

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, "Flood Insurance.")

Dated: September 16, 2008.

Michael K. Buckley,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Mitigation Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. E8-22523 Filed 9-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-12-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 20

[PS Docket No. 07-114; DA 08-2129]

Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission seeks comment on proposals in certain *ex parte* filings submitted by the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO), the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), AT&T, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and Verizon Wireless regarding location accuracy requirements for wireless licensees subject to the Commission's rules that specify standards for wireless Enhanced 911 (E911) Phase II location accuracy and reliability.

DATES: Comments are due October 6, 2008 by 12 p.m. Reply Comments are due October 14, 2008 by 12 p.m.

ADDRESSES: All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Marlene H. Dortch, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. Parties shall also serve one copy with the Commission's copy contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc. (BCPI), Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, (202) 488-5300, or via e-mail to fcc@bcpiweb.com. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the Paperwork Reduction Act information collection requirements contained herein should be submitted to the Federal Communications Commission via e-mail to PRA@fcc.gov and to Nicholas A. Fraser, Office of Management and Budget, via e-mail to Nicholas.A.Fraser@omb.eop.gov or via fax at 202-395-5167.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas J. Beers, Chief, Policy Division,

Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, at (202) 418-0952. For additional information concerning the Paperwork Reduction Act information collection requirements contained in this document, send an e-mail to PRA@fcc.gov or contact Jerry Cowden at (202) 418-0447.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 20, 2007, the Commission released a Report and Order (*Location Accuracy Order*) requiring wireless licensees subject to section 20.18(h) of the Commission's rules, which specifies the standards for wireless Enhanced 911 (E911) Phase II location accuracy and reliability, to satisfy these standards at a geographical level defined by the coverage area of a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). On March 25, 2008, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (Court) stayed the Location Accuracy Order.

On July 14, 2008, APCO and the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) filed an *ex parte* letter addressing handset-based and network-based location accuracy criteria, stating that they "are now willing to accept compliance measurements at the county level" rather than at the PSAP level, and that "[p]ublic safety and wireless carriers are in current discussions on a number of other issues associated with E9-1-1."

On July 31, 2008, the Commission filed with the Court a Motion for Voluntary Remand and Vacatur, which requested remand based on the proposals contained in the July 14 *ex parte* letter and "[i]n light of the public safety community's support for revised rules." Following this filing with the Court, NENA, APCO, Verizon Wireless, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and AT&T submitted written *ex parte* letters with the Commission with proposed new wireless E911 rules. Taken together, these proposals reflect agreement among those parties for new E911 accuracy requirements for both handset-based and network-based technologies, in order to achieve E911 accuracy compliance at the county-level. The parties also offer plans to convene industry groups to address related E911 issues, and AT&T included a proposal reflecting agreement on carrier provision of confidence and uncertainty data to PSAPs. Copies of all relevant *ex parte* submissions are included in the Attachment to this document.

We therefore seek comment on the proposed changed accuracy requirements, including the benchmarks, limitations, and exclusions noted therein, for handset-based and

network-based location technologies. We also invite views on the pledges to convene industry groups to explore related issues, and whether we should require the provision of confidence and uncertainty data. In sum, by this Public Notice, the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks comment on all of these proposals as well as any alternative modifications to location accuracy requirements. The Bureau urges all interested parties to review the entirety of the above-referenced *ex parte* letters.

We also seek comment on the attached Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis in connection with the proposals described.

This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.191 and 0.392 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 0.191, 0.392.

This abbreviated comment cycle is appropriate given the compelling public interest in achieving accurate and reliable E911 location information.

Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. If multiple docket or rulemaking numbers appear in the caption of the proceeding, commenters must transmit one electronic copy of the comments to each docket or rulemaking 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 numbers. All filings concerning this Public Notice should refer to PS Docket No. 07-114. 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 include the following words in the body of the message, "get form." A sample form and directions will be sent in reply. Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and four copies of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, commenters must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number.

Paper filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail (although we continue to experience delays in receiving U.S. Postal Service mail). Parties are strongly encouraged to

file comments electronically using the Commission's ECFS.

The Commission's contractor will receive hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary at 236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE., Suite 110, Washington, DC 20002.

- The filing hours at this location are 8 a.m. to 7 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, Marlene H. Dortch, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. Parties shall also serve one copy with the Commission's copy contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc. (BCPI), Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, (202) 488-5300, or via e-mail to fcc@bcpiweb.com.

Documents in PS Docket No. 07-114 will be available for public inspection and copying during business hours at the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th St., SW., Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. The documents may also be purchased from BCPI, telephone (202) 488-5300, facsimile (202) 488-5563, TTY (202) 488-5562, e-mail fcc@bcpiweb.com.

To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an e-mail to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530 (voice), 202-418-0432 (tty).

This matter shall be treated as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentations must contain summaries of the substance of the presentations and not merely a listing of the subjects discussed. More than a one- or two-sentence description of the views and arguments presented generally is required. Other requirements pertaining to oral and written presentations are set forth in section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules.

This document contains proposed new information collection requirements. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on the information collection requirements contained in this document, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107-198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4), we seek specific comment on how we might "further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees."

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

1. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), the Commission has prepared this present Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the possible significant economic impact of the proposal described in the attached Public Notice on small entities. 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 in the Public Notice. The Commission will send a copy of the Public Notice, including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA). In addition, the Notice and IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Proposed Rules

2. The Public Notice seeks comments broadly on a proposal recently submitted by APCO, NENA, AT&T, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and Verizon Wireless, and on any other alternative approaches, to best ensure that public safety answering points (PSAPs) receive location information that is as accurate as possible for all wireless E911 calls. APCO, NENA, AT&T, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and Verizon Wireless propose requiring measurement of location accuracy compliance at the county level rather than PSAP level; certain modifications to the Phase II location accuracy requirements set forth in 47 CFR 20.18(h); provision for testing to establish baseline confidence and uncertainty levels in a county; and stakeholder-based consultation to explore such E911-related issues as possible approaches for assessing wireless 911 location accuracy for calls originating indoors; updated outdoor and indoor accuracy measurement

methodologies, testing of emerging technology claims; E911 responsibilities in an open-access environment, and the development of hybrid network aGPS technologies.

