



Washington Laboratories, Ltd.

7560 LINDBERGH DRIVE
GAITHERSBURG, MD 20879
(301) 216 - 1500 FAX # (301) 216 - 1590

February 17, 2009

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

RE: Comments of February 13, 2009
APPLICATION: FCC ID: LOBSHH200 & IC: 7955A-SHH200 for Cervis, Inc..

Dear Mr. Fabina:

Below are the comments that you have provided regarding the application for certification referenced above. Our responses to those comments are in ***bold italic***. Many responses refer you to additional exhibit(s) which has been uploaded to the application folder at the ATCB website.

Thank you for your attention. Please feel free to contact us for any additional information that you may require.

Regards,

Steven D. Koster
EMC Operations Manager

WLL Project: 10276

1. The amended equipment label shows the model number of this device as SmaRT 2.4 GHz Handheld but the IC application form lists the model number of this device as SmarRT Handheld. Please revise either the equipment label or the IC application form and all supporting exhibits to show the correct model number of this device.

R. This label is the desired final label. Therefore the application form will be modified and uploaded. Also a cover letter stating that all models mentioned in test report and other documentation correspond to the model name of SmaRT 2.4 GHz Handheld.

2. The equipment shown in the ID label photo exhibit is different from the equipment shown in all the other internal photos. In particular, compare the ID label photo to the photo showing the RF shield on the modular transmitter. For example, in these photos the antennas are different and the component layout is different because there is more distance between the IC and the RF shield on one photo than there is on the other photo. Please explain why these devices appear different or provide the correct photo.

R. We uploaded a photo from the 900MHz unit instead of the 2.4GHz unit in error. We are uploading the correct one now.

3. For Your Information – I fail to understand why Cervis, Inc. is requesting modular approval of this transmitter. Changes to the antenna such as those shown in the photos in item 2 above would require retesting and filing of either a Class II Permissive Change application or making a Class I Permissive Change test report and keeping these records. In my opinion, the layout changes shown in the photos in item 2 would also trigger a retest of the modified device to determine if it still complies with the appropriate limits. That is why I fail to understand the client's insistence on obtaining a modular transmitter approval.

Richard Fabina Examining Engineer

R. Noted. For internal reasons they applicant wishes to stay with their plans of obtaining a modular transmitter approval.