From: Nicholas Abbondante  ITS/ES-Box
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2001 10:36 AM
To:  Roland Gubisch  ITS/ES-Box
Cc:  Scott Lambert  ITS/ES-Box; Danielle Gravelle  ITS/ES-Box
Subject:  RE: BodyMedia FCC ID: PV8-909901G01REVD
Answers interspersed

-----Original Message-----
From: Roland Gubisch  ITS/ES-Box
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2001 6:17 PM
To:  Nicholas Abbondante  ITS/ES-Box
Cc:  Scott Lambert  ITS/ES-Box; Danielle Gravelle  ITS/ES-Box
Subject:  BodyMedia FCC ID: PV8-909901G01REVD

Nick:

Technical review of this application for the "monitor" or "armband" is complete, and we note the following:

1) I cannot find a letter from the client designating the confidential exhibits, and justifying them. Please point me to it, or provide.

No confidentiality requested.  Form 731 already reflects this.

2) The device has a short-form FCC ID label. Its use is justified, but the 15.19(a)(3) text normally included in the label must then appear in the user manual verbatim. I cannot find the text anywhere. Somewhat similar text occurs on p.46, but that is not sufficient. The text of 15.19(a)(3) should probably be located on p. 46.

Review manual page 48 and let me know if the text there is acceptable.

3) It does not appear that this transmitter has a  direct connection to the PC. Rather, it is connected to the PC through its cradle. The cradle is both a transmitter and a PC peripheral. As a peripheral to a peripheral, the armband should be tested standalone unless its cradled configuration is the worst-case configuration. Please comment.

You are correct.  The armband is a peripheral to a peripheral.  It was tested in conjunction with the cradle because they talk to each other, and that was how I decided to exercise the unit.  The cradle is a PC peripheral and therefore was tested simultaneously in a typical configuration.

4) The transmitter should have been tested per 15.33 to the 10th harmonic, or 9.16 GHz. The test report does not appear to reflect that this was done. Specific supporting text should be added, unless already in place.

The radiated emissions scan was performed to ~9.5 GHz.  No emissions of note were detected.  I will amend the report and resubmit to reflect the full test range.

5) It is not clear how the armband emissions were separated from the base emissions during testing, as both are transmitters. Please comment.

The configuration of the units had the armband talking 50% of the time and the cradle talking 50% of the time.  This effectively exercises both the transmit and receive modes of both devices simultaneously.

Roland