B. Legal Basis

3. The legal basis for any action that may be taken pursuant to this Public Notice is contained in Sections 4(i) and 332 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 332.

C. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Proposed Rules Would Apply

4. 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. The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction." In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act. A small business concern is one which: (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).

5. Nationwide, there are a total of approximately 22.4 million small businesses, according to SBA data. A "small organization" is generally "any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field." Nationwide, as of 2002, there were approximately 1.6 million small organizations. The term "small governmental jurisdiction" is defined generally as "governments of cities, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts, with a population of less than fifty thousand." Census Bureau data for 2002 indicate that there were 87,525 local governmental jurisdictions in the United States. We estimate that, of this total, 84,377 entities were "small governmental jurisdictions." Thus, we estimate that most governmental jurisdictions are small.

1. Telecommunications Service Entities

a. Wireless Telecommunications Service Providers

6. Pursuant to 47 CFR 20.18(a), the Commission's 911 Service requirements are only applicable to Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) "[providers], excluding mobile satellite service operators, to the extent that they: (1) Offer real-time, two way switched

voice service that is interconnected with the public switched network; and (2) Utilize an in-network switching facility that enables the provider to reuse frequencies and accomplish seamless hand-offs of subscriber calls. These requirements are applicable to entities that offer voice service to consumers by purchasing airtime or capacity at wholesale rates from CMRS licensees."

7. Below, for those services subject to auctions, we note that, as a general matter, the number of winning bidders that qualify as small businesses at the close of an auction does not necessarily represent the number of small businesses currently in service. Also, the Commission does not generally track subsequent business size unless, in the context of assignments or transfers, unjust enrichment issues are implicated.

8. *Cellular Licensees.* The SBA has developed a small business size standard for wireless firms within the broad economic census category "Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications." Under this SBA category, a wireless business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees. For the census category of Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications, Census Bureau data for 2002 show that there were 1,397 firms in this category that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 1,378 firms had employment of 999 or fewer employees, and 19 firms had employment of 1,000 employees or more. Thus, under this category and size standard, the great majority of firms can be considered small. Also, according to Commission data, 437 carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of cellular service, Personal Communications Service (PCS), or Specialized Mobile Radio (SMR) Telephony services, which are placed together in the data. We have estimated that 260 of these are small, under the SBA small business size standard.

9. *Common Carrier Paging.* The SBA has developed a small business size standard for wireless firms within the broad economic census category, "Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications." Under this SBA category, a wireless business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees. For the census category of Paging, Census Bureau data for 2002 show that there were 807 firms in this category that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 804 firms had employment of 999 or fewer employees, and three firms had employment of 1,000 employees or more. Thus, under this category and associated small business size standard, the majority of firms can be considered small. In the Paging *Third Report and Order*, we developed a small business

size standard for "small businesses" and "very small businesses" for purposes of determining their eligibility for special provisions such as bidding credits and installment payments. A "small business" is an entity that, together with its affiliates and controlling principals, has average gross revenues not exceeding \$15 million for the preceding three years. Additionally, a "very small business" is an entity that, together with its affiliates and controlling principals, has average gross revenues that are not more than \$3 million for the preceding three years. The SBA has approved these small business size standards. An auction of Metropolitan Economic Area licenses commenced on February 24, 2000, and closed on March 2, 2000. Of the 985 licenses auctioned, 440 were sold. Fifty-seven companies claiming small business status won. Also, according to Commission data, 375 carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of paging and messaging services. Of those, we estimate that 370 are small, under the SBA-approved small business size standard.

10. *Wireless Telephony.* Wireless telephony includes cellular, personal communications services (PCS), and specialized mobile radio (SMR) telephony carriers. As noted earlier, the SBA has developed a small business size standard for "Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications" services. Under that SBA small business size standard, a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees. According to Commission data, 445 carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of wireless telephony. We have estimated that 245 of these are small under the SBA small business size standard.

11. *Broadband Personal Communications Service.* The broadband Personal Communications Service (PCS) spectrum is divided into six frequency blocks designated A through F, and the Commission has held auctions for each block. The Commission defined "small entity" for Blocks C and F as an entity that has average gross revenues of \$40 million or less in the three previous calendar years. For Block F, an additional classification for "very small business" was added and is defined as an entity that, together with its affiliates, has average gross revenues of not more than \$15 million for the preceding three calendar years." These standards defining "small entity" in the context of broadband PCS auctions have been approved by the SBA. No small businesses, within the SBA-approved small business size standards bid

successfully for licenses in Blocks A and B. There were 90 winning bidders that qualified as small entities in the Block C auctions. A total of 93 small and very small business bidders won approximately 40 percent of the 1,479 licenses for Blocks D, E, and F. On March 23, 1999, the Commission re-auctioned 347 C, D, E, and F Block licenses. There were 48 small business winning bidders. On January 26, 2001, the Commission completed the auction of 422 C and F Broadband PCS licenses in Auction No. 35. Of the 35 winning bidders in this auction, 29 qualified as "small" or "very small" businesses. Subsequent events, concerning Auction 35, including judicial and agency determinations, resulted in a total of 163 C and F Block licenses being available for grant.

