

**Helen Zhao**

---

**Subject:** FW: Silver Spring Networks, FCC ID: OWS-NIC41, Assessment NO.: AN06T5643, Notice#1



KV2 Internal antenna.pdf



SSN Product Pix.pdf



Silver Spring Networks Agent L...



SSN FCC Rev1 1.doc



ATT4588009.txt



NIC41 Guide Revised.pdf



SSN Modular revised.pdf



KV2 antenna.pdf



SSN RF cond setup.pdf



ATT4588010.txt

From: Thomas Cokenias

Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 3:51 PM

To: Helen Zhao

Subject: Re: Silver Spring Networks, FCC ID: OWS-NIC41, Assessment NO.: AN06T5643, Notice#1

Hello Helen,

Answers follow questions.

Thanks and best regards

Tom

>>

>> Question #1: This device is seeking modular approval, but the  
>> modular approval cover letter and user manual all indicates the  
>> device request professional installation. Based on checklist  
>> provided by FCC, modular approval can not be approved if  
>> professional installation is required. Please address this issue.

ANS 1 The modular approval letter and user manual have been corrected. Corrected versions are attached

>>

>> Question #2: There are two antenna specifications in the filing,  
>> one covers 4.5dBi Maxcad antenna, one covers three Mobile Mark  
>> antennas, please confirm if three mobile mark antennas will be  
>> covered by this filing. Please provide antenna information of 1  
>> dBi electric sheet antenna (show photos, etc.)

ANS 2 Yes, please include the three Mobile Mark antennas under this filing. The electric meter antenna data sheet is attached. The peak gain is actually 0 dBi, cable loss approx 1 dB = -1 dBi effective

>>

>> Question #3: The Product Photos in the filing show two PCB boards,  
>> please indicate clearly which is front view of board #1, which is  
>> back view of board #1, which is front view of board #2, which is  
>> back view of board #2. Please provide additional photos to show  
>> external view when two PCB boards are connected.

ANS 3 Attached please find new product photographs with explanatory captions.

>>

>> Question #4: The modular approval cover letter indicates there is  
>> on board power regulator, "please refer to Block Diagram", but

>> either block diagram or schematics does not show power regulator.  
>> Please check.

ANS 4 I confirmed with the manufacturer that the power regulation is all done in the RF chip, U1 on the schematic

>>  
>> Question #5: The test setup photos - antenna port conducted test  
>> does not even show the EUT. Please explain where is the EUT.

ANS 5 New antenna port conducted test photo is attached with explanatory caption

>>  
>> Question #6: Please clarify tuneable frequency range of this  
>> device. Is it 903.68-926.208MHz (from channel 0 to channel 11)? or  
>> 903.25-925.9 as indicated on first page of the test report? The  
>> low, middle, high channels in the report refer to inconsistent  
>> frequencies. Please clarify.

>>  
ANS 6 Frequency range is 903.680 - 926.208 MHz. Tests were performed on the following channels:

LOW: Ch0 903.680 MHz      MID: Ch 06 915.968 MHz      HIGH:  
Ch 11 926.208 MHz

For all tests these were the center frequencies, verified when using CW test mode setting. Some plots do not have center frequencies that correspond to the chosen frequencies, however, the emissions measured were always from these three channels. A revised test report is attached referencing this information.

>> Question #7: Several issues in test report: Page 34 & 35 low  
>> channel and middle channel TX spurious plots show same fundamental  
>> frequency 911MHz. Page 37 shows max. PSD is 7.19, which does not  
>> agree with the following plots.

>>  
ANS 7 The analyzer has a span of approximately 10 GHz and therefore cannot resolve the frequency difference between LOW and MID channels. The two plots are indeed for different frequencies, even though the analyzer DSP assigns the same value for the fundamental. The spurious emissions are at different frequencies and amplitudes as would be expected for different operating frequencies.

>> Question #8: Please submit an agency authorization letter.

ANS 8 Agency authorization letter attached.

>>  
>> Best Regards,  
>> Helen Zhao

>>  
>> 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 and forfeiture of the  
>> filing fee. 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.