U.S. TECH
A TRADITION IN TESTING SERVICES

Friday, March 19, 2004

Mr. Bill Graff
ATCB
6731 Whittier Ave
McLean, VA 22101

Bill,

Below is the response to your letter sent March 2, 2004 for Pegasus Technologies.

FCC ID: QLBPTSS2003LP
I have a few comments on this Application.

1.) No Form 731 has been uploaded with this filing. The only document uploaded to the Form 731 folder at our website is a copy of the Test Report. Please provide a correct Form 731.

Form 731 has been re-uploaded to the Web Site.

2.) The detail presented of the emission during the zero-span timing plots appears to show five discrete bursts. Please explain how this meets the definition of a pseudo-random hop sequence.

The original plot provided was repeated with adjustment to the software control as specified by the manufacturer for a pseudo random hop sequence.. The original data was provided after a 15 second sweep, with the max hold function. The plot provided now has a 10 second sweep, with the same max hold condition.

3.) Please identify the IF bandwidth of the receiver. This is to insure that receivers associated with frequency hopping radios track with the hop sequence of the transmitter.

The IF bandwidth is set by the transceiver IC (XE1202). This is a low IF or 0 IF receiver, whose bandwidth is 200 KHz.

4.) Photos must always be separated into inside views and outside views. This is an FCC requirement and is necessary even if we are looking at a modular approval. Please review your photos and segregate into a complete assembly version (for the outside view), and a disassembled version (for the inside view). Please upload to the ATCB website.

Photos have been uploaded to the ATCB website, in the order you designated.

5.) Another FCC requirement is that the Test Setup Photos must be provided as a separate exhibit. Please provide.

Test Setup Photos have been uploaded as you designated.

6.) Please show the calibration dates for the instrumentation listed in the Test Report.

Calibration dates have been uploaded as part of the revised report.

7.) Section 2.6 of the Test Report. The circuit board is described as using an HLF connector yet the antenna is listed as incorporating a reverse SMA. Please clarify.

The module has an HLF connector, but the pigtail is terminated in a test board that has a reverse SMA connector. The final configuration will provide a pigtail connector terminating in HLF for the module and reverse SMA for the antenna.

8.) The peak power listed in the Test Report (about 16mW) does not match the RF Exposure exhibit (232mW). Please review.

This was a report error. A corrected report has been uploaded.

9.) According to current FCC requirements, it is not appropriate to calculate an MPE distance for the RF Exposure Exhibit. The Commission instead wants MPE estimations to show the appropriate field density at 20cm. Please review.

Due to the report correction, RF exposure limits no longer apply to this unit. I hope this satisfies this information request.

10.) Please review table 4a. 4b and 4c. Why are the second harmonic emissions at approximately 1800MHz for all three tables shown in terms of dBd? This is a field strength measurement at three meters. If these are actually in terms of dBc instead, it is appropriate to include a field strength reading of the carrier.

This data was presented following a format previously accepted under another submittal. It has been revised in the table to show compliance with restricted band frequencies. Even though these frequencies are not in a restricted band, they meet restricted band requirements.

11.) How were the average limits calculated in table 5a, 5b, and 5c for the second harmonic reading?

Incorrectly. We have updated the tables accordingly.

12.) Please expand on the manufacturer supplied data for average time of occupancy per channel during 10 seconds. Provide a detailed calculation if necessary.

Again, this was from a previous template, which required the manufacturer to take the data, since he was unable to provide a means to have us take it. The statement and previous data was inadvertently left on. We have corrected the table to provide the correct value for average time of occupancy.

Thank you for your patience in awaiting this response, and please do not hesitate to contact me for any further clarification.

Sincerely,

Louis A. Feudi
Operations Manager
Acting Engineering Manager