Subject: RE: FW: FCC ID: KBCIX260LMC350, ATCB File #: ATCB000155
Date: Tue, 21 Jan 2003 07:39:25 -0500
From: "Jim Nicholson" <jimnicho@cisco.com>
To: "'Dennis Ward'" <dennis@yosemite.net>, <jon.hughes@celltechlabs.com>
CC: "'William Graff'" <whgraff@qwest.net>

Dennis,

Cisco's position is as follows in this matter:

- The AIR-LMC352 referenced below is calibrated to 20 dBm in production. There is, of course, some tolerance on this value.
- The calibration is performed in a test jig, using an exact 5 VDC supply. If there is some variation to this voltage in Itronix's test configuration, this measured power level may vary from the calibrated level. Cisco's FCC data and subsequent grant were issued using a similar test jig.
- Not being familiar with Spectrum Technology, and to be fair in comparing the measured power, I would need to know their power measurement methodology/test equipment vs. what was originally used at Mort Flom.
- Cisco will stand behind the originally reported data for this radio for the units currently being produced.

Regards,

Jim

-----Original Message-----
From: Dennis Ward [mailto:dennis@yosemite.net]
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2003 5:34 PM
To: Jim Nicholson; jon.hughes@celltechlabs.com
Cc: 'William Graff'
Subject: Re: FW: FCC ID: KBCIX260LMC350, ATCB File #: ATCB000155

HI Jim
here is my problem, and perhaps you can help resolve the issue. The Cisco device is listed in the operational description as a 100mw (20dBm) device. The conducted power measured at Spectrum Technology is 132mw (21.2dBm) with the added cable factor in the report it is 190mw (22.9dBm). This is significantly greater than that measured in the original filing for the device which used the Morton Flom data of 2 years ago. The occupied bandwidth plots at 2412 and 2462MHz of the 190mw device may not be compliant, thus leading me to question the applicability of the data from 2 years ago. **Added note 1-25-03 - the cable factor was inadvertantly added in the report. The cable factor was already part of the measured value. The actual measured value is then 21.2dBm or 132 mw not 190mw**
Will Cisco issue a letter stating that at the measured power levels in the Spectrum Technology report, the data from 2 years ago is representative of this specific application?

As to my part, the device must be compliant and unfortunately I do not think the old data is appropriate

for this particular device usage. personally believe that at least new PPSD and bandedge compliance will be needed. Bandwidth issues can use the old data.

Thanks
Dennis

Jim Nicholson wrote:

> Dennis,
>
> There have been changes made to the device, but the changes made either do not affect the listed parameters, or improve the originally measured data. This being the case, what do you require of Cisco? Will the letter still suffice?
>
> Thanks,
>
> Jim
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > **From:** Dennis Ward [mailto:dennis@yosemite.net]
> > **Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2003 1:43 PM
> > **To:** jimnicho@cisco.com
> > **Cc:** William Graff
> > **Subject:** Re: FW: FCC ID: KBCIX260LMC350, ATCB File #: ATCB000155
> >
> > Thanks Jim
> > What about the PPSD, conducted power, bandwidth and other data that is over 2 years old? What iterations have occurred in the device since then that may affect these data? Can Cisco verify that the data is true to this device? If I remember correctly, this product has seen modifications to it since the original data was taken.
> >
> > It would help greatly if a letter stating that the data is still applicable because no changes have been made to the device. This should be on letter head and signed by the manufacturer.
> > Thanks
> > Dennis
> >
> > William Graff wrote:
> >
> > > -----Original Message-----
> > >
> > > **From:** Jim Nicholson [mailto:jimnicho@cisco.com]
> > > **Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2003 5:50 AM
> > > **To:** William H. Graff
> > > **Subject:** FCC ID: KBCIX260LMC350, ATCB File #: ATCB000155
> > >
> > > Bill,
> > >
> > > Referencing the email below from Dennis Ward to Jon Hughes of Itronix (I don't have Dennis' email address or I would email him directly), please provide some feedback as to exactly what is required to satisfy Item 1. I have attached the Block Diagram referenced in Item 2.

“Dennis Ward at ATCB has come back with the following comments regarding the application. Can you please assist with response to these items?

1. Please note that the PPSD, Occupied Bandwidth, Conducted spurious emissions and Band edge data are all from a device over 2 years old. This is an application for a new FCC ID number, and there is no indication as to how many changes may or may not have taken place in the life cycle of the original product. Please provide evidence to support the assumption that the test data (over 2 years old) is applicable for the device tested.

2. Page 9 (BLOCK DIAGRAM #1) is blank. Please resolve.”

Thanks for your time.

Jim Nicholson

EMC Compliance Engineer

EAG WNBU Engineering

Cisco Systems, Inc.

320 Springside Drive, Suite 350

Akron, Ohio44333

Phone: (330) 664-7362

Fax: (330) 664-7301

E-Mail: jimnicho@cisco.com