

For this application please see responses in red below the specific FCC question.

-----Original Message-----

From: Generic Office of Engineering Technology
[mailto:oeotech@fccsun27w.fcc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2007 1:40 PM
To: hotline@AmericanTCB.com
Subject: E52B5J0452

To: William Graff
From: Jim Szeliga
jim.szeliga@fcc.gov
FCC Equipment Authorization Branch

Re: FCC ID: E52B5J0452

Applicant: Kyocera Mita Corporation
Correspondence Reference Number: 35701
731 Confirmation Number: TC222020
Date of Original Email: 02/01/2007

Subject: E52B5J0452

Please provide the following clarification and or corrections to this application:

1. The sequence of dates for the correspondence is confusing: On January 13 there is an exhibit requesting limited module approval. On January 18 there is a correspondence to the client on limits for modular approval. Then on January 27 the client responded with a new test report and an indication that a request for limited module approval was submitted. Test report 26BEo123-HO-1a shows the device being tested as a module. Test report 26BEo123-HO-1b appears to be tested as a limited module for a specific type printer. Please clarify that that the filing is not missing an exhibit for a revised request for limited module approval to the January 18th request or the January 13 is the response to the January 18 (miss-dated) and there is no revised request for limited modular approval as indicated in the January 27 response.

Response - There was a question in the original request as to the approval process for modular or limited modular approval. The device was always a limited modular approval however this was not correctly indicated in the filing and certain issues in report 1a had to be corrected. Report 1b is a revision of report 1a providing these certain additional information. Both reports give radiated emissions data for spurious and fundamental inside the host, but report 1a only gave conducted emissions in stand alone configuration. Since conducted emissions in report 1a were done only in stand alone configuration, report 1b is a revision that provided conducted emissions measurements of the transmitter while in the host (see page 25 of report 1b).

Report 1b is thus inline with approval for an LMA inside a specific host.

2. Item 4 of the request for limited modular approval (unless we are missing the revised request) indicates that this module is installed by professionals, however, In such a case, an operating condition on the grant of equipment authorization for the module would state that the module is

only approved for use when installed in devices produced by a specific manufacturer, typically the Grantee.

It was not deemed necessary to include the "Professional" installation note on the grant as this device is of an extremely low output. The professional installation note has now been added to the grant notes as follows: **"This module must be installed by the OEM or OEM integrator. Instructions on installation of this module may not be provided to the end user. Only those antenna(s) tested with the device or similar antenna(s) with equal or lesser gain may be used with this transmitter."** As this device has no rf exposure concerns the generally added comment about a 20 cm separation will not be included. Also, since the antenna meets the requirements of 15.203 there is no need for a "professional" installation note on the grant.

3. Item 5 of the request for limited modular approval indicates that the device was tested as a stand-alone. However, compliance was based on the modular being in the printer (26BE0123-HO-1b).

Since the report with both configurations is mentioned, while the English may not be perfect, the meaning appears to clearly indicate proper testing was done. As can be seen by the revised report 26BE0123-HO-1b the device was tested in both standalone and in the host. This verifies item 5 which states "The modular transmitter has been performed the testing as a stand alone and then confirmed the compliance..." The comment should therefore be taken to mean that the device was first tested in standalone configuration as shown in the test report and then tested while in the host as shown in the report.

4. Item 6 of the request for limited modular approval and the label exhibit shows only the module label while the January 27 response indicates a revised label for the host.

The label exhibit for the module is correct and shows the FCC ID number on the module. The manual properly states that the host is to have a label stating "Contains FCC ID:E52B5J0452..." A photo was provided showing where the host label would be placed, but as it was not the actual FCC ID label for the module, it was not considered needed. It has been uploaded to the FCC site.

5. For Item 7 of the request for limited modular approval, the user manual does not address the specific series of printers as applicable in test 26BE0123-HO-1b. Since a limited module approval is sought, the application for equipment authorization must make this fact clear. It must also specifically state how control of the end product (i.e. this module is installed at the factory and only in printer series), into which the module will be installed, will be maintained, such that full compliance of the end product is always ensured.

The corrected manual with the information mentioned has been provided and uploaded.

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information within 30 days of the original e-mail date may result in application dismissal pursuant to Section 2.917(c).

DO NOT Reply to this email by using the Reply button. In order for your

response to be processed expeditiously, you must upload your response via the Internet at www.fcc.gov, E-Filing, OET TCB Electronic Filing, TCB Login. If the response is submitted through Add Attachments, a message which informs the processing staff that a new exhibit has been submitted must also be submitted via Submit Correspondence. Also, please note that partial responses increase processing time and should not be submitted.

Any questions about the content of this correspondence should be directed to the e-mail address listed below the name of the sender.