



Memo

No.: memo116
To: Timothy Johnson ATCB.
From: David A. Durfee, Bay Computer Associates, Shawn McMillen Metlabs.
CC: Mary Ellen Heinen,
Date: July 25, 2005
Re: Response to ATCB Comments on 7/24/05 relative to Pepper Wireless Pad FCC submission S5Y1234

Tim

Roland is away for the week and has asked me to handle any required follow-up on this submission. The following is our response to your three comments relayed to us over the weekend by Marianne.

- 1) Was EIRP re-measured by MET. If not, what steps were taken to ensure the device was at maximum power equal to or greater than that measured during EMC testing.

Answer : The EIRP was not re-measured by MET. The conducted power level was controlled though software. The same test codes were used by both test houses in order to set the EUT to its maximum power level. Also, in the previous response, the analytical SAR estimation and the measured SAR, based on the reported EIRP, correlated. Given the two above conditions the confidence level is high that the EUT was set to its maximum power level as reported during the EMC measurements.

- 2) Is the most recent Probe Calibration data provided? The SAR probe calibration > 1 Year. Please explain.

Answer : MET has a two year probe calibration cycle under its A2LA accreditation program.

- 3) It is recommended that the testing addendum be updated to include tabular information regarding the Validation and the results.

Answer : Please see updated supplemental SAR report.



Please do not hesitate if any further information is needed from Shawn or myself.

Regards

David A. Durfee
Bay Computer Associates

Shawn McMillen
Met Laboratories Inc.