



---

## Network Systems Organization

Norman H. Nelson  
Symbol Technologies, Inc.  
6480 Via Del Oro  
San Jose, CA 95119-1208  
Voice: (408) 528-2649  
FAX: (408) 528-2740  
norm@sj.symbol.com

Federal Communications Commission  
Equipment Approval Services  
P.O. Box 358315  
Pittsburgh, PA 15251-5315

**Re: FCC ID H9PLA3020 Ref # 9492**

Date: October 11, 99

Dear Reviewer,

In response to the following Email:

>To: Norman Nelson, Symbol Technologies, Inc.  
>From: Errol Chang  
> echang@fcc.gov  
> FCC Application Processing Branch  
>  
>Re: FCC ID H9PLA3020  
>Applicant: Symbol Technologies Inc  
>Correspondence Reference Number: 9492  
>731 Confirmation Number: EA94292  
>Date of Original E-Mail: 09/02/1999  
>  
>

>1. Test configuration B, as shown in figure 1b and section 2.5 (Test Results),  
>is indicating at least 2.5 cm (1.0 + 1.5) between the antenna and  
>tissue-equivalent material. This is inconsistent with information  
>included in a cover letter provided by Vocollect, Inc. - 1.7" from  
>antenna to inside case of EUT and 2.1" from antenna to skin. The  
>distances indicated in section 1.4.3 of the SAR report are also  
>different. The heading for Configuration B in section 2.5 should  
>be 10 mm, not 10 cm. Please clarify.

Test condition A simulates the abdominal tissue exposure when the TT-500 is worn like a belt. The Vocollect cover letter explains that the nominal antenna to tissue distance is 1.7" + 0.4" for the belt. It has a tissue to antenna distance of 2.1". The EUT was placed on the phantom without the belt. That gives the antenna to fluid distance of 4.5 cm.


Test condition B simulates close proximity of other persons exposure where the EUT case to phantom distance is 10mm. Indeed the heading of Configuration B in section 2.5 should be 10 mm.

>


>2. The photos in section 2.2 are missing. Please re-submit those setup photos.

### 1.1 Configuration Photographs

at 2450 MHz



**Configuration A:** Intended Usage



**Configuration B:** 10 mm between outer case of EUT and Phantom

>

>3. Please clarify that the antenna (2 dBi dipole) used for this Talkman  
>device is a new antenna, not one of those requested in the original  
>grant for Symbol Technology (H9PLA3020).

The antenna is number 16 in the original grant.

>

>4. The information indicated in the SAR report - Table 1: Bill of Materials  
> ... has two antennas. What are these antennas and how do they  
> relate to this Talkman device or the antenna used for this device.

In the BOM there is one antenna and one (cable assembly, antenna) not two separate antennas.

> The third item in this table is indicating a 500 mW device (LA-3020-500).  
> The original grant for H9PLA3020, to be used for this Talkman device, is  
> only approved for 250 mW. SAR was performed at 240 mW. Please clarify.  
>

The 240mW measured at ITS is less than 0.2 dB from our measured value of 250mW well within the measurement uncertainty. If this is a problem please multiply all test results by 1.04 for a scaled measurement.

The 500 mW was an engineering goal that was not achieved because of excess current consumption. The power spec for the transmitter in production is 250 mW as listed on the original grant for the LA3020-500.

>5. Please provide the exact model number and/or description of this  
>Talkman device from Vocollect, Inc. for adding/modifying the original  
>grant conditions for Symbol Technology H9PLA3020.

>

Vocollect Talkman: Model number TT-500.

>

Respectfully,

Norman H. Nelson