

Information about the Applicant

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Applicant: | INTERMEC Technologies Corporation |
| Address: | 6001 36th Avenue West |
| City, State, Zip | Everett, WA 98203-1264 |
| Test Requested By: | Katie Molina |
| Model: | PB42 Printer |
| FCC ID: | HN2-PB42 |
| Agent | Northwest EMC, Inc. |
| Approval Type | Certification |
| Equipment Type | Low power intentional radiator |
| Rule Part | 15.247 |

Overview

This application is for the original certification of Intermec's PB42 printer, FCC ID: HN2-PB42. The PB42 contains Mitsumi's Bluetooth radio module, Model WML-C30XX, which is identical to the radio described in the original application for FCC ID: POOWMLC30XX. The Intermec PB42 printer will be located within 20cm of Intermec's CK60 handheld terminal. The CK60 contains FCC ID: HN2-BTM311. A letter from Terry Mahn and Bob Ungar of Fish and Richardson (attached to the cover letter from Agent) explains why the radios cannot transmit simultaneous. Therefore the radios are not co-located and are eligible for TCB approval. The radio utilizes a single integral antenna. This configuration satisfies the requirements of 47 CFR 15.203. The test reports and exhibits demonstrate compliance with FCC rules 47 CFR 15.247 as a portable, Part 15 Spread Spectrum Transmitter. The 7 Layers test report demonstrates compliance of the PB42's radio module with the antenna port conducted requirements. The Northwest EMC test report demonstrates compliance of the PB42 printer with the AC power line conducted emissions, and the radiated spurious emissions requirements. The SAR report demonstrates compliance of the PB42 printer with the RF Exposure requirements.

Since the original radio FCC ID: POOWML-C30XX is already approved, that information is accepted and used as accurate and complete, not requiring further evaluation.

Findings

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Finding | The applicant has gone to great lengths to explain that there is no co-location involved for the application. The test report has many references to co-location |
| Resolution | Additional information has been provided in the cover letter |
| Finding | The applicant has provided two different schematic exhibits? |
| Resolution | This has been corrected |
| Finding | The equipment is subject to verification as a digital device, no evidence has been provided. |
| Resolution | Additional information has been provided in the cover letter |

Recommendation

All items have been resolved and completed to my satisfaction; therefore I recommend this application for approval.

Signature



Opinion

| Specification Requirements | Description |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 15.207 | Conducted Power Line Emissions |

Opinion: The Equipment meets the intent specified by the requirements listed above.

Discussion: The Applicant has submitted test results in the form of a test report

Reference: Technical Report

| Specification Requirements | Description |
|----------------------------|--|
| 15.247(d) | Spurious Emissions, Radiated Emissions |

Opinion: The Equipment meets the intent specified by the requirements listed above.

Discussion: The Applicant has submitted test results in the form of a test report.

Reference: Technical Report

| Specification Requirements | Description |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| 2.1091/15.247(b)(5) | RF Exposure |

Opinion: The Equipment meets the intent specified by the requirements listed above.

Discussion: The Applicant has submitted a SAR Report demonstrating compliance.

Reference: SAR Report