12. *Narrowband Personal Communications Services.* To date, two auctions of narrowband personal communications services (PCS) licenses have been conducted. For purposes of the two auctions that have already been held, "small businesses" were entities with average gross revenues for the prior three calendar years of \$40 million or less. Through these auctions, the Commission has awarded a total of 41 licenses, out of which 11 were obtained by small businesses. To ensure meaningful participation of small business entities in future auctions, the Commission has adopted a two-tiered small business size standard in the *Narrowband PCS Second Report and Order*. A "small business" is an entity that, together with affiliates and controlling interests, has average gross revenues for the three preceding years of not more than \$40 million. A "very small business" is an entity that, together with affiliates and controlling interests, has average gross revenues for the three preceding years of not more than \$15 million. The SBA has approved these small business size standards. In the future, the Commission will auction 459 licenses to serve Metropolitan Trading Areas (MTAs) and 408 response channel licenses. There is also one megahertz of narrowband PCS spectrum that has been held in reserve and that the Commission has not yet decided to release for licensing. The Commission cannot predict accurately the number of licenses that will be awarded to small entities in future auctions. However, four of the 16 winning bidders in the two previous narrowband PCS auctions were small businesses, as that term was defined. The Commission assumes, for purposes of this analysis that a large portion of the remaining narrowband

PCS licenses will be awarded to small entities. The Commission also assumes that at least some small businesses will acquire narrowband PCS licenses by means of the Commission's partitioning and disaggregation rules.

13. *Rural Radiotelephone Service.* The Commission has not adopted a size standard for small businesses specific to the Rural Radiotelephone Service. A significant subset of the Rural Radiotelephone Service is the Basic Exchange Telephone Radio System (BETRS). The Commission uses the SBA's small business size standard applicable to "Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications," *i.e.*, an entity employing no more than 1,500 persons. There are approximately 1,000 licensees in the Rural Radiotelephone Service, and the Commission estimates that there are 1,000 or fewer small entity licensees in the Rural Radiotelephone Service that may be affected by the rules and policies adopted herein.

14. *Air-Ground Radiotelephone Service.* The Commission has not adopted a small business size standard specific to the Air-Ground Radiotelephone Service. We will use SBA's small business size standard applicable to "Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications," *i.e.*, an entity employing no more than 1,500 persons. There are approximately 100 licensees in the Air-Ground Radiotelephone Service, and we estimate that almost all of them qualify as small under the SBA small business size standard.

15. *Offshore Radiotelephone Service.* This service operates on several UHF television broadcast channels that are not used for television broadcasting in the coastal areas of states bordering the Gulf of Mexico. There are presently approximately 55 licensees in this service. We are unable to estimate at this time the number of licensees that would qualify as small under the SBA's small business size standard for "Cellular and Other Wireless Telecommunications" services. Under that SBA small business size standard, a business is small if it has 1,500 or fewer employees.

b. International Service Providers

16. The Commission has not developed a small business size standard specifically for providers of international service. The appropriate size standards under SBA rules are for the two broad census categories of "Satellite Telecommunications" and "Other Telecommunications." Under both categories, such a business is small if it has \$13.5 million or less in average annual receipts.

17. The first category of Satellite Telecommunications "comprises establishments primarily engaged in providing point-to-point telecommunications services to other establishments in the telecommunications and broadcasting industries by forwarding and receiving communications signals via a system of satellites or reselling satellite telecommunications." For this category, Census Bureau data for 2002 show that there were a total of 371 firms that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 307 firms had annual receipts of under \$10 million, and 26 firms had receipts of \$10 million to \$24,999,999. Consequently, we estimate that the majority of Satellite Telecommunications firms are small entities that might be affected by our action.

18. The second category of Other Telecommunications "comprises establishments primarily engaged in (1) providing specialized telecommunications applications, such as satellite tracking, communications telemetry, and radar station operations; or (2) providing satellite terminal stations and associated facilities operationally connected with one or more terrestrial communications systems and capable of transmitting telecommunications to or receiving telecommunications from satellite systems." For this category, Census Bureau data for 2002 show that there were a total of 332 firms that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 303 firms had annual receipts of under \$10 million and 15 firms had annual receipts of \$10 million to \$24,999,999. Consequently, we estimate that the majority of Other Telecommunications firms are small entities that might be affected by our action.

c. Equipment Manufacturers

19. *Wireless Communications Equipment Manufacturing.* The Census Bureau defines this category as follows: "This industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in manufacturing radio and television broadcast and wireless communications equipment. Examples of products made by these establishments are: transmitting and receiving antennas, cable television equipment, GPS equipment, pagers, cellular phones, mobile communications equipment, and radio and television studio and broadcasting equipment." The SBA has developed a small business size standard for Radio and Television Broadcasting and Wireless Communications Equipment Manufacturing, which is: all such firms

having 750 or fewer employees. According to Census Bureau data for 2002, there were a total of 1,041 establishments in this category that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 1,010 had employment of under 500, and an additional 13 had employment of 500 to 999. Thus, under this size standard, the majority of firms can be considered small.

20. *Semiconductor and Related Device Manufacturing.* These establishments manufacture "computer storage devices that allow the storage and retrieval of data from a phase change, magnetic, optical, or magnetic/optical media." The SBA has developed a small business size standard for this category of manufacturing; that size standard is 500 or fewer employees. According to Census Bureau data for 1997, there were 1,082 establishments in this category that operated for the entire year. Of these, 987 had employment of under 500, and 52 establishments had employment of 500 to 999.

21. *Computer Storage Device Manufacturing.* These establishments manufacture "computer storage devices that allow the storage and retrieval of data from a phase change, magnetic, optical, or magnetic/optical media." The SBA has developed a small business size standard for this category of manufacturing; that size standard is 1,000 or fewer employees. According to Census Bureau data for 1997, there were 209 establishments in this category that operated for the entire year. Of these, 197 had employment of under 500, and eight establishments had employment of 500 to 999.

