

---

Return-path: <frank@timcoengr.com>  
Envelope-to: marstech@interlog.com  
Delivery-date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 18:32:42 -0500  
Received: from [64.21.143.21] (helo=mail.dnsvr.com)  
by app5.nasc.inter.net with esmtp (Exim 3.34 #1)  
id 18BkWO-00067e-00  
for marstech@interlog.com; Tue, 12 Nov 2002 18:32:40 -0500  
Received: from corinth.gothicsoftware.net (unknown [216.155.109.180])  
by mail.dnsvr.com (Postfix) with ESMTP id AA3A24399A  
for <linda@marstechltd.com>; Tue, 12 Nov 2002 19:57:40 -0500 (EST)  
Received: from PC55 ([66.21.183.99]) by corinth.gothicsoftware.net with Microsoft SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.4905);  
Tue, 12 Nov 2002 18:36:57 -0500  
From: "Frank" <frank@timcoengr.com>  
To: <linda@marstechltd.com>  
Subject: FW: Part 15.214  
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 18:32:19 -0500  
Message-ID: <HOEEKAEDMOKOOFJIMONPKELPCAAA.frank@timcoengr.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0000\_01C28A79.D59D58D0"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
Importance: Normal  
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 12 Nov 2002 23:36:57.0527 (UTC) FILETIME=[63E8DC70:01C28AA4]  
X-PMFLAGS: 570949760 0 1 P16590.CNM

Hi Linda,

Just received this note at about 445pm tonight.  
Looks like your client can omit the statement.  
Read on to see what LaForge has to say.  
Sorry it took so long.  
Best wishes,  
Frank

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

From: TCB Council [<mailto:tcb@tcbcouncil.org>]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2002 4:27 PM  
To: [tcb@tcbcouncil.org](mailto:tcb@tcbcouncil.org)  
Subject: FW: Part 15.214

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

From: Raymond Laforge [<mailto:RLAFORGE@fcc.gov>]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2002 3:14 PM  
To: [tcb@tcbcouncil.org](mailto:tcb@tcbcouncil.org)  
Subject: Re: Part 15.214

Compliance with 15.214(d)1 can be shown in the test report. It does not have to be in the manual. However, the statement per 15.214(c) is still required on a label on the device.

>>> [tcb@tcbcouncil.org](mailto:tcb@tcbcouncil.org) 11/01/02 03:43PM >>>

Part 15.214 We have a client that is submitting a cordless telephone. The client will comply with the label statement: Privacy of communications may not be ensured when using this phone.

However, this client does not wish to publish in the User Manual the 256 possible discrete digital codes (or more) statement as described in 15.214(d)(1). The client does agree that a statement per 15.214 (d)(3), required protection, etc will be provided in the Test Report. Is it necessary for compliance to publish the number for discrete digital code etc. statement in the User Manual or is it adequate to show this data only in the Test Report?

What is the FCCs position?