



Electro Magnetic Interference Testing and Engineering

Wireless Testing, Electrical Safety Testing,

PCB Designs, and Hardware Design Engineering

360 Herndon Parkway, Suite 1400, Herndon, VA 20170

Tel: 703-689-0368, Fax: 703-689-2056

August 11, 2002

Joe Dichoso

Federal Communication Commission

Reference: LDK102045

Correspondence number: 23654

Applicant: Cisco Systems Inc.

1a) There appears to be a noncompliant spur with 4510 MHz 2.4 GHz off, 5 GHz on?

An error occurred during the formatting of the test data, the peak and average results were inadvertently swapped, the failing average value is indeed the peak measurement. The value has been corrected and the new corrected table is provided as one of the attachments to this response.

2a) For your reply to #5, Explain/correct the user-installed FCC ID label, pointer label, or what? User installed second label is only for modules. If this is not a module, user cannot install label and the label must be visible.

The unit was tested as a module device, please find the cover letter provided as one of the attachments to this response.

New RF safety RT:

- 1) Response to reply to CRN 23502 1) - integral-antenna PCMCIA cards in laptops are portable devices subject to SAR limits. Please evaluate compliance with SAR limits with device inserted in laptop, as requested in CRN 23260 to this filing.
- 2) The unit was tested with a laptop and an extender adapter to provide the 5 V needed to power on the PCMCIA card. Since the laptops supplies only a 3.3 V the unit could not be used in a laptop configuration and could not be considered as a portable device. Please find the cover letter from our client that certified that the unit could only be use in an Access point is provided as one of the attachments to this response.
- 3) Response to reply to CRN 23502 3) - pg 4 of 8 shows LDK 102044 - not this filing

A revised Operational Description is provided as one of the attachments to this response.

- 4) Response to reply to CRN 23502 11) - cal factors not uploaded



Electro Magnetic Interference Testing and Engineering

Wireless Testing, Electrical Safety Testing,

PCB Designs, and Hardware Design Engineering

360 Herndon Parkway, Suite 1400, Herndon, VA 20170

Tel: 703-689-0368, Fax: 703-689-2056

The file was uploaded as an attachment with the last response, it is provided as one of the attachments to this response once more.

Response to reply to CRN 23502 18) & 16) - the averaging process is still not very clear. 2.1091 (d) (2) says time averaging is not applicable for general population devices - is this data still valid? For 100% duty factor time-averaged or "current result" (Wandel&G datasheet item) is expected to give same data. Averaging around the azimuth with turntable rotating continuously doesn't make sense. That means all azimuth readings in Table 5.2.1 are averaged?

Since the EUT is an access point the traffic typically handled by this device will approximate 90% duty cycle, hence the use of 100% duty cycle to simulate worst-case configuration result. We believe 2.1091 would be valid in this case; nonetheless, new max RMS measurement data is included in the revised MPE rev2 report provided as one of the attachments to this response.

Sincerely,

Desmond A. Fraser

President