

"Donald Watts"

<dwatts@ramartech.com>

07/08/2003 09:36 AM

To: b <tdwyer@us.tuv.com>

cc:

Subject: RE: FCC Test Configuration Justification

Tim,

Below is a copy of the chain of emails that flew around during the initial submission and certification of PTransponditV1.

My thinking was that we had followed the same process as before on the certification of PtransponditV2.

Donald Watts

AT RAMAR LLC

PO Box 110127

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-0127

Ph: 919-991-9924 x109

Fax: 919-991-9946

Cell: 919-949-9399

At 04:16 PM 11/18/2002, you wrote:

4 Tim,
It's possible but you will need to do some testing in each of the metal boxes. You could do prescan in all of them and then test worst case. Also, test the transmitter standalone for reference purposes. The manual and grant condition must specify that the transmitter can only be used in specific enclosures as specified in the filing.

Timothy R. Johnson 11/15/02 02:07PM >>>

3 Joe,
Original Filing FCC ID: NTAXMETER2. Keep in mind the original submittal contained a small hole or two in the lid.....However the new companies photographs were attached.

Give me a call to discuss if necessary (phone: 404-414-8071).

Thanks,

Tim

At 12:04 PM 11/15/2002, you wrote:

2 Tim,
Ray forwarded this inquiry to me. I forwarded it to Joe Dichoso. Joe wants the FCC Id of the original filing to look at it.

Please provide that information.

thanks,

rich

? >>> > >>> Timothy R. Johnson 11/12/02 04:49PM >>>

Ray,

1

About 5 months back I discussed a 902-928 MHz TX 15.249 unit with Rich Fabina for Tadiran. The product was designed for water meters applications which are buried underground within a metal "pit" that is flush to the surface. This unit exceeded the 15.249 peak 50,000 uV/m limits when tested on an OAT site. Since the device is designed to transmit within the metal pit, this explains the higher measurement when tested in an open field without the pit surrounding it.

From our discussions, Rich considered it acceptable to place the device within a normal metal "pit" during testing as long as the manufacture could attest to this fact for all installations and that the users manual/installation instructions clearly dictated this fact. He also cautioned that the manufacturer would still be considered responsible for all installations.

We now have the following question from a similar company. They have tested the device in the same fashion (see photos). Since they tested within a cast metal box + full metal lid, they would like to know if it be acceptable for them to place this product in other model "pits" of different dimensions (i.e. circular vs. rectangular, or slightly different size) without having to retest each configuration. They stated that all pits would contain a full metal lid and full metal box like the original unit tested.

Please let us know if this would be acceptable.

Thank You,

Timothy R. Johnson, NARTE Certified EMC Engineer (No. EMC-002205-NE) Examining Engineer
American TCB, Inc. 6731 Whittier Ave. McLean, VA 22101

email: tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com
alternate email: TRJ@adelphia.net
direct number: 404-414-8071
corporate phone: 703-847-4700
corporate fax: 703-847-6888

Timothy R. Johnson, NARTE Certified EMC Engineer (No. EMC-002205-NE) Examining Engineer
American TCB, Inc. 6731 Whittier Ave. McLean, VA 22101

email: tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com
alternate email: TRJ@adelphia.net
direct number: 404-414-8071
corporate phone: 703-847-4700
corporate fax: 703-847-6888

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

From: tdwyer@us.tuv.com [mailto:tdwyer@us.tuv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2003 11:43 AM
To: emoses@us.tuv.com; Donald Watts

Subject: FCC Test Configuration Justification

Don, Eugene,

Please email any additional information pertaining to the FCC approval of this test configuration.

The email about the configuration included with the filing has a question mark after Joe DiChoso's name and makes reference to a competitor's product that was approved using the test configuration. Since the email included in the filing mentioned the previous approval of the MS8TRANSPONDITV1 specifically, it appears that is not enough for FCC.

Please see if you have any additional information such as:

- email or notes about approval by FCC and who authorized it
- FCCID's for competitor's products approved using this configuration
- other information that may be relevant.

The FCC requires a reply within 30 days, but it should be addressed as soon as possible to make sure it gets resolved within the 30 day period.

TUV Rheinland of North America, Inc.
EMC
Product Safety Division

Tim Dwyer
EMC Program Manager
Tel (203) 426-0888 Ext. 104
Fax (203) 426-4009
Email tdwyer@us.tuv.com
web www.tuv.com

----- Forwarded by Tim Dwyer/US/TUV on 07/02/2003 11:30 AM -----

oetech@fccsun34w.fcc.gov

To: tdwyer@us.tuv.com
cc:

07/02/2003 10:21 AM

Subject: Test Configuration Justification

To: Timothy Dwyer
From: Mike Nicolay
mnicolay@fcc.gov
FCC Equipment Authorization Branch

Re: FCC ID: MS8PTRANSPONDITV2

Applicant: Advanced Technology Ramar Ltd
Correspondence Reference Number: 8850
731 Confirmation Number: TC334382
Date of Original Email: 07/02/2003

Subject: Test Configuration Justification

I see that the EUT was tested in a unique configuration. According to a letter submitted, a prior justification was apparently approved by the FCC. I have asked Joe Dichoso about this but he does not remember the specifics of such a request. He's not sure if this was the product that was the product approved for the modification test configuration. Please submit the justification information allowing for this special test configuration.

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information within 30 days of the original e-mail date may result in application dismissal pursuant to Section 2.917(c).

DO NOT Reply to this email by using the Reply button. In order for your response to be processed expeditiously, you must upload your response via the Internet at www.fcc.gov, E-Filing, OET TCB Electronic Filing, TCB Login. If the response is submitted through Add Attachments, a message which informs the processing staff that a new exhibit has been submitted must also be submitted via Submit Correspondence. Also, please note that partial responses increase processing time and should not be submitted.

Any questions about the content of this correspondence should be directed to the e-mail address listed below the name of the sender.

Have you heard about our new on-line 'TUVdotCOM' service?
<http://www.tuvdotcom.com>

The information included in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. Any use of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this transmission in error, please delete this email and destroy any copies of it.

Any opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of TUV Rheinland of North America, Inc.