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

22. The Public Notice seeks comment broadly on APCO, NENA, AT&T, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and Verizon Wireless' proposals, and on any other alternative approaches, to best ensure that public safety answering points (PSAPs) receive location information that is as accurate as possible for all wireless E911 calls. APCO, NENA, AT&T, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and Verizon Wireless propose requiring measurement of location accuracy compliance at the county level rather than PSAP level; certain modifications to the compliance levels set forth in rules section 20.18(h).

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

23. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant, specifically

small business 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) and exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.”

24. The Public Notice seeks comment on the relative merits of APCO, NENA, AT&T, Sprint Nextel Corporation, and Verizon Wireless’ proposals. To assist in the analysis, commenters are requested to provide information regarding how small entities would be affected if the Commission were to adopt APCO, NENA, AT&T, Sprint Nextel

Corporation, and Verizon Wireless’ proposals, or any alternative proposals offered by other commenters.

Commenters should also provide information on alternative approaches to alleviate any potential burdens on small entities.

Federal Communications Commission.

Thomas J. Beers,

Division Chief, Policy Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau.

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

ATTACHMENT**ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC-SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS OFFICIALS-INTERNATIONAL
NATIONAL EMERGENCY NUMBER ASSOCIATION**

July 14, 2008

Chief Derek Poarch
Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20552

Re: PS Docket 07-114 and CC Docket 94-120

Dear Chief Poarch:

The Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO) and the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) thank you and your colleagues for continued leadership on public safety matters, specifically wireless E9-1-1. Today, we submit this letter to report to you the work that has been ongoing since the FCC released its Order addressing the location of individuals placing 9-1-1 calls from their wireless devices.

We have previously advocated that wireless E9-1-1 accuracy should be measured at the PSAP level. We are now willing to accept compliance measurements at the county level. In part, this reflects the changes that are occurring in the PSAP community, as some communities are consolidating 9-1-1 centers, and others are changing PSAP geographic boundaries to match county boundaries. Counties, unlike PSAP service areas, also reflect a stable geographic area and would be a more appropriate regulatory criteria.

The FCC should maintain the current Phase II E9-1-1 metrics for 67% of calls, location accuracy within 50 meters for handset location solutions and 100 meters for network location solutions. However, both APCO and NENA agree that it may be appropriate to make adjustments to the current requirement that 95% of wireless E-9-1-1 Phase II calls be accurate within 150 meters for handset location solutions and 300 meters for network location solutions. We recognize that satisfying this requirement at a PSAP or county level is especially difficult for many carriers due to variations in geography and system deployments. Thus, the Commission may want to consider either reducing the percentage of 9-1-1 calls from 95% or increasing the 150/300 meter metrics.

We also recognize that it may not be technically feasible for carriers to meet the modified location accuracy requirements in every county. Therefore, the FCC should establish a waiver process with clear guidelines and procedures. For such waivers, the Commission should identify factors for consideration such as technical limitations, whether the carrier is meeting network optimization criteria and whether it is maintaining state-of-the-art capabilities for its chosen location technology. In the event that a carrier seeking a waiver proposes to select a different location technology, the Commission should consider whether there is a clearly defined plan to improve location accuracy.

Public safety and wireless carriers are in current discussions on a number of other issues associated with E9-1-1, with the goal of improving information available to PSAPs. There are areas of agreement in concept; however, the details are still being developed. These include:

- **Providing more uniform uncertainty values through a standard confidence factor:** The goal is to provide PSAPs with the most accurate and highest quality E9-1-1 location information possible with existing positioning equipment, while providing consistent interpretation of the results from diverse carriers and technologies. A wireless carrier's uncertainty estimates under this proposal will therefore provide a real-time, per call estimate of the 9-1-1 caller's location, and the uncertainty estimate associated with each Phase II E9-1-1 call should be viewed with roughly the same "confidence", regardless of carrier.
- **Indoor testing:** A working group of public safety and wireless carriers, vendors and other experts should be established to develop the specifics of indoor testing.
- **Next Generation Issues:** A working group of public safety and wireless carriers and others as needed should be established to examine advances in both wireless services and PSAP call centers, with the goal of ensuring that advances in wireless and location technologies have the corresponding capability to transmit voice and data services in a usable format for PSAPs. Examples include: femtocell or access point technologies, next generation GPS satellite technology, IP platforms and PSAP access for the delivery of voice, video and data location information.

Public safety and wireless carriers continue to meet to address these issues. The key point of this letter to put on record our opinion that in light of the changes occurring both in the PSAP and wireless communities, E9-1-1 location accuracy should be determined at the county level. We are hopeful that in the very near future we, perhaps in concert with the wireless industry, can provide you with greater details on assessing wireless carrier compliance at the county level as well as more details on the concepts mentioned above.

Again, thank you for your commitment to public safety and the importance of E9-1-1.

Respectfully,

Willis Carter, President
APCO International

Ronald Boneau, President
NENA

August 20, 2008

The Honorable Kevin Martin
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Re: PS Docket 07-114

Dear Chairman Martin:

The Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO), the National Emergency Numbering Association (NENA), and Verizon Wireless submit this letter to propose improved compliance measurements for the Commission's wireless E911 location accuracy rules governing handset-based technologies. APCO, NENA and Verizon Wireless have worked together to develop technologically feasible compliance measurements that improve the ability of providers to locate customers making calls to 9-1-1 from wireless phones.

