Washington Laboratories, Ltd.

7560 LINDBERGH DRIVE
GAITHERSBURG, MD 20879
(301) 417 – 0220 FAX # (301) 417 - 9069

May 11, 2004

Mr. Tim Johnson
American Telecommunications Certification Body Inc.
6731 Whittier Ave
McLean, VA 22101

RE: Comments of April 29, 2004
APPLICATION: RZC-WDMX Blast Technology ApS

Dear Mr. Johnson:

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,

Gregory M. Snyder
Chief EMC Engineer, Wireless/Telco Services Manager

Brian J. Dettling
Documentation Specialist WLL Project: 8033

---

1) Please explain the P/N designator in the modular approval letter. This does not appear to match anything in the block diagram, schematic, or parts list. Additionally, why is the same part number listed for the buffered input and the regulator? These are typically separate components.

R.. The letter has been corrected to indicate the PCMCIA card in place of the part number. Please see exhibit "Modular Request Letter 2.pdf".

2) The FCC label is not clear enough to easily read. Please provide a higher resolution label.

R. An improved graphic has been obtained from the applicant. Please see exhibit "WDMX Label Hi-Res.pdf".

3) The operational description describes the EUT as a router. Please explain.

R. The reference to the router is only a nomenclature used within the theory of operation. The operational description is from Zcomax and was used for their previously approved PCMCIA card (FCC ID: RWQ-CPE2).

4) Note that the equipment code for this type of device is typically DTS, not DSS.

R. The Form 731 has been changed to the correct DTS equipment code. Please see exhibit "WDMZ Form 731 Rev 1.pdf".

5) Please note that the FCC no longer desires that the safe distance for mobile devices be calculated in the RF exposure exhibit if the safe distance is < 20 cm, but instead prefers the power density results to be calculated at 20cm and compared to the power density limit. Please remove references to distance.

R. The references to the minimum safe distance have been removed from the MPE calculations. Please see exhibit "Blast FCC MPE Report Rev1.pdf".

6) Schematics must show component values, not just reference designators. Please provide new schematics with the component values shown.

R. The schematics are from Zcomax for their previously approved PCMCIA card (FCC ID: RWQ-CPE2). Additionally, AmericanTCB approved the same exhibit under FCC ID: QGK-DT100, and FCC ID: HD588352. No other schematics are available.

7) The application is for a modular approval. However, a manual for end use device was provided. Please provide the manufactures integrator manual for the PCMCIA Card. This manual must provide instructions to the integrator on how to maintain compliance, label the device, etc. We have provided sample manual information as an attachment. Note this information may require rewording as necessary. Additionally, please note that the end use manual provided stated a 35 cm separation distance. This should have been 20 cm as a mobile device.

R. The applicant has supplied their installation guide (with the correct separation distance indicated). Please see exhibit "Blast_OEM_QuickStartGuide.pdf".

8) It can not be determined if the power meter was in calibration or not during the test. Please verify test date vs. calibration due date.

R. The incorrect due date was listed in the test report. The HP438A (Asset # 00394) was sent for calibration on 3/10/2004 and returned on 3/11/2004 with a new calibration due date of 3/10/2005.

9) The marker does not appear to be placed on the highest emission in the restricted band for Figure 3-20. Please explain and/or correct as necessary.

R. The emission to the left of where the marker is placed on Figure 3-20 is an ambient signal. Evaluation was performed to verify that this emission is not generated by the EUT.