable Phones

103. Summary. We next seek comment on the provision of access to emergency services by consumers who purchase disposable mobile handsets. As a new product offering, the Commission has little information on these devices and below we encourage commenters, among other things, to provide us information on these handsets and the services they use.

104. Background. Disposable mobile handsets are low cost and either recyclable, rechargeable or disposable once the allotted airtime is used.²³⁸ The lower cost and simplicity of use are achieved by limiting the features available on the handset, for instance the Hop-On disposable phone offers voice recognition dialing instead of keypad dialing.²³⁹ Some of these phones will only offer outbound calling, while others will allow customers to receive calls as well.²⁴⁰ The voice service on these phones, in some instances, will be resold service.²⁴¹ Estimates are that companies will offer the handsets with approximately 60 minutes of airtime for approximately \$30.²⁴² Some marketing material on Hop-On's website indicates that they will distribute their phones through retail outlets, and will offer volume discounts to encourage their use as gifts at, for example, trade shows and corporate functions.²⁴³ Apparently, however, such phones are not currently being offered on a widespread basis.²⁴⁴

105. Discussion. We begin by asking commenters to provide us with estimates on when these handsets may become available to consumers.²⁴⁵ We next ask whether these phones, like resold offerings, are subscribed to a licensee's service. We also ask commenters to inform our technical understanding of this product. For example, we seek comment on whether the disposable mobile handsets that are coming to market will be capable of providing callback information. Commenters should also address whether such handsets will be able to provide location information. If callback and location information are not currently part of the design of these handsets, we ask commenters to address the technical and economic feasibility of requiring disposable mobile handsets to comply with these rules. In discussing the economics of compliance, we also encourage commenters to address whether the public interest in having E911-capable handsets is outweighed by the utility of such devices, should it be economically infeasible for them to comply with our rules.²⁴⁶ Additionally, we encourage commenters to address whether disposable phones should fall within the scope of our "all-calls" rule, which requires the forwarding of all

²³⁸ See Jay Wrolstad, *Start-up Pitches Disposable Mobile Phones*, *Wireless NewsFactor*, <<http://www.wirelessnewsfactor.com/perl/story/8181.html>> (visited July 29, 2002). On July 25, 2002, the Commission approved Hop-On's CDMA-compatible disposable phone for use.

²³⁹ See <<http://www.hoponwireless.com/index.html>> (visited Nov. 19, 2002).

²⁴⁰ See *id.* (visited Nov. 19, 2002).

²⁴¹ See *supra* para. 93. See also <<http://www.hoponwireless.com/index.html>> (visited Nov. 19, 2002).

²⁴² See Jay Wrolstad, *Start-up Pitches Disposable Mobile Phones*, *Wireless NewsFactor*, <<http://www.wirelessnewsfactor.com/perl/story/8181.html>> (visited July 29, 2002).

²⁴³ See <<http://www.hoponwireless.com/businessops.html>> (visited Nov. 12, 2002).

²⁴⁴ See Michelle Singletary, *The Color of Money*, *Washington Post*, Nov. 7, 2002, at E3 (indicating that disposable phone offerings have been delayed due to technical changes and production problems).

²⁴⁵ *Id.*

²⁴⁶ See generally, *E911 First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 18676.

911 calls to a PSAP, regardless of whether the handset has a subscription with a mobile wireless carrier.²⁴⁷

106. *Legal Authority and Implementation Issues.* We also ask commenters to address the legal authority of the Commission to place basic and enhanced 911 requirements on manufacturers of disposable mobile handsets. In particular, we seek comment on whether requiring mobile wireless service providers to ensure that the handsets used to access their networks comply with our rules is sufficient or whether we should place an affirmative duty on the manufacturers of these handsets.²⁴⁸ Should we determine that the service provider should be required to comply with our rules, we seek comment on whether, as we discussed above, the reseller or the licensee, should be required to ensure compliance.²⁴⁹ In addition, to the extent that these handsets are capable of delivering callback and location information, we seek comment on how best to establish time frames for compliance with our E911 rules.

7. Automated Maritime Telecommunications Systems (AMTS)

107. *Summary.* We next seek comment on whether AMTS licensees should be required, like VHF Public Coast Carrier licensees, to comply with our basic and enhanced 911 rules “to the extent that they offer land-based real-time two-way switched voice service that is interconnected to the public switched network.”²⁵⁰

108. *Background.* An AMTS is a specialized system of coast stations providing integrated and interconnected marine voice and data communications, somewhat like a cellular phone system, for tugs, barges, and other vessels on waterways.²⁵¹ In 1997, the Commission adopted an Order that permitted VHF Public Coast licensees, including AMTS licensees, to provide land-based users with more services so that they would be better able to “compete against other CMRS providers, such as cellular, PCS, and SMR.”²⁵² At that time, the Commission did not address whether these licensees should be included within the scope of our E911 rules.²⁵³

109. *Discussion.* We first seek comment on whether the customers of AMTS carriers have an expectation of being able to reach 911 emergency service personnel. In this regard, we seek comment on whether, as we did in deciding that VHF Public Coast Station licensees must comply with our 911 rules, we should limit such a requirement to the *land-based* portion of AMTS providers’ two-way switched voice service offerings, as there may be a clearer expectation with regards to land-based services.²⁵⁴ In

²⁴⁷ See 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(b).

²⁴⁸ See *supra* para. 91.

²⁴⁹ See *supra* para. 95.

²⁵⁰ See Implementation of 911 Act, The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements, *Fifth Report and Order*, CC Docket No. 92-105, *First Report and Order*, WT Docket No. 00-110, *Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 92-105, WT Docket No. 00-110, 16 FCC Rcd. 22264 (2001).