This letter outlines these proposed compliance measurements for handset-based technologies, and the undersigned parties agree that any location accuracy rules that the Commission adopts for carriers that employ handset-based solutions should be limited to the measures set out here. As referenced in APCO and NENA's July 14, 2008 letter to Chief Derek Poarch, these proposed rules would measure wireless 9-1-1 location accuracy at the county level. Furthermore, these proposed compliance measurements will ensure that over time the wireless industry will continue to improve accuracy levels as technology develops. These new rules would be as follows:

- o Two years after the Commission adopts new rules, on a county-by-county basis, 67% of Phase II calls must be accurate to within 50 meters in all counties; 80% of Phase II calls must be accurate to within 150 meters in all counties, provided, however, that a carrier may exclude up to 15% of counties from the 150 meter requirement based upon heavy forestation that limits handset-based technology accuracy in those counties.
- o Eight years after the Commission adopts new rules, on a county-by-county basis, 67% of Phase II calls must be accurate to within 50 meters in all counties; 90% of Phase II calls must be accurate to within 150 meters in all counties, provided, however, that a carrier may exclude up to 15% of counties from the 150 meter requirement based upon heavy forestation that limits handset-based technology accuracy in those counties.

In addition, Verizon Wireless, working with the wireless industry, APCO, and NENA, will continue good faith efforts to identify possible approaches for assessing wireless 9-1-1 location accuracy for calls originating indoors. Today, wireless calls are increasingly originating indoors and providers' ability to locate these 9-1-1 calls remains an important challenge. Accordingly, while indoor calls are a separate issue from the accuracy standards identified above, Verizon Wireless, APCO, and NENA agree to convene, within 180 days of the Commission's order, an industry group to evaluate methodologies for assessing wireless 9-1-1 location accuracy for calls originating indoors and report back to the Commission within one year.

Sincerely,

Brian Fontes
CEO
NENA

Robert M. Gurs
Director, Legal & Gov't Affairs
APCO

John T. Scott, III
VP & Deputy General Counsel
Verizon Wireless

cc: Commissioner Michael Copps
Commissioner Robert McDowell
Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
D. Gonzalez A. Goldberger
A. Giancarlo
W. Leighton
B. Gottlieb
R. Crittenden
D. Poarch

Sprint Nextel
2001 Edmund Halley Drive
Reston, VA 20191 Office:
(703) 433-3786 Fax:
(913) 523-9831

August 21, 2008

Via Electronic Submission

The Honorable Kevin Martin
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Ex Parte Communication, PS Docket 07-114

Dear Chairman Martin:

On August 20, 2008, the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO), the National Emergency Numbering Association (NENA), and Verizon Wireless filed a letter proposing improved compliance measurements for the Commission's wireless E911 location accuracy rules governing handset-based providers. As a handset-based carrier, Sprint Nextel Corporation ("Sprint") submits this letter in further support of that proposal.

The proposed accuracy standard meets the concerns of public safety while acknowledging the limitations of current technology. Although setting the accuracy standard at the county level will impose significant testing costs and require substantial time to complete, the accuracy standards articulated should be achievable. Sprint commends all those involved in the work required to produce this proposal and urges the Commission to adopt this compromise.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, this letter is being electronically filed. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Anna M. Gomez _____

Anna M. Gomez
Vice President, Federal and State Regulatory
Sprint Nextel Corporation

/s/Lawrence R. Krevor _____

Lawrence R. Krevor Vice
President, Spectrum Sprint
Nextel Corporation

letter to Chairman Martin *PS*
Docket, 07-114

cc: Commissioner Michael Copps
Commissioner Robert McDowell
Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
D. Gonzalez A. Goldberger
A. Giancarlo
W. Leighton
B. Gottlieb
R. Crittendon
D. Poarch

August 25, 2008

The Honorable Kevin Martin
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Re: PS Docket 07-114

Dear Chairman Martin:

The Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO), the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), and AT&T Mobility (AT&T) submit this letter to propose improved compliance measurements for the Commission's wireless E911 location accuracy rules governing network-based technologies. APCO, NENA and AT&T have worked together to develop technologically feasible compliance measurements that improve the ability of providers to locate customers making calls to 9-1-1 from wireless phones.

This letter outlines these proposed compliance measurements for carriers using network-based technologies. As referenced in APCO and NENA's July 14, 2008 letter to Chief Derek Poarch, these proposed rules would measure wireless 9-1-1 location accuracy at the county level, but the undersigned parties also recognize that it is not technically feasible for carriers to meet the current accuracy standard in all counties using location accuracy technology currently available. Accordingly, the undersigned parties agree that any location accuracy rules that the Commission adopts for carriers that employ network-based solutions must be limited to the metrics and schedules set out here. These proposed compliance measurements will ensure that over time the wireless industry will continue to improve accuracy levels as technology develops.

As network-based providers will be unable to meet the new proposed county-level accuracy standards in all areas relying solely upon current network-based technology solutions, carriers who employ network-based location solutions may be expected to deploy handset-based solutions as an overlay to existing network-based solutions in order to meet the more stringent county-level requirements set forth below. To encourage the improvements in location accuracy that may be achieved using both network and handset based solutions, this proposal provides that network-based carriers may elect to use a system of blended reporting for their accuracy measurements, as defined below. Carriers

also may elect to report accuracy in any county based solely on the handset-based accuracy standards. The specifics of the proposal are as follows:

Accuracy Standards for Network-Based Location Solution Carriers:

67%/100M: 67 percent of all calls, measured at the county level, shall be located within 100 meters in each county by the end of year 5, in accordance with the interim benchmarks below; and

90%/300M: 90 percent of all calls, measured at the county level, shall be located within 300 meters in 85 percent of all counties by the end of year 8, in accordance with the interim benchmarks below.

Applicability of Accuracy Standards: The county-level location accuracy standards will be applicable to those counties, on an individual basis, for which a network-based carrier has deployed Phase II in at least one cell site located within a county's boundary. Compliance with the 67 percent standard and compliance with the 90 percent standard in a given county shall be measured and reported independently (i.e. the list of compliant counties for the 67 percent standard may be different than for the 90 percent standard).

