

Response to TCB Findings

1. Please clarify the intention of this Class II PC filing.

The RF section of this device is identical to a previous filing and HME has modified and updated only the non-intentional radiator/processing part of the device. The device actually performs the same function as the previous submittal but with a different chassis and different processor board. The actual RF board and antenna remains unchanged.

The testing completed was to prove that modifying the device around the transmitter did not affect the transmit characteristics of the transmitter, so only Radiated Spurious and transmitted power (actually not required as this is a conducted measurement) were evaluated. No conducted measurements were made as no changes were made to the qualified transmitter board.

Please see the related document explaining the differences/similarities of the new model (BS200) and the existing model (Base Station 6000).

2. How was the limit of 115dBuV/m determined for fundamental emissions on Page 23 of the report? Please clarify.

It was intended to use the calculated EIRP based on the previous grant to compare with the current data. Thus verifying the new system was within the Class II permissive change requirements. In other words the radiated power output was at or below the previous submittal.

3. For radiated emissions has the EUT antenna positions been adjusted for both the main and aux antennas to maximize emissions? Please clarify.

During all testing the worst case antennal positions were tested as was determined during the prescans.