²⁵¹ See Amendment of Parts 2 and 80 of the Commission’s Rules Applicable to Automated Maritime Telecommunications Systems (AMTS), *First Report and Order*, RM-5712, 6 FCC Rcd 437 para. 3 (1991).

²⁵² See Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Concerning Maritime Communications, *Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, PR Docket No. 92-257, 12 FCC Rcd 16949, 16964-65 paras. 24-26 (1997); see also 47 C.F.R. § 80.123.

²⁵³ See also, Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Concerning Maritime Communications, *Second Memorandum Opinion and Order and Fifth Report and Order*, PR Docket No. 92-257, 17 FCC Rcd. 6685, 6703 n.171 (2002) (stating “[n]either the Fifth R&O nor the present item addresses whether our 911 and enhanced 911 (E911) requirements apply or should apply to AMTS operations).

²⁵⁴ *VHF Memorandum Opinion*, 16 FCC Rcd at 22286 para. 59.

the *VHF Memorandum Opinion*, the Commission relied on the fact that for maritime services, both VPC and AMTS, there exists well-established emergency response systems that user of maritime services are familiar with and that comply with internationally mandated maritime communications safety standards.²⁵⁵

110. Lastly, assuming we decide to require compliance by AMTS carriers, we seek comment on the general time frames for deployment of E911 capabilities. In this regard, we ask commenters to address the technical and operational capabilities of these providers to deliver callback and location information.

8. Emerging Services and Devices

111. We seek comment generally on emergency access issues with respect to any other voice services and devices that are not mentioned above.

112. We are currently aware that carriers have begun marketing Personal Data Assistants (PDA) with voice capabilities. To the extent that these devices function as CMRS carrier handsets, we see no reason why such devices would not be required to comply with the Commission's 911 and E911 rules. Nor do we see any reason why purchasers of these devices would not expect to have access to 911 and E911 services. We seek comment on any obstacles CMRS providers may confront with assuring these devices provide access to 911 service.

113. We also seek comment on other new technological platforms. For example, services such as IP Telephony are not widely deployed, but may ultimately be relevant to our E911 policies. The Commission recently received an independent report prepared by Dale Hatfield on various technical issues related to the deployment of E911.²⁵⁶ As part of that report, Dr. Hatfield identifies potential technical issues that may arise with voice delivered using the Internet Protocol (VoIP) communicating the necessary call-back and location information to PSAPs. We seek comment on the extent to which significant issues exist with regard to the access to 911 and E911 capabilities by consumers using newly developing communications platforms such as IP Telephony, and what, if any, role the Commission should take regarding any such issues.²⁵⁷ In this regard, we appreciate the many benefits that new technologies bring to the public in terms of increased access and opportunities for all Americans. Our regulatory policies are designed to continue to encourage the development of these capabilities, while also enhancing public safety.

114. We also ask commenters to discuss the potential for these and other devices to act as a means of providing access to emergency services for individuals with speech and hearing disabilities.

115. Finally, we seek comment on whether and how the Commission could structure its E911 rules or similar requirements to encourage entry for these and other new devices, while taking into account the important public safety concerns relevant to our E911 policies. We encourage commenters to consider whether a rapidly evolving telecommunications market is best served by periodic rulemakings focused on a service-by-service analysis such as the one detailed above, or whether such markets could benefit from rules of more general applicability with parties seeking relief through other Commission

²⁵⁵ See *id.* See also Liz Chapman, *Coast Guard's Rescue 21 System to be Maritime 911*, available at <<http://www.bangornews.com/editorialnews/article.cfm?ID=74350&byline=LizChapman&cname=Statewide§ion=Hancock&tt=10AM>> (visited Oct. 11, 2002).

²⁵⁶ See generally Dale N. Hatfield, *A Report on Technical and Operations Issues Impacting the Provision of Wireless Enhanced E911 Services*, Public Notice, DA 02-2666 (*Hatfield Report*).

²⁵⁷ See Comments of NENA, APCO, and NASNA on Hatfield Report at 6.

procedures such as waivers or petitions for clarification.

IV. PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

A. Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

116. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 603, the Commission has prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis ("IRFA") of the possible significant economic impact on small entities of the proposals suggested in this *Further Notice*. The IRFA is set forth in Appendix B. Written public comments are requested on the IRFA. These comments must be filed in accordance with the same filing deadlines as comments filed in this *Further Notice*, and must have a separate and distinct heading designating them as responses to the IRFA.

B. Paperwork Reduction Analysis

117. This *Further Notice* contains potential new or revised information collections. As part of the Commission's continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, we will establish, through *Federal Register* publication, a period for public comment on these burdens, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995²⁵⁸ when the final rules are adopted and more specific data is available as to which services will be affected by what regulations. The Commission will consider these comments before the final rules become effective and before the Commission seeks OMB approval for these burdens.

C. Ex Parte Presentations

118. This is a permit-but-disclose notice and comment rule making proceeding. Members of the public are advised that ex parte presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided they are disclosed under the Commission's Rules.²⁵⁹

D. Comment Dates

119. Pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before **February 3, 2003** and reply comments on or before **February 28, 2003**. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies.

120. Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. If multiple docket or rulemaking numbers appear in the caption of this proceeding, however, commenters must transmit one electronic copy of the comments to each docket or rule making number referenced in the caption. In completing the transmittal screen, commenters should include their full name, U.S. Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket or rulemaking number. Parties may also submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail. To get filing instructions for e-mail comments, commenters should send an E-mail to ecfs@fcc.gov, and should including the following words in the body of the message, "get form <your e-mail address>." A sample form and directions will be sent in reply.

121. Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and four copies of each filing. If more than one docket or rule making number appear in the caption of this proceeding, commenters must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rule making number. Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal

²⁵⁸ See Pub. L. No. 104-13.

²⁵⁹ See generally 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1202, 1.1203, 1.1206(a).