Blended Reporting: Accuracy data from both a network-based solution and a handset-based solution may be blended to meet the network-based standard. Such blending shall be based on weighting accuracy data in the ratio of aGPS handsets to non-aGPS handsets in the carrier's subscriber base. The weighting ratio shall be applied to the accuracy data from each solution and measured against the network-based standards.

Example of blended reporting at 60% penetration of aGPS devices in the network:

Metric	Network-based Average	Handset-based Average	Blended Result
67%/100M	120M	40M	72M
90%/300M	400M	100M	220M

The blended results are derived by combining 40% of the network-based average with 60% of the handset-based average to produce a blended average for the county.

Network-Based Solution Compliance Benchmarks

67%/100M NETWORK-BASED ACCURACY STANDARD

End of Year 1¹: Carriers shall comply in 60% of counties, which counties shall cover at least 70% of the POPs covered by the carrier, network-wide. Compliance will be measured on a per county basis using existing network-based accuracy data.

¹ Benchmark intervals such as "Year 1" are to be measured from the effective date of any order adopting these proposed new location accuracy rules.

End of Year 3: Carriers shall comply in 70% of counties, which counties shall cover at least 80% of the POPs covered by the carrier, network-wide. Compliance will be measured on a per county basis, using, at the carrier's election, either: (i) network-based accuracy data; or (ii) blended reporting.

End of Year 5: Carriers shall comply in 100% of counties. Compliance will be measured on a per county basis, using, at the carrier's election, either: (i) network-based accuracy data; (ii) blended reporting; or (iii) subject to the following caveat, solely handset-based accuracy data (at handset-based accuracy standards).

A carrier may rely solely on handset-based accuracy data in any county if at least 95% of its subscribers, network-wide, use an aGPS handset, or if it offers subscribers in that county who do not have an aGPS device an aGPS handset at no cost to the subscriber.

90%/300M NETWORK-BASED ACCURACY STANDARD

End of Year 3: Carriers shall comply in 60% of counties, which counties shall cover at least 70% of the POPs covered by the carrier, network-wide. Compliance will be measured on a per county basis using, at the carrier's election, either: (i) network-based accuracy data; or (ii) blended reporting.

End of Year 5: Carriers shall comply in 70% of counties, which counties shall cover at least 80% of the POPs covered by the carrier, network-wide. Compliance will be measured on a per county basis using, at the carrier's election, either: (i) network-based accuracy data; or (ii) blended reporting.

End of Year 8: Carriers shall comply in 85% of counties. Compliance will be measured on a per county basis using, at the carrier's election, either: (i) network-based accuracy data; (ii) blended reporting; or (iii) subject to the caveat above, solely handset-based accuracy data (at handset-based accuracy standards).

ETAG: An ETAG (E911 Technical Advisory Group) shall be established to work with the E911 community to address open issues within this framework (e.g., updated outdoor and indoor accuracy measurement methodologies, tactics for improving accuracy performance in challenged areas, testing of emerging technology claims, E911 responsibilities in an open-access environment, the development of hybrid network-AGPS technologies, etc.).

Confidence and Uncertainty: Confidence and uncertainty data shall be provided on a per call basis upon PSAP request. This requirement shall begin at the end of Year 2, to allow testing to establish baseline confidence and uncertainty levels at the county level. Once a carrier has established baseline confidence and uncertainty levels in a county, ongoing accuracy shall be monitored based on the trending of uncertainty data and additional testing shall not be required.

Sincerely,

Brian Fontes
CEO
NENA

Robert M. Gurss
Director, Legal & Gov't Affairs
APCO

Robert W. Quinn, Jr.
SVP - Federal Regulatory
AT&T

cc: Commissioner Michael Copps

Commissioner Robert McDowell
Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
D. Gonzalez
A. Goldberger
A. Giancarlo
W. Leighton
B. Gottlieb
R. Crittenden
D. Poarch



Joan Marsh AT&T Services, Inc. 1120 20th Street, N.W. Suite
Vice President - 1000 Washington, D.C. 20036
Federal Regulatory 202.457.3120 Phone 832.213.0172 1-ax
ioanmaricmarsh-Yi-aU.qmi

September 5, 2008

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

**Re: In the Matter of Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements (PS
Docket No. 07-114; CC Docket No. 94-102)**

Dear Mr. Dortch,

On August 25, 2008, AT&T filed a joint letter with APCO and NENA to outline a proposal for improved compliance measurements for the Commission's wireless E911 location accuracy rules governing network-based technologies. This letter supplements that filing with additional detail on the location accuracy challenges inherent in a network-based technology solution and how those challenges can be met through the deployment of assisted global positioning system ("aGPS") devices.

Achieving meaningful network-wide accuracy performance improvements in any existing network-based E911 location system is a significant challenge, due largely to the following three factors:

- Variations in cell site density,
- Impact of local topography on RF propagation, and
- Existing network designs.

Looking first at cell site density, the accuracy performance of a network-based E911 solution generally improves as the number of cell sites in the targeted area increases. This fact — a fundamental premise of all network-based E911 solutions — stems from the ability of the location technology to obtain more location measurements (time based measurements for UTDOA) from different location measurement units deployed at individual cell sites that "see" the uplink signals from the 911-calling handset. While a network-based solution is often referred to as being based on "triangulation," individual locates within 300m of a 911 caller's actual location are often based on data from as many as ten or more cell sites. Accordingly, network-based E911 location performance will generally be more accurate in urban and suburban areas, with

their higher cell site density, than the same system operating in a rural district, where there are fewer cell sites needed for commercial service due to lower call volumes.

Local topography also plays an important role in accuracy measurements. Local terrain features — both natural (e.g., mountains, dense forestation, lakes, valleys) and manmade (e.g., buildings, etc.) - degrade network-based E911 accuracy performance by reducing the number of cell sites that can generate location data. For example, due to topographically-induced variations in RF propagation, a network-based E911 location technology used in a flat rural or suburban area will generally outperform the same location system used in a mountainous area, even where the cell site density in the two areas is similar.

