



American Telecommunications Certification Body Inc.  
6731 Whittier Ave, McLean, VA 22101

February 27, 2003

RE: WavelP Ltd.

FCC ID: QQ2-GA24

I have a few comments on the above referenced Application.

- 1) The original test report and users manual lists 2 antennas that information was not been received on (36010/HN/NV, 36428/NH/NV). Please provide this information. Note: if these are of the same type antenna as the MA-WC24-6X and MA-WC24-5X antennas, since the gain is equal to or less than the MA-WC24-6X antenna, further testing with these antennas will not be necessary.
- 2) The original test report lists a model MTI 364023/N antenna. The users manual does not list this antenna, nor has information been provided on this antenna. Therefore evaluation of this antenna regarding any necessary testing requirements has not been done. Please comment or provide further information for this antenna.
- 3) The antenna information previously provided listed a 17 dBi gain parabolic dish antenna model 18T-2400-1 which was included in the information for the 26T-2400-1. This antenna does not appear to be listed in the test report or manual. If this antenna was used, it would require testing since the device would operate at full power (the other model tested required a reduction in power). Please confirm this antenna is not going to be used.
- 4) Appendix C shows a +24 dBi gain antenna without any reduction in power. Please explain when your previous response confirmed that no combination of antennas/power would exceed +36 dBi (this is also given in users manual section 2.4.3.2 and appendix D).
- 5) Appendix C should clearly list the requirements for all antennas. Only 10 antennas have been shown. This device is being approved with 15 (or 16 antennas, depending on #2 above). If this has been consolidated based on antenna gain, please note that +14 dBi and +23 dBi antennas were not included in this table and that +24 dBi was listed twice.
- 6) Regarding the new RF exposure exhibit provided. Please either add a explanation that the output EIRP will never exceed +36 dBi for any antenna combination used, therefore the above calculations are representative for worse case RF exposure conditions for all antennas that may be used.
- 7) The test reports reference antenna's by type and gain. Please provide an entire list of all antennas being approved, including type, gain, model number, and manufacturer, which specific models were tested, and also the classification of the antenna (mobile or fixed). Note that currently if all antennas meet +36 dBi, then they may all be classified as mobile.
- 8) The new test report shows 5 antennas. Please explain which configuration was present for the original test report.
- 9) Please confirm the RBW and VBW settings used for final measurements in the new test report for both Peak and Average measurements.
- 10) Please explain why the data on plot B17 (page 28 of 175) is much higher than the data reported on page 7 of 175. Assuming the final measurement used a larger RBW and the fact that the peak is not at the edge of the plot suggests the final measurement should have been higher.
- 11) Plot B35 appears to show a reading at approximately 40 MHz over the limit. Please explain.
- 12) The new test report for appears to show that most of the measurements were made with the horn antenna positioned in the vertical polarity. The test photographs it appears that some TX antennas were positioned in vertical polarity, while others were positioned in horizontal polarity during the test. Please note that both horizontal and vertical polarity should have been checked. Please comment if this was checked for each configuration.

--- Continued on Next Page ---

- 13) Please explain how this system plans to be installed with co-located antennas given only one output for the device. In order to help address co-location concerns, complete information must be provided (and ultimately will need to be addressed in the users manual) that includes a complete list of what antennas may be co-located (assumed for some directional antennas), what antenna may not be located (assumed to be all omni-directional antennas), and their specific setup configurations must be known to adequately address RF exposure issues. Please explain if a "site" is expected to consist of multiple EUT's as given in this application or are other types of transmitters also involved. Please provide information regarding the specific arrangement of antennas expected, distance from each other, etc. Also, a complete explanation of how the system meets the requirement of 15.247(b)(3)(iii) must be addressed. Also note that prior to this point, co-location has not been addressed in the RF exposure requirements.
- 14) FYI. Proposed Grant Comments To Be Determined.



Timothy R. Johnson  
Examining Engineer

[mailto: tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com](mailto:tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com)

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information may result in application termination. Correspondence should be considered part of the permanent submission and may be viewed from the Internet after a Grant of Equipment Authorization is issued.

Please do not respond to this correspondence using the email reply button. In order for your response to be processed expeditiously, you must submit your documents through the AmericanTCB.com website. 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 sender.