Service mail (although we continue to experience delays in receiving U.S. Postal Service mail). The Commission's contractor, Vistrionix, Inc., will receive hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary at 236 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Suite 110, Washington, DC 20002. The filing hours at this location are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes must be disposed of before entering the building. Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743. U.S. Postal Service first-class mail, Express Mail, and Priority Mail should be addressed to 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center of the Federal Communications Commission, Room TW-A306, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

122. Parties who choose to file by paper should also submit their comments on diskette. These diskettes should be submitted to the Commission's Secretary, Marlene H. Dortch, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission. The Commission's contractor, Vistrionix, Inc., will receive hand-delivered or messenger-delivered diskette filings for the Commission's Secretary at 236 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Suite 110, Washington, DC 20002. The filing hours at this location are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes must be disposed of before entering the building. Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743. U.S. Postal Service first-class mail, Express Mail, and Priority Mail should be addressed to: 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission. Such a submission should be on a 3.5-inch diskette formatted in an IBM compatible format using Word for Windows or compatible software. The diskette should be accompanied by a cover letter and should be submitted in "read only" mode. The diskette should be clearly labeled with the commenter's name, the docket number of this proceeding, type of pleading (comment or reply comment), date of submission, and the name of the electronic file on the diskette. The label should also include the following phrase "Disk Copy - Not an Original." Each diskette should contain only one party's pleading, preferably in a single electronic file. In addition, commenters must send diskette copies to the Commission's copy contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room CY-B402, Washington, D.C. 20554.

123. Accessible formats (computer diskettes, large print, audio recording and Braille) are available to persons with disabilities by contacting Brian Millin, of the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau, at (202)418-7426, TTY (202) 418-7365, or at bmillin@fcc.gov. This Further Notice can be downloaded in ASCII Text format at: <http://www.fcc.gov/wtb>.

E. Further Information

124. For further information concerning this *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, contact: Gregory W. Guice, Attorney Advisor, Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, at (202) 418-0095; David Siehl, Attorney Advisor, Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, at (202) 418-1313; or Arthur Lechtman, Attorney Advisor, Policy Branch, Satellite Division, International Bureau, at (202) 418-1465.

V. ORDERING CLAUSES

125. IT IS ORDERED, that pursuant to Sections 1, 4(i), 7, 10, 201, 202, 208, 214, 222(d)(4)(A)-(C), 222(f), 222(g), 222(h)(1)(A), 222(h)(4)-(5), 251(e)(3), 301, 303, 308, 309(j), and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 157, 160, 201, 202, 208, 214, 222(d)(4)(A)-(C), 222(f), 222(g), 222(h)(1)(A), 222(h)(4)-(5), 251(e)(3), 301, 303, 308, 309(j), 310, this *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* is hereby ADOPTED.

126. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Reference Information Center, SHALL SEND a copy of this Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary

APPENDIX A
LIST OF PARTIES

I. IB Docket No. 99-81²⁶⁰

Comments

Aeronautical Radio, Inc.
Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. (“APCO”)
Association of American Railroads
BellSouth Corporation
Boeing Company (“Boeing”)
Bosch Telecom, Inc.
Celsat America, Inc. (“Celsat”)
Century OCN Programming, Inc.
Constellation Communications, Inc.
Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition
Globalstar, L.P.
Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. and Hughes Communications, Inc.
ICO Services Limited (“ICO”)
ICO USA Service Group (BT North America Inc., Hughes Telecommunications and Space Company,
Telecomunicaciones de Mexico, TRW Inc.) (“ICO USA”)
Inmarsat Ltd.
Iridium LLC
Lynch, Timothy H.
Mobile Communications Holdings, Inc.
National Academies’ Committee on Radio Frequencies
National Telecommunications and Information Administration (“NTIA”)
PanAmSat Corporation
Pegasus Development Corporation
Personal Communications Industry Association
Satellite Industry Association (“SIA”)
SBC Communications Inc.
Society of Broadcast Engineers, Inc.
TMI Communications and Company, Limited Partnership (“TMI”)
United States Coast Guard (“USCG”)
UTC, The Telecommunications Association
WinStar Communications, Inc.
Wireless Communications Association International, Inc.

Reply Comments

American Petroleum Institute
Association of American Railroads
Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc. and the National Association of Broadcasters
BellSouth Corporation
Boeing Company

²⁶⁰ The Establishment of Policies and Service Rules for the Mobile Satellite Service in the 2 GHz Band, IB Docket No. 99-81, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 14 FCC Rcd 4843 (1999) (“2 GHz NPRM”). Not all parties filing comments in response to the 2 GHz NPRM addressed 911 issues.

Celsat America, Inc.
Constellation Communications, Inc.
European Union/Delegation of the European Commission
Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition
GE American Communications, Inc.
Globalstar, L.P.
Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. and Hughes Communications, Inc.
ICO Services Limited
ICO USA Service Group (BT North America Inc., Hughes Telecommunications and Space Company,
Telecomunicaciones de Mexico, TRW Inc.)
Inmarsat Ltd.
Iridium LLC
KaStar Satellite Communications Corp.
Mobile Communications Holdings, Inc.
National Telecommunications and Information Administration
PanAmSat Corporation
Satellite Industry Association
Society of Broadcast Engineers, Inc.
Titan Wireless
United Telecom Council (formerly UTC, The Telecommunications Association)
WinStar Communications, Inc.
Wireless Communications Association International, Inc.

Supplemental Comments

Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc. and the National Association of Broadcasters
Boeing Company
Celsat America, Inc.
Constellation Communications Holding, Inc. (formerly Constellation Communications, Inc.)
Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition
Globalstar, L.P.
ICO Services Limited
ICO USA Service Group (BT North America Inc., Telecomunicaciones de Mexico, TRW Inc.)
Inmarsat Ltd.
Iridium LLC
Mobile Communications Holdings, Inc.
TMI Communications and Company, Limited Partnership
United Telecom Council (formerly UTC, The Telecommunications Association)

Ex Parte Presentations

Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc. and the National Association of Broadcasters
AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.
BellSouth Corporation
Boeing Company
Celsat America, Inc.
Department of Defense
Final Analysis Inc.
Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition
Globalstar, L.P.
ICO Services Limited
Eagle River Investments LLC
ICO USA Service Group
Inmarsat Ltd.
Iridium LLC

Mobile Communications Holdings, Inc.
STM Wireless, Inc.
Teledesic LLC
Wireless Communications Association International, Inc.

II. IB Docket No. 99-67

A. Notice of Proposed Rulemaking²⁶¹

Comments

Aeronautical Radio, Inc.
AMSC Subsidiary Corporation (“AMSC”)
The Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. (“APCO”)
The Boeing Company (“Boeing”)
COMSAT Corporation
Constellation Communications, Inc.
Hughes Network Systems
ICO Global Communications (Holdings) Limited (“ICO Global”)
Inmarsat Ltd.
Iridium LLC
Iridium North America
Leo One USA Corporation
L/Q Licensee, Globalstar, L.P., and Airtouch Satellite Services U.S., Inc. (“LGA”)
LSC, Inc.
Ministry of Posts and Telecommunication of Japan
Motorola, Inc.
The National Academies
National Emergency Number Association (“NENA”)
National Search and Rescue Committee (“NSARC”)
National Telecommunications and Information Administration (“NTIA”)
Norcom Networks Corporation
Orbital Communications Corporation (“ORBCOMM”)
Rockwell Collins, Inc.
RTCA, Inc.
The Satellite Industry Association (“SIA”)
Skybridge, LLC (late filed)
Sea-Land Service, Inc.
Teledesic LLC
The U.S. GPS Industry Council
United States Coast Guard (“USCG”)

Reply Comments

AMSC Subsidiary Corporation

²⁶¹ See Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 to Implement the Global Mobile Personal Communications by Satellite (GMPCS) Memorandum of Understanding and Arrangements, IB Docket No. 99-67, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 14 FCC Rcd. 5871 (1999) (“*GMPCS NPRM*”). Not all parties filing comments in response to the *GMPCS NPRM* addressed 911 issues.

Chamber of Shipping of America (late-filed)
Constellation Communications, Inc.
Cornell University
Global VSAT Forum (request for extension to file reply)
Inmarsat Ltd.
Iridium LLC
L/Q Licensee, Globalstar, L.P., and Airtouch Satellite Services U.S., Inc.
Motorola, Inc.
National Emergency Number Association
National Telecommunications and Information Administration
Norcom Networks Corporation
The Satellite Industry Association
Teledesic LLC
TMI Communications and Company, L.P.
The U.S. GPS Industry Council

Ex Parte Presentations

L/Q Licensee, Globalstar, L.P., and Airtouch Satellite Services U.S., Inc.
LSC, Inc.

B. Public Notice²⁶²

Comments

Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. (“APCO”)
The Boeing Company (“Boeing”)
Final Analysis Communication Services, Inc. and Orbital Communications Corporation
 (“FA/ORBCOMM”)
Globalstar USA, Inc.; Globalstar, L.P.; L/Q Licensee, Inc.; Qualcomm Incorporated (“Globalstar”)
ICO Services Limited (“ICO”)
Inmarsat Ltd. (“Inmarsat”)
Motient Services Inc. (“Motient”)
National Emergency Number Association (“NENA”)
SCC Communications Corp. (“SCC”)
Washington State E911 Program (“Washington State”)

Reply Comments

The Boeing Company
Globalstar USA, Inc.; Globalstar, L.P.; L/Q Licensee, Inc.; Qualcomm Incorporated
ICO Services Limited
National Emergency Number Association
National Telecommunications and Information Administrations (“NTIA”) (late-filed, April 11, 2001)
SCC Communications Corp.

²⁶² International Bureau Invites Further Comment Regarding Adoption of 911 Requirements for Satellite Services, *Public Notice*, 16 FCC Red. 3780 (2000) (*Satellite 911 Public Notice*).

Ex Parte Presentations and Other Filings

SCC Communications Corp. (April 10, 2001 *ex parte* letter)

Ex Parte Meeting in IB Docket No. 99-67, Memorandum from Arthur Lechtman, Satellite and Radiocommunication Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission to William F. Caton, Acting Secretary, February 22, 2002 (*Feb. 22 Ex Parte Memo*).

Inmarsat Ventures plc (May 28, 2002 *ex parte* letter) (“Inmarsat”)

APPENDIX B

**Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis
Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
CC Docket No. 94-102**

127. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended (RFA),²⁶³ the Commission has prepared this Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the possible significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities by the policies and rules proposed in this *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Further Notice)*, CC Docket No. 94-102 and IB Docket No. 99-67. Written public comments are requested on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments on the *Further Notice*. The Commission will send a copy of the *Further Notice*, including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration. See 5 U.S.C. § 603(a). In addition, the *Further Notice* and IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the Federal Register.²⁶⁴

A. NEED FOR, AND OBJECTIVES OF, THE PROPOSED RULES

128. The *Further Notice* initiates a reevaluation of the scope of communications services that should provide access to emergency services. The *Further Notice* examines and seeks comment on the need to require compliance with the Commission's basic and enhanced 911 (E911) rules, or similar requirements, by various other mobile wireless and certain wireline voice and data services. The *Further Notice* considers whether existing services such as telematics or voice service provided by multi-line systems should be required to provide access to 911 service.²⁶⁵ The *Further Notice* also considers whether certain new services should be subject to any E911 requirements. The *Further Notice* additionally seeks comment on the impact that exclusion of these services and devices from the Commission's 911 rules may have on consumers, as well as the technological and cost issues involved in providing E911, taking into account the expectations of consumers for 911 service when they use these services and devices. The *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* also seeks comment on a proposal to require mobile satellite service (MSS) providers (in particular, MSS providers offering real-time, interconnected two-way voice service) to establish emergency call centers to answer 911 emergency calls.