Finally, network design also impacts E911 location accuracy. A carrier has to consider many factors when making decisions about the number of cell sites deployed in any given service territory, which are based on current and future caller usage patterns, local zoning restrictions, local community acceptance, and economics. The resulting number and pattern of deployed cell sites will directly affect E911 accuracy performance for network-based systems. Examples of specific circumstances that present challenges include:

- A so-called "string of pearls" deployment along a desert or rural freeway, in which cell sites are built only in the freeway's immediate vicinity so as to serve travelers along that highway,
- A "coverage island", where a carrier builds coverage to serve a particular location (e.g., ski area, etc.) but does not initiate service elsewhere, and
- "Border areas" created along the RF boundaries of existing service areas.

In addition, location accuracy is affected by the position of the cell sites and their attendant location measurement units in relation to each other. If the geometric spacing is optimal, then a minimum of three sites can be used to triangulate for a good location estimate. If the geometric spacing is poor, then significantly more cell sites are necessary to get a good location estimate. Unfortunately, local zoning restrictions often limit the ability for carriers to deploy cell sites in an optimal geometric spacing.

Each of these situations present accuracy challenges to a network-based E911 solution. In some areas, one or more of these factors render the achievement of the current network-based location standards infeasible at the county level. In many instances, these challenges can be mitigated or overcome through the deployment of aGPS technology. Accordingly, using both network-based and handset-based E911 technologies in concert will allow all carriers over time to significantly improve E911 accuracy performance across the majority of service areas.

An aGPS-equipped handset is very much like a stand-alone global positioning device that measures the signals from satellites to calculate locations using triangulation techniques. However, unlike a stand-alone GPS receiver, the aGPS handset also receives assistance data from the serving carrier's network, allowing it to calculate location

estimates much faster than a pure GPS device. Initial deployment of aGPS technology requires that both consumer handsets and network components be upgraded. Handsets must have a GPS chipset and antenna, along with the software necessary to receive location assistance data from the serving carrier's network. Components in the serving network must also be enhanced so as to facilitate the delivery of relevant location assistance data. However, once those handset and network improvements have been completed, aGPS technology will, in many environments, provide significantly-improved accuracy performance, so long as a sufficient number of GPS satellites can be received by the handset. Of course, due to line of sight obstructions, local topography can also prevent aGPS location systems from achieving current handset-based location accuracy standards in many counties.

The joint proposal submitted on August 25, 2008 by AT&T, APCO, and NENA recognizes the benefits and shortcomings of both network and handset E911 location technologies, and outlines an achievable path to materially-improved E911 accuracy for the nation's wireless users. First, by measuring E911 accuracy performance at the county level, public safety officials and carriers alike will be able to evaluate E911 system performance using an agreed-upon geographic standard. Next, revised accuracy standards for both network and handset solutions acknowledge that improving E911 system performance will be a significant challenge across many of the diverse RF environments found in carriers' service areas. The delivery of confidence and uncertainty data on a per-call basis will markedly improve 911 call takers' ability to assess the validity of each call's location information and deploy public safety resources accordingly.

In addition, the use of a "blended" E911 accuracy measurement standard will mean that more and more consumers will reap the benefits of both handset and network technologies as the proposed compliance period progresses. Over time, in areas where one E911 location technology has certain inherent weaknesses, the strengths of the other technology may be leveraged, thereby continuing to improve first responders' ability to locate those in need of emergency services. This overlay approach recognizes both the benefits of current E911 systems and the technology investments made over the past decade by wireless carriers, while acknowledging and advancing the important public interest in improved E911 location accuracy.

In accordance with Commission rules, this letter is being filed electronically with your office for inclusion in the public record.

Sincerely,

Joan Marsh

cc: Derek Poarch
Jeff Cohen

John T. Scott, III
Vice President &
Deputy General Counsel
Regulatory Law

Verizon Wireless

Veri70nwireless

1300 I Street, N.W. Suite
400 West Washington, DC
20005

Phone 202 589-3760
Fax 202 589-3750
john.scott@verizonwireless.com

September 5, 2008

Ex Parte

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal
Communications Commission 445
Twelfth Street, S.W. Washington, D.C.
20554

Re: Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements, PS Docket No. 07-114

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On August 20, 2008, the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials, International (APCO), the National Emergency Numbering Association (NENA), and Verizon Wireless filed a letter with the Commission proposing improved compliance measurements for wireless providers using handset-based E911 technologies. This letter submits additional information in support of that proposal.

The proposal has five interrelated aspects: (1) new E911 accuracy standards that will be measured at the county level; (2) deadlines for achieving these standards; (3) an exception for a subset of counties that present technical challenges to location accuracy; (4) a commitment to work toward recommendations on indoor accuracy testing, and (5) agreement that the Commission should go no farther than adopting these new standards in amending its current E911 rules for handset-based technologies.

Verizon Wireless believes that the proposed accuracy standards, while rigorous, can be achieved within the time frames set forth in the proposal. In the company's experience, the greatest technical barrier to the accuracy of handset-based E911 technologies is the presence of terrain obstructions, whether natural or manmade. The "topology" (or terrain characteristics) of an area is critically important to accuracy because the precision of the location fix depends on the wireless handset's ability to "see" multiple Global Positioning System (GPS) satellites. In Verizon Wireless's hybrid Assisted GPS location system, four or more satellites are required for a precise GPS-

Verizon Wireless's system uses a "hybrid" technology known as "Assisted GPS", because it supplements GPS technology with network-based network triangulation technology. The network-based technology, however, does not provide accuracy to within the precise distance limits the Commission previously set for handset-based technology.

only location. When there are not enough satellites visible to the handset due to line of sight obstructions, then the location system relies on data from surrounding cell sites to supplement or completely replace satellite signals in calculating location measurements. When cell sites are used to supplement or substitute for satellite measurements, the handset must be able to "see" a minimum of three cell sites that are geometrically spaced in a manner that allows for triangulation, much like the network-based E911 solutions deployed by other carriers. Location measurements become less accurate as more reliance is placed on cell site triangulation.

