Reponse to TCB questions

Subject:
Re: O82-226038
Date:
Wed, 11 Oct 2000 09:56:56 -0500
From:
"Jim Blaha" <jimb@execpc.com>
Reply-To:
"Jim Blaha" <jblaha@lsr.com>
To:
"Certification Manager" <certification@curtis-straus.com>
References:
1

Dear Jon,
A quick comment on Item 1 of this attached email.
Due to the fact that there is no manual for this product, please note the FCC ID Label contains the FCC Caution Statement you are looking for. The customer and I decided to format this label in this way to insure that the FCC Caution Statement is acknowledged by the user. I present this as satisfying the FCC rules in place of the manual statement. Could you comment for future reference.
Regards,
Jim Blaha
L. S. Compliance, Inc.

----- Original Message -----
From: Certification Manager <certification@curtis-straus.com>
To: <jblaha@lsr.com>
Sent: Monday, October 09, 2000 1:29 PM
Subject: O82-226038

> Dear Jim,
>
> I have completed my review of the application submitted on behalf of
> NABCO Entrances, Inc. We have the following issues to resolve in order
> to issue the grant.
>
> 1. The letter regarding the lack of manual mentions a manual associated
> with the "transmitter board" which will be supplied with the unit. I
> believe the letter notes that the pulse extender board does not have its
> own manual. I need the manual that is supplied with the combined system
> to submit to the FCC. In particular I will be verifying that the
> caution required by 15.21 is contained in the manual.
>
> 2. Please confirm that the label is permanently attached within the
> meaning of 2.925 (d) (1). Please provide the label construction
> details, i.e. mylar.

>
> 3. Please confirm the data presented in the second table on page 18 of
> the test report is accurate. I think the limit is inflated by the
> averaging factor. For example, the fundamental limit is 74.7, yet the
> table has 81.6uV/m. This leads to a margin which is higher than it
> really is by the averaging factor. For this submission, the data still
> passes, but that might not be the case in your future submissions.
> Also, the selection of emissions that fall within restricted bands
> appears to be overly conservative. Only 1200 and 1500 are within the
> restricted bands, yet the table applies the restricted limits to 600,
> 901, 1200, and 1500MHz.
>
> 4. Please identify the detector used for emissions at specific
> frequencies. You state on page 9 of the test report that both the peak
> and quasi-peak detectors were used, yet I do not see any reason why the
> quasi-peak detector would be required. For this type of 15.231 device a
> peak reading is preferred for all emissions outside of the restricted
> bands (quasi-peak may be used but then the averaging factor cannot be
> taken). For emissions within the restricted bands and below 1000MHz,
> the quasi-peak detector is used. For other restricted band emission a
> peak reading adjusted to average is required.
>
> 5. Please provide evidence (such as an oscilloscope plot) documenting
> the claim that the device ceases to operate in 2 seconds (maximum 5
> seconds allowed) upon release of the switch per 15.231 (a) (1).
>
> Sincerely,
>
> --
> Jon D. Curtis
> Certification Manager
>
> Curtis-Straus LLC
> Telecom Certification Body
> 527 Great Road
> Littleton, MA 01460
> USA
> t:978-486-8880 f:978-486-8828
>
>