

From: Dward ATCB [dward@atcb.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 7:38 PM
To: Rod Thorne; dhilliard@wrf.com
Cc: Eugene Schlindwein
Subject: RE: SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2

Attachments: KL7-676T-V1 15-231 grant reprint.pdf; KL7-676T-V1 15-240 grant reprint.pdf;
2404A-676T IC certificate.pdf

Hi Rod

Attached are the FCC grants and the IC cert.

Also, below is an excerpt from an IC email dealing with the IC label that is to be on a device.

The company who is the applicant for the certification of a product must put on the label, their company name, the

certification number and the model number on the label. When I say model number, I mean the model number (name)

which was chosen by the company for certification purposes and which was on the Appendix I of RSP-100.

This doesn't mean that the company cannot have another marketing name for their product and put it on the packaging and on the product itself.

Example:

Company "ABCD Telephone" has a product called "Super Telephone" (marketing name).

They have obtained certification with certification number "9999A-SPTTEL" and the model number is "SPT001".

This is what they must do:

On the label of the product they must put "ABCD Telephone", "9999A-SPTTEL", and "SPT001".

Additionally, if they want to have the marketing name "Super Telephone" on the packaging and on the product, they can.

Thanks

Dennis Ward

Evaluation Engineer

American TCB

Certification Resource for the Wireless Industry www.atcb.com

703-847-4700 fax 703-847-6888

direct - 703-880-4841

cell - 209-769-8316

NOTICE: This E-Mail message and any attachment may contain privileged or company proprietary information. If you received this message in error, please return to the sender.

From: Rod Thorne [mailto:rthorne@savi.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 4:00 PM
To: Dward ATCB; dhilliard@wrf.com
Cc: Eugene Schlindwein
Subject: RE: SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2

Dear Dennis:

Page 6 of the FCC letter states the following:

“Fixed UHF Readers equipped to operate under Section 15.240 will be installed and configured by factory-trained service personnel in locations that comply with the Section 15.240 site and registration requirements. In all other locations, Tag operations will default to modes that comply with Section 15.231 as detailed above.”

This means that the Reader controls the tag, which will not operate as a 15.240 device unless it is queried by a Registered 15.240 Reader at listed locations. Tags are obviously mobile devices and we satisfied the FCC that the control functions reside in the Reader which is network-enabled only at a registered location. We will include the user notifications in our new Reader Manual, when we declare our readers to 15.240, which we have not yet done. Until we do, this tag will operate only at 15.231 with the existing infrastructure.

The FCC themselves have been trying to decide how to obtain, record, and transmit the installation location information to the NTIA. For the moment, they have told us just to e-mail it to one of their appointed staff who will maintain the data base.

So this issue has indeed been addressed during our long discussions with the OET since June.

Hope this information is satisfactory.

Regards,
Rod

From: Dward ATCB [mailto:dward@atcb.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 3:23 PM
To: Rod Thorne; dhilliard@wrf.com
Subject: RE: SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2

Hi Rod

The grant and IC is being completed as I type. One question that has come up is how do you address 15.240(f) which states “As a condition of the grant, the grantee of an equipment authorization for a device operating under the provisions of this section shall provide information to the user concerning compliance with the operational restrictions in paragraphs (a) and (e) of this section. As a further condition, the grantee shall provide information on the locations where the devices are installed to the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology, which shall provide this information to the Federal Government through the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.”

If this is in the manual I could not find it. Perhaps Savi can provide a separate sheet with this info quickly.

Thanks

Dennis Ward
Evaluation Engineer

American TCB

Certification Resource for the Wireless Industry www.atcb.com

703-847-4700 fax 703-847-6888

direct - 703-880-4841

cell - 209-769-8316

NOTICE: This E-Mail message and any attachment may contain privileged or company proprietary information. If you received this message in error, please return to the sender.

From: Rod Thorne [mailto:rthorne@savi.com]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2005 8:53 AM

To: dhilliard@wrf.com; dward@atcb.com

Subject: FW: SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2

Dear Dennis:

It's unfortunate we didn't handle the question about 231(e) yesterday when we had Julie on the phone. He is now out of the office for a while, so I don't know when you will now receive an answer to the follow-up question.

I'm copying David in case he has any insights to offer you.

Regards,

Rod

From: Dward ATCB [mailto:dward@atcb.com]

Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2005 5:28 PM

To: Rod Thorne; 'Mark Briggs'

Subject: FW: SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2

Hi Ron / Mark

Please review the attached letter from the FCC and compare it with the actual filing to verify that this is indeed what was agreed.

Also, I have an email into Julius Knapp on an issue. He did not include 15.231(e) in the letter and I wanted to make absolutely sure that the FCC was onboard with all three.

Thanks

Dennis Ward

Evaluation Engineer

American TCB

Certification Resource for the Wireless Industry www.atcb.com

703-847-4700 fax 703-847-6888

direct - 703-880-4841

cell - 209-769-8316

NOTICE: This E-Mail message and any attachment may contain privileged or company proprietary information. If you received this message in error, please return to the sender.

From: Julius Knapp [mailto:Julius.Knapp@fcc.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2005 2:47 PM

To: DWard@ATCB.com

Cc: RPetit@WRF.com; DHilliard@WRF.com; Rashmi Doshi; Joe Dichoso

Subject: SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2

<<SAVI PUBLIC JK Letter2.doc>>

Dennis: Here is the letter we discussed in our teleconference this afternoon. As I stated over the phone, we have determined that the operations described in the letter are permissible. We expect to send a formal response confirming this shortly, but in the meantime there is no reason to hold up action on the application for certification provided it is consistent with the description in the letter and meets the relevant technical requirements. Thanks, Julius Knapp, Deputy Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology