

March 2, 2004

Timothy R. Johnson
Examining Engineer
American TCB, Inc.
6731 Whittier Ave.
McLean, VA 22101

Re: Partial Reply to 2/27/04 comments referenced by Item.

Item 6) The 6 dB bandwidth measurements points do not appear to always be correctly taken. Note that the 6 dB bandwidth must take into account the widest points below the peak, not just at the first 6 dB null.

[Answer to 6\) We believe that the plots still demonstrate compliance with the > 500 kHz limit applicable to this measurement, even though some of the markers were not set as wide as they could have been.](#)

Item 7) It cannot easily be determined if the device meets the new AC conducted emissions limits. The limit shown is the old limit and appears to show a point at 150 kHz that may exceed the new limits. Please provide better information to support the new conducted limits or let us know to proceed with the old limits. This is because the grant will be issued with one of the following grant notes depending on which set of limits it is shown to have met:

Current Limits

NOTE: The manufacture and importation of this device must cease on July 10, 2005 pursuant to 15.37(j) or 18.123 transition provisions adopted under FCC 02-157 (ET Docket 98-80).

Future Limits (CISPR)

NOTE: This device has shown compliance with the conducted emissions limits in 15.107, 15.207, or 18.307 adopted under FCC 02-157 (ET Docket 98-80) and may be marketed after July 11, 2005 and is not affected by the 15.37(j) or 18.123 transition provisions.

[Answer to 7\) It is acceptable to use the following statement on the grant for this product.](#)

Current Limits

[NOTE: The manufacture and importation of this device must cease on July 10, 2005 pursuant to 15.37\(j\) or 18.123 transition provisions adopted under FCC 02-157 \(ET Docket 98-80\).](#)

Item 8) The band edge tests do not appear to list the Internal Rangestar 802.11b Dual Surface-Mount (P/N: 100929) antenna in the data, therefore it is uncertain how these readings are considered applicable. Additionally it is uncertain what antenna was present during radiated spurious emissions testing. Please explain/correct as necessary. Note that the gain of the antenna used in this application appears to be 4.5 dBi, while the bandedge compliance tends to show that the worse case occurred with the dipole antenna.

[Answer to 8\) Please find attached new Band Edge measurement plots for the CISCO MPI350.](#)

We believe that we have address all of your Part 15 related concerns detailed in your 2/27/04 comments. Please let us know if we can provide any further assistance.

Best Regards,
Rod Munro

rmunro@spectrumti.com