

Barry Quinlan

From: <TTidwell@icomply.com>
To: <DLight@icomply.com>; <jdc@curtis-straus.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2001 7:23 PM
Attach: Modular Approval Request.doc; FCC label requirement.doc; Label.pdf; Processing
Subject: RE: PD92011BWLAN

> -----Original Message-----

> From: David Light
 > Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2001 8:04 AM
 > To: Tom Tidwell
 > Subject: FW: PD92011BWLAN

>
 >
 >

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jon D. Curtis [SMTP:jdc@curtis-straus.com]
 > Sent: Monday, June 25, 2001 4:36 PM
 > To: David Light; Davida Hanson
 > Subject: PD92011BWLAN

>
 >

> Dear David and Davida,

>

> Thank you for your business. I have the following issues to resolve on
 > this one before we proceed to the grant.

>

> 1. The attached public notice has a requirement for a letter to be
 > filed when requesting modular approvals. Eight points from the public
 > notice must be addressed in the letter. I note that you have attempted
 > to address some of them on page 7 of the test report, but I would prefer
 > if you would take them in public notice order within the body of the
 > letter that you will submit requesting modular approval for this
 > device. In addition, I draw your attention to points 5 and 6 of the
 > requirements where I have not been able to establish from the submitted
 > materials that you are in compliance. Point 5 requires that the device
 > be tested outside of any other housing and it appears that you tested
 > inside of a laptop. You may need to avail yourselves of the LMA
 > procedures at the end of the public notice. For point 6, you may find
 > it necessary to tell me more about the label if this product is ever
 > provided to end users already installed in a laptop such that the label
 > on the board is not visible.

[Tom Tidwell] I have attached a letter that addresses each point.

The device actually snaps onto the top of the laptop case and is removable
 by the user. The manufacturer will provide instructions to the OEM when the
 device is sold as a module.

> <<Modular Approval Request.doc>> <<FCC label requirement.doc>>

>

> 2. Can you explain further the configuration change from line conducted
 > to radiated emissions? Line conducted emissions were performed in a
 > system configuration, whereas radiated emissions seems to have been done

> in a minimal configuration which only included the laptop. What is the
> rationale?

[Tom Tidwell] The radiated emissions for the device as an unintentional radiator were tested in the full configuration. Since the radio module was being tested as a stand-alone device, we did not fully configure the PC with peripherals for the intentional (restricted bands) testing. The Powerline conducted emissions test was done when the product was being tested as an unintentional radiator and was fully configured. We simply put the radio into TX mode and repeated the conducted emissions test.

> 3. The label exhibit appears to contain a blank white area on the
> product. We need a drawing or photo of the actual label to be applied
> to the product. In addition, please comment on the label material and
> the adhesive. For modular approval, please address all items in point 6
> of the public notice on modular approvals.

[Tom Tidwell] I am attaching the label. The label is printed with indelible ink and is made of UL approved material since it also serves as the UL label.

> <<Label.pdf>>

>

> 4. I can find no processing gain report in the materials submitted. If
> you wish, I can grant this application without processing gain data
> under the provisional requirements of DA 00-2317. Otherwise, please
> submit a processing gain report.

[Tom Tidwell] <<Processing Gain.xls>>

> --

> Jon D. Curtis, P.E.

>

> Director of Engineering

> Curtis-Straus LLC

>

> One Stop Laboratory for NEBS, EMC,

> Product Safety, and Telecom Testing.

> 527 Great Road

> Littleton, MA 01460 USA

> Voice 978-486-8880 Fax 978-486-8828

> email: jcurtis@curtis-straus.com

> WWW.CURTIS-STRAUS.COM

> << File: modular transmitter approval public notice.PDF >>