Where, for example, an area's topology is characterized by forest, the likelihood of a good location fix is reduced because the tree cover obstructs the transmission path between the satellites and the handset. The more extensive the tree cover, the greater difficulty the system has in generating a GPS-based fix. Likewise, man-made as well as natural obstructions may also pose challenges for obtaining an accurate network-based fix because RF signals may be delayed or blocked altogether. In contrast, where an area is more open so that it is more likely that sufficient GPS satellites will be accessed by the handset, handset-based technologies provide highly accurate location fixes.

In short, while meeting E911 accuracy requirements at the county level is feasible in many counties, the parties to the proposal recognized that it is not technically feasible for carriers to meet the current accuracy standards in all counties using currently available technology. Any new E911 rule for handset-based systems must recognize these realities in order to be technically achievable.

The APCO-NENA-Verizon Wireless proposal incorporates these technical realities in two ways. First, in recognition that accuracy will now be tested and measured at an individual county level, it sets the percentage of Phase 2 E911 calls that must be accurate to within 50 meters at 67%, and the percentage of calls that must be accurate to within 150 meters at 80%, within two years from the effective date of the new rules. No more than six years later (that is, eight years after the rules' effective date), the percentage of Phase 2 calls that must be accurate to within 150 meters increases to 90%, thus raising over time the required accuracy of the system.

Second, the proposal allows the wireless provider to exclude up to 15% of counties served from the 150 meter accuracy standard based on heavy forestation, to reflect the fact that many counties are characterized by tree coverage that reduces the ability to obtain sufficient accuracy to establish compliance.

By excluding a small percentage of counties, as well as a small (and decreasing) percentage of calls from compliance, the proposal acknowledges that these exceptions are both necessary and appropriate in order to achieve the rigorous accuracy requirements that will apply to all other E911 Phase 2 calls.

The compliance periods set forth in the proposal serve two important purposes. The initial two-year period is necessary for Verizon Wireless to establish new protocols for county-level accuracy testing and to conduct that testing in order to verify compliance

with the new standards. The additional six-year period is needed for Verizon Wireless to work to achieve the more rigorous "90% of Phase 2 calls" accuracy standard. The company anticipates that during this time there are likely to be developments in the field of location technologies that may enable improvements in accuracy of handset-based technologies. This period will allow the company needed time to test and deploy new software or equipment using such technologies.

The APCO-NENA-Verizon Wireless proposal addresses Public Safety's desire for wireless E911 systems to demonstrate accuracy at an individual county level, while incorporating a limited but needed amount of flexibility for wireless carriers using handset-based technologies to meet the accuracy standards. The company believes that this proposal is feasible and achievable as long as it is adopted as a whole and without additional requirements. It thus encourages the Commission to consider it at such time as the Commission resumes its consideration of changes to its E911 accuracy rules.

Sincerely, John T.

Scott, III

cc: Derek Poarch, Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau
Jeffrey Cohen, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau
Brian Fontes, NENA
Robert Gurss, APCO



September 9, 2008

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

RE: PS Docket 07-114 and CC Docket 94-102

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International ("APCO") and the National Emergency Number Association ("NENA") wish to take this opportunity to address the recent letters from Verizon Wireless and AT&T Mobility regarding their proposals for revisions to the E9-1-1 wireless location accuracy rules, as set forth in our prior joint letters with each company.

APCO and NENA agree that these proposals will promote the public interest and should be adopted by the Commission. Significantly, Verizon and AT&T have both agreed that location accuracy should be measured at the county level. This represents a substantial improvement over the measurement areas currently used by carriers and the positions they had previously advocated. As we described in our letter of July 14, 2008, county-level accuracy would in many cases be identical to PSAP-level accuracy. Counties also are more easily defined than PSAPs and are not prone to administrative boundary changes.

The joint proposals, if adopted by the Commission, also could bring an end to years of distracting debates regarding the appropriate accuracy standards. All parties will then be able to focus attention on the important, critical task of implementing and improving wireless E9-1-1 capabilities.

We also believe that the specific standards identified in the letters present a sensible approach that will achieve improved accuracy in a reasonable time frame. Most importantly, the requirements for 67% of 9-1-1 calls (50/100 meters) will be met at the county level within two years for Verizon and five years for AT&T, consistent with the five-year benchmark that APCO and NENA had previously recommended and was adopted in the last FCC order. Also, we are pleased that AT&T proposes to combine handset and network based technologies to provide improved accuracy across a variety of geographic settings.

The carriers have also agreed to provide confidence and uncertainty data on a per call basis upon receiving PSAP requests. This will greatly improve the ability of PSAPs to utilize accuracy data and manage their 9-1-1 calls. Finally, we look forward to working with the carriers to develop approaches for assessing indoor call accuracy, as wireless phones are increasingly being used to make 9-1-1 calls from inside homes and offices. Location accuracy is especially important in those settings where first responders may have difficulty locating the exact site of the emergency.

Please contact the undersigned should the Commission require any additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert M.

Gurss

Director, Legal and Government Affairs
APCO International 1725 DeSalcs Street,
NW Suite 808 Washington, DC 20036

/s/ Brian Fontes Chief

Executive Officer NENA
4350 North Fairfax Drive
Suite 750 Arlington, VA
22203-1695

cc: Derek Poarch Jeff
Cohen John T.
Scott, III Joan
Marsh