B. Legal Basis for Proposed Rules

129. The proposed action is authorized under Sections 1, 4(i), 7, 10, 201, 202, 208, 214, 222(d)(4)(A)-(C), 222(f), 222(g), 222(h)(1)(A), 222(h)(4)-(5), 251(e)(3), 301, 303, 308, 309(j), and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 157, 160, 201, 202, 208, 214, 222(d)(4)(A)-(C), 222(f), 222(g), 222(h)(1)(A), 222(h)(4)-(5), 251(e)(3), 301, 303, 308, 309(j), 310.

C. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities To Which the Proposed Rules Will Apply

130. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of and, where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities that may be affected by the proposed rules, if adopted.²⁶⁶ The RFA generally

²⁶³ See 5 U.S.C. § 603. The RFA, *see* 5 U.S.C. §§ 601-612., has been amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), Pub. L. No. 104-121, Title II, 110 Stat. 857 (1996) (CWAA).

²⁶⁴ See 5 U.S.C. § 603(a)

²⁶⁵ See *infra* n.5.

²⁶⁶ See 5 U.S.C. § 603(b)(3).

defines the term “small entity” as having the same meaning as the terms “small business,” “small organization,” and “small governmental jurisdiction.”²⁶⁷ In addition, the term “small business” has the same meaning as the term “small business concern” under Section 3 of the Small Business Act.²⁶⁸ Under the Small Business Act, a “small business concern” is one that: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the Small Business Administration (SBA).²⁶⁹ A small organization is generally “any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.”²⁷⁰ Nationwide, as of 1992, there were approximately 275,801 small organizations.²⁷¹

131. The definition of “small governmental jurisdiction” is one with populations of fewer than 50,000.²⁷² There are 85,006 governmental entities in the nation.²⁷³ This number includes such entities as states, counties, cities, utility districts and school districts. There are no figures available on what portion of this number has populations of fewer than 50,000. However, this number includes 38,978 counties, cities and towns, and of those, 37,556, or ninety-six percent, have populations of fewer than 50,000.²⁷⁴ The Census Bureau estimates that this ratio is approximately accurate for all government entities. Thus, of the 85,006 governmental entities, we estimate that ninety-six percent, or about 81,600, are small entities that may be affected by our rules.

132. Individual voice services and devices that are examined as to appropriateness for 911 and E911 service provision include: mobile satellite service, telematics service, multi-line telephone systems, resold cellular and personnel communications service, pre-paid calling, disposable phone, automated maritime telecommunications systems, and emerging services and devices.

133. We have included small incumbent LECs in this RFA analysis. As noted above, a “small business” under the RFA is one that, *inter alia*, meets the pertinent small business size standard (*e.g.*, a telephone communications business having 1,500 or fewer employees), and “is not dominant in its field of operation.”²⁷⁵ The SBA's Office of Advocacy contends that, for RFA purposes, small incumbent LECs are not dominant in their field of operation because any such dominance is not “national” in scope.²⁷⁶ We have

²⁶⁷ 5 U.S.C. § 601(6).

²⁶⁸ 5 U.S.C. § 601(3) (incorporating by reference the definition of “small business concern” in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 632). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 601(3), the statutory definition of a small business applies “unless an agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and after opportunity for public comment, establishes one or more definitions of such term which are appropriate to the activities of the agency and publishes such definitions(s) in the Federal Register.”

²⁶⁹ 15 U.S.C. § 632.

²⁷⁰ *Id.* § 601(4).

²⁷¹ Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992 Economic Census, Table 6 (special tabulation of data under contract to Office of Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration).

²⁷² 5 U.S.C. § 601(5).

²⁷³ 1992 Census of Governments, U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

²⁷⁴ *Id.*

²⁷⁵ 5 U.S.C. § 601(3).

²⁷⁶ See Letter from Jere W. Glover, Chief Counsel for Advocacy, SBA, to Chairman William E. Kennard, FCC (May 27, 1999). The Small Business Act contains a definition of “small business concern,” which the RFA incorporates into its own definition of “small business.” See 5 U.S.C. § 632(a) (Small Business Act); 5 U.S.C. 601(3) (RFA). SBA regulations interpret “small business concern” to include the concept of dominance on a national basis. 13 C.F.R. § 121.102(b).

therefore included small incumbent LECs in this RFA analysis, although we emphasize that this RFA action has no effect on the Commission's analyses and determinations in other, non-RFA contexts.

134. **Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a specific small business size standard for providers of incumbent local exchange services. The closest applicable size standard under the SBA rules is for Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁷⁷ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 1,329 incumbent local exchange carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of local exchange services.²⁷⁸ Of these 1,329 carriers, an estimated 1,024 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 305 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁷⁹ Consequently, we estimate that the majority of providers of local exchange service are small entities that may be affected by the rules and policies adopted herein.

135. **Competitive Local Exchange Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a specific small business size standard for providers of competitive local exchange services. The closest applicable size standard under the SBA rules is for Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁸⁰ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 532 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of either competitive access provider services or competitive local exchange carrier services.²⁸¹ Of these 532 companies, an estimated 411 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 121 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁸² Consequently, the Commission estimates that the majority of providers of competitive local exchange service are small entities that may be affected by the rules.

