

Chris Harvey

From: Jim Nicholson (jimnicho) [jimnicho@cisco.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2005 12:59 PM
To: Chris Harvey; Compliance Certification Services
Cc: Claire Hoque; Christine Vu; Michael Heckrotte
Subject: RE: Cisco Systems, Inc., FCC ID: LDK102058, Assessment NO.: AN05T5120, Notice#2

Chris,

The following parameters were used to measure the Peak Output Power documented in this report:

Span: ~35 MHz
Reference Level: 30 dBm
Attenuation: 40dB Internal (Additional internal attenuation was used rather than the external attenuation suggested in the test procedure)
Sweep Time: Coupled
Resolution Bandwidth: 1 MHz
Video Bandwidth: 3 MHz
Detector: Sample
Trace: Trace Average 100 traces in Power Averaging Mode
Integration BW: =26 dB BW from 26 dB Bandwidth Test Results

Regards,

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Harvey [mailto:Chrisharveyemc@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 5:42 PM
To: Jim Nicholson (jimnicho); 'Compliance Certification Services'
Cc: 'Claire Hoque'; 'Christine Vu'; 'Michael Heckrotte'
Subject: RE: Cisco Systems, Inc., FCC ID: LDK102058, Assessment NO.: AN05T5120, Notice#2

Jim, from the information provided I still have questions regarding the Pt. 90 Peak Output Power compliance. I see that your Peak Output Power test procedure seems to comply with the requirements for power integration over the emission Bandwidth (EBW) from the UNII test guidance provided by the FCC. The plots in the test report lack sufficient detail to determine if the power has been integrated over the entire EBW. I still can not tell if this complies with the RMS power averaging requirements of 90.1215.

Additionally the Peak Power Output procedure states to use a 20dB attenuator; however the example plots in that procedure show a reference level offset of 11.7dB. Please explain this discrepancy.

10/20/2005

Best regards,

Chris Harvey
Chris Harvey EMC Consultants, Inc.
charvey@ieee.org
cell 443-622-3300

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Nicholson (jimnicho) [mailto:jimnicho@cisco.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2005 9:45 AM
To: Compliance Certification Services
Cc: Claire Hoque; Christine Vu; Michael Heckrotte
Subject: RE: Cisco Systems, Inc., FCC ID: LDK102058, Assessment NO.:
AN05T5120, Notice#2

Attached is my updated test report addressing item 2 below. I've also attached the test procedure referenced in my test report (thanks to Mike H. for this).

I believe this addresses all known issues at this time. Please let me know if there are any other pending issues that would prohibit issuing the approval grant for this device.

Thanks,

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Compliance Certification Services [mailto:charvey-tcb@CCSEMC.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2005 4:03 PM
To: Jim Nicholson (jimnicho)
Cc: charvey-tcb@CCSEMC.com
Subject: Cisco Systems, Inc., FCC ID: LDK102058, Assessment NO.:
AN05T5120, Notice#2

Jim, I have continued the review of the FCC Pt. 90 portion of this application and continue to have issues that must be resolved before the review can be completed:

1. The Pt. 90 report and test procedure does not define the Peak Power in terms of RMS equivalent power. Please confirm that the Peak Power Output measured has been measured as a conducted emission over any interval of continuous transmission calibrated in terms of an RMS-equivalent voltage in accordance with FCC 90.1215. (Not adequately addressed from Notice #1 question #5)
2. Although the Substitution Method of measuring the Fieldstrength of Spurious Emissions is mentioned, the EIA/TIA-603 Substitution method is not described nor does the data seem appropriate for Substitution Method. Please provide a measurement method description including the test equipment used and calculation of the limit. (Not adequately addressed from Notice #1 question #3)
3. The collocation radiated spurious emissions (simultaneous transmission) does not seem to be documented in the test report, although the test procedure was provided. Please provide documentation of compliance with the Fieldstrength of Spurious Emissions for the simultaneous transmission conditions.

note: This approval request is for a composite FCC 15.247 and FCC Pt. 90

10/20/2005

Subpart Y device, submitted under 2 applications. Questions pertaining to the FCC 15.247 portion have been adequately addressed except for the simultaneous transmission spurious emissions above. Addressing the issue above will close this open issue.

Best regards,

Chris harvey
charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com

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.

10/20/2005