136. **Competitive Access Providers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a specific size standard for competitive access providers (CAPS). The closest applicable standard under the SBA rules is for Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁸³ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 532 CAPs or competitive local exchange carriers and 55 other local exchange carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of either competitive access provider services or competitive local exchange carrier services.²⁸⁴ Of these 532 competitive access providers and competitive local exchange carriers, an estimated 411 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 121 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁸⁵ Of the 55 other local exchange carriers, an estimated 53 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 2 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁸⁶ Consequently, the Commission estimates that the majority of small entity CAPS and the majority of other local exchange carriers may be affected by the rules.

137. **Local Resellers.** The SBA has developed a specific size standard for small businesses

²⁷⁷ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513310.

²⁷⁸ FCC, Wireline Competition Bureau, Industry Analysis and Technology Division, *Trends in Telephone Service*, at Table 5.3, p 5-5 (May 2002) (*Telephone Trends Report*).

²⁷⁹ *Id.*

²⁸⁰ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513310.

²⁸¹ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

²⁸² *Id.*

²⁸³ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513310.

²⁸⁴ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

²⁸⁵ *Id.*

²⁸⁶ *Id.*

within the category of Telecommunications Resellers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁸⁷ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 134 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of local resale services.²⁸⁸ Of these 134 companies, an estimated 131 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 3 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁸⁹ Consequently, the Commission estimates that the majority of local resellers may be affected by the rules.

138. **Toll Resellers.** The SBA has developed a specific size standard for small businesses within the category of Telecommunications Resellers. Under that SBA definition, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁹⁰ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 576 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of toll resale services.²⁹¹ Of these 576 companies, an estimated 538 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 38 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁹² Consequently, the Commission estimates that a majority of toll resellers may be affected by the rules.

139. **Interexchange Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a specific size standard for small entities specifically applicable to providers of interexchange services. The closest applicable size standard under the SBA rules is for Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁹³ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 229 carriers reported that their primary telecommunications service activity was the provision of interexchange services.²⁹⁴ Of these 229 carriers, an estimated 181 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 48 have more than 1,500 employees.²⁹⁵ Consequently, we estimate that a majority of IXC's may be affected by the rules.

140. **Operator Service Providers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a specific size standard for small entities specifically applicable to operator service providers. The closest applicable size standard under the SBA rules is for Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁹⁶ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 22 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of operator services.²⁹⁷ Of these 22 companies, an estimated 20 have 1,500 or fewer employees and two have more than 1,500 employees.²⁹⁸ Consequently, the Commission estimates that a majority of local resellers may be affected by the rules.

141. **Prepaid Calling Card Providers.** The SBA has developed a size standard for small businesses within the category of Telecommunications Resellers. Under that size standard, such a

²⁸⁷ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513330.

²⁸⁸ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

²⁸⁹ *Id.*

²⁹⁰ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513330.

²⁹¹ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

²⁹² *Id.*

²⁹³ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513310.

²⁹⁴ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

²⁹⁵ *Id.*

²⁹⁶ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513310.

²⁹⁷ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

²⁹⁸ *Id.*

business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.²⁹⁹ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 32 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of prepaid calling cards.³⁰⁰ Of these 32 companies, an estimated 31 have 1,500 or fewer employees and one has more than 1,500 employees.³⁰¹ Consequently, the Commission estimates that a majority of prepaid calling providers may be affected by the rules.

142. **Mobile Satellite Service Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the U.S. Small Business Administration has developed a small business size standard specifically for mobile satellite service licensees. The appropriate size standard is therefore the SBA standard for Satellite Telecommunications, which provides that such entities are small if they have \$12.5 million or less in annual revenues.³⁰² Currently, nearly a dozen entities are authorized to provide voice MSS in the United States. We have ascertained from published data that four of those companies are not small entities according to the SBA's definition,³⁰³ but we do not have sufficient information to determine which, if any, of the others are small entities. We anticipate issuing several licenses for 2 GHz mobile earth stations that would be subject to the requirements we are adopting here. We do not know how many of those licenses will be held by small entities, however, as we do not yet know exactly how many 2 GHz mobile-earth-station licenses will be issued or who will receive them.³⁰⁴ The Commission notes that small businesses are not likely to have the financial ability to become MSS system operators because of high implementation costs, including construction of satellite space stations and rocket launch, associated with satellite systems and services. Still, we request comment on the number and identity of small entities that would be significantly impacted by the proposed rule changes.

143. **Other Toll Carriers.** Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a specific size standard for small entities specifically applicable to "Other Toll Carriers." This category includes toll carriers that do not fall within the categories of interexchange carriers, operator service providers, prepaid calling card providers, satellite service carriers, or toll resellers. The closest applicable size standard under the SBA rules is for Wired Telecommunications Carriers. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.³⁰⁵ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 42

²⁹⁹ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513330.

³⁰⁰ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

³⁰¹ *Id.*

³⁰² 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, North American Industry Classification System ("NAICS") code 51740, formerly NAICS code 513340

³⁰³ Comsat Corporation, Globalstar USA, Honeywell International, Inc., and Mobile Satellite Ventures Subsidiary LLC ("MSVS") each holds one of the current licenses for 1.6 GHz mobile satellite stations. Comsat Corporation reported annual revenue of \$618 million in its most recent annual report to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"). Globalstar USA (formerly AirTouch Satellite Services) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Vodafone Group Plc. In an annual report filed with the SEC, Vodafone reported revenue of 15 billion pounds sterling for the year ending March 31, 2001. In another annual report filed with the SEC, Honeywell International Inc. reported receiving sales revenue of \$23.7 billion in 2001. MSVS is wholly owned by a limited partnership that is 48.1% owned by Motient Corporation and 39.9% owned by a limited partnership controlled by a wholly-owned subsidiary of BCE, Inc. In an annual report filed with the SEC, Motient reported revenue of \$93.3 billion for calendar year 2001. BCE, Inc. reports in its corporate website, www.bce.ca/en/investors/corporate/fast/, that it received \$21.1 billion of revenue in 2001.

³⁰⁴ The Commission has issued space-station licenses for eight Mobile Satellite Service systems that would operate with 2 GHz mobile earth stations. Although we know the number and identity of the space-station licensees, neither the number nor the identity of future 2 GHz mobile-earth-station licensees can be determined from that data.

³⁰⁵ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513310.

carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of "Other Toll Services."³⁰⁶ Of these 42 carriers, an estimated 37 have 1,500 or fewer employees and five have more than 1,500 employees.³⁰⁷ Consequently, the Commission estimates that a majority of "Other Toll Carriers" may be affected by the rules.

144. **Wireless Service Providers.** The SBA has developed a size standard for small businesses within the two separate categories of Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications or Paging. Under that standard, such a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.³⁰⁸ According to the FCC's *Telephone Trends Report* data, 1,761 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of wireless service.³⁰⁹ Of these 1,761 companies, an estimated 1,175 have 1,500 or fewer employees and 586 have more than 1,500 employees. Consequently, we estimate that a majority of wireless service providers may be affected by the rules.

D. Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements for Small Entities.

145. The reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements ultimately adopted will depend on the rules adopted and the services subject to those rules. First, any and all of the affected entities who the Commission finds appropriate to provide 911 and E911 services (See General Criteria, for example, in paragraphs 12-15 of the *Further Notice*) would need to comply with the Commission's basic or enhanced 911 rules. This would involve a schedule for implementing 911 and E911 service, and possibly regulations mandating the provision of automatic number identification (ANI), possible software modification to assist in recognition of single or multiple emergency numbers, and provision of automatic location information (ALI) and interference precautions as well as regulations specific to individual services. Additionally, paragraphs 17-27 of the *Further Notice* propose that all Mobile Satellite Service (MSS) licensees provide real-time, two-way, switched voice service that is interconnected with the public switched network establish national call centers to which all subscriber emergency calls are routed. Call center personnel, and would then determine the nature of the emergency and forward the call to an appropriate Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). As noted in paragraph 14 of the *Further Notice*, the Commission invites comment on how the various services at issue, *i.e.* individual voice services and devices, relate to the provision of access to emergency services for persons with disabilities. (Paragraph 14 of the *Further Notice*.)

146. The *Further Notice*, in paragraphs 57-80, considers possible 911 and E911 regulation for the telematics service. Telematics can be generally defined as the integrated use of location technology and wireless communication to enhance the functionality of motor vehicles. In that regard, paragraphs 65-73 of the *Further Notice* analyzes the plus and minuses and prospective regulations associated with telematics systems providing access to PSAPs through an intermediary or jointly packaged mobile voice service. Paragraph 70, suggests that telematics systems give notice to consumers regarding any current limitations of telematics service in directly transmitting emergency information to a PSAP. Paragraphs 74-75 suggest a requirement that telematics providers deliver automatic crash notification data to PSAPs. This requirement raises possible issues of technical modifications and coordination between telematics providers and PSAPs.

147. The *Further Notice*, in paragraphs 81-91, examines whether to require multi-line telephone systems, including wireline, wireless, and Internet Protocol-based systems, to deliver call-back

³⁰⁶ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

³⁰⁷ *Id.*

³⁰⁸ 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, NAICS code 513322.

³⁰⁹ *Telephone Trends Report*, Table 5.3.

and location information. Possible requirements that the *Further Notice* suggests if the Commission decides that multi-line telephones systems should provide these services include technical standards as discussed in paragraphs 86-90 of the *Further Notice*. Paragraphs 92-97 of the *Further Notice* discuss issues that arise when consumers buy service from carriers and other service providers that resell minutes of use on facilities-based wireless carriers' networks. In that regard, the *Further Notice* raises the possibility of requiring the underlying facilities-based licensee to ensure that its resellers offer basic and E911 service compatible with its method of providing these services, or whether the resellers should be held accountable. Similarly, paragraphs 98-102 seek comment on whether the Commission should impose E911 requirements directly on pre-paid calling providers that are not also licensees or whether the underlying licensee should be required to ensure compliance with the E911 rules by the pre-paid calling provider.

148. Paragraphs 103-106 of the *Further Notice* discuss the possibility of access to emergency service by consumers who purchase disposable mobile handsets. In this case, the *Further Notice* notes that disposable handsets are a new product offering and as such, the Commission has little information on these devices. However, the *Further Notice* invites comment on whether, if disposable phone service is determined to be appropriate for offering 911 and E911 services, requiring mobile wireless service providers to ensure that the handsets used to access their networks comply with the 911 and E911 rules is sufficient or whether the Commission should place the burden for compliance on manufacturers of these handsets. If it is also determined that these handsets do not provide PSAPs with an opportunity to contact the handset user for further critical location information if necessary, some time of regulatory solution, such as a readily identifiable code to notify the PSAP that the incoming call is placed from a handset which does not offer call-back capability, could be adopted. The *Further Notice* also seeks comment on whether to extend 911 and E911 regulation to automated maritime telecommunications systems (paragraphs 107-110) and to emerging voice services and devices (paragraphs 111-115).

149. Other regulations and requirements are possible for those services discussed in the *Further Notice* found suitable for 911 and E911 service. Such rules and requirements could be found appropriate, based on comment filed in response to the *Further Notice* and would be designed to meet the consumer needs and licensee situations in each service and service area.

E. Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered

150. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.³¹⁰

151. The critical nature of the 911 and E911 proceedings limit the Commission's ability to provide small carriers with a less burdensome set of E911 regulations than that placed on large entities. A delayed or less than adequate response to an E911 call can be disastrous regardless of whether a small carrier or a large carrier is involved. The various licensees scrutinized in the *Further Notice* have been exempt to date from the Commission's 911 and E911 regulations as the Commission sought information from which to judge the appropriateness of requiring that those services provide 911 and E911 service. The *Further Notice* continues this examination and reflects the Commission's concern that only those

³¹⁰ See 5 U.S.C. § 603.

entities that can reasonably be expected to provide emergency services, financially and otherwise, be asked to provide this service. The *Further Notice* affords small entities another opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of the affected services providing emergency services and on what the Commission can do to minimize the regulatory burden on those entities who meet the Commission's criteria for providing such service.

152. Throughout the *Further Notice*, the Commission tailors its request for comment to devise a prospective regulatory plan for the affected entities, emphasizing the individual needs of the service providers and manufacturers as well as the critical public safety needs at the core of this proceeding. The Commission will consider all of the alternatives contained not only in the *Further Notice*, but also in the resultant comments, particularly those relating to minimizing the effect on small businesses.

153. The most obvious alternatives raised in the *Further Notice* are whether the services under discussion should be required to comply with the Commission's basic and enhanced 911 rules or whether the Commission should continue to exempt these entities from providing this service. The *Further Notice*, to assist in this discussion, suggests, in paragraphs 12-15, criteria to determine the appropriateness of each service under consideration to provide emergency services. These criteria are open for comment and this provides an excellent opportunity for small entity commenters and others concerned with small entity issues. Again, we seek comment to determine the appropriate service groups to provide critical services.

154. Along these lines, discussion of criteria and alternatives could focus on implementation schedules. In discussing each of the prospective entities and soliciting further information, throughout the *Further Notice* the Commission invites comment on the schedule for implementing 911 and E911 services which best meets the abilities, technically and financially suitable to the individual entities. In the past, the Commission has best been able to offer affected small and rural entities some relief from E911 by providing small entities with longer implementation periods than larger, more financially flexible entities that are better able to buy the equipment necessary to successful 911 and E911 implementation and to first attract the attention of equipment manufacturers.

155. In its discussion of MSS, the *Further Notice* recognizes that satellite carriers face unique technical difficulties in implementing both basic and enhanced 911 features. Thus, in paragraphs 22-26, the *Further Notice* examines the use of call centers in response to this problem. Paragraph 25 of the *Further Notice* notes that several commenters, thus far, have indicated that MSS callers tend to be located in remote areas where no PSAP may be available. The *Further Notice* suggests alternative solutions to this problem noting that, in the context of the 911 Act proceeding, stating that in areas where no PSAP has been designated, carriers still have an obligation not to block 911 calls and clarifying where such calls can be directed when no designated PSAP exists. There are a number of alternatives raised in the *Further Notice* in discussing the specifics of the calling center alternative. For example, should the Commission require carriers to relay automatically available location information to emergency call centers, and what reasonably achievable accuracy standards could be established for this location information?

156. Paragraphs 30-32 of the *Further Notice* recognize that high costs are associated with modifying satellite network infrastructures to accommodate E911 emergency call information and route it to appropriate PSAPs. These paragraphs discuss alternate solutions suggested in the comments to date, and request further comment aimed at reducing such costs. For example, some carriers argue that network modifications are necessary to forward ANI and ALI data, such as retrofitting switches throughout the network and making costly private trunking arrangements between earth stations and PSAPs. One commenter suggested that the retrofit costs could be reduced if (1) a single, central emergency call service could receive calls for the nation, or (2) each of the 50 states has a single point of emergency contact. Additionally, in paragraphs 35-41, the *Further Notice* considers alternatives for providing ALI. The *Further Notice* discusses a Coast Guard recommendation that the Commission require strict ALI accuracy standards for GMPCS. There are a number of issues and alternatives relating

to the need for GPS that could conceivably impact small entities.

157. The *Further Notice*, in paragraphs 49-54, discusses international issues connected to MSS. The *Further Notice* seeks comment on a number of related alternatives, including whether resolution of international standards should in any way further delay adoption of a call center requirement or E911 rules for MSS, and on liability issues in connection with recognition of multiple emergency access codes. Finally, in regards to possible MSS emergency service requirements, the *Further Notice*, in paragraph 55, considers integration of the Ancillary Terrestrial Component.

158. In considering possible 911 and E911 regulation for telematics systems, the *Further Notice*, in paragraphs 64-71, questions whether a telematics call-center approach to 911 calls might be more appropriate than an approach based solely on 911 calls placed through a jointly packaged mobile voice service. Paragraphs 74-75 of the *Further Notice* weigh the benefits and costs involved in requiring telematics providers to deliver automatic crash notification data to PSAPs. Further, paragraph 80 of the *Further Notice* considers whether the Commission's legal authority might lead it to impose requirements directly on telematics providers or equipment manufacturers.

159. The *Further Notice*, in paragraphs 81-91, examines potential 911 and E911 requirements for multi-line telephone systems. In that regard, the Commission considers whether to impose such regulations on a national basis or whether it is sufficient to rely on actions by state and local governments, associations, and private entities to ensure reliable coverage. The National Emergency Number Association, for example, has proposed model legislation what would allow states, through state legislation, to adopt many of the standards and protocol associated with delivering E911 services through multi-line systems. Paragraph 89 of the *Further Notice* looks at an E911 consensus group proposal regarding multi-line systems and delivery of call-back and location information to an appropriate PSAP. The *Further Notice* again questions whether it would be more appropriate to regulate equipment manufacturers in the multi-line context.

160. In considering possible basic and enhanced 911 requirements for resold cellular and personal communications services, the *Further Notice*, in paragraphs 92-97, weighs whether to impose a more express obligation on either the reseller or the underlying licensee to ensure compliance with the E911 rules.

F. Federal Rules that Overlap, Duplicate, or Conflict with the Proposed Rules

161. None.