



Mr. Bill Caton, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 "M" Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

APR 25 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL FCC MAIL ROOM

Re: Comments on Report No. DC-95-28, ET Docket 95-19

C & C Laboratory is an independent EMC testing laboratory located in Northern California and was founded in 1986. At present our staff runs about 40 people full time.

Currently we are listed with the FCC, VCCI and have been audited to EN45000 by three different European competent bodies and have been accepted as an EMC subcontractor for Underwriters Laboratory.

The electronic industry has awoken to the point of just becoming aware that EMC problems in the field are real and costly.

Europe has become the world leader for developing standards which products should be in compliance with to help eliminate some of the EMC problems.

The European countries have national standards just as the USA has the FCC standards. These national regulations are not always in harmony with each other, meaning that compliance with one country doesn't guarantee compliance with another country. The industry has voiced for many years that they would like to see the FCC to become more compatible, or in harmony with the European countries to reduce their cost of testing. The industry has also voiced its concern over the problem of not all European countries accepting each others national standards. For a product aimed at the world wide market, compliance is a major problem even when the product passes all the requirements. Not only are there different types of tests but the paper work and approvals is a full time job in itself.

The FCC has stated they will accept CISPR 22B data taken at 10 meters and reference to the CISPR limit, but FCC wants the C63.4 configuration. CISPR calls out a procedure that resembles the old FCC MP-4 procedure. This shows us that the FCC is trying to harmonize but at this time we still see these as two different tests.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

The European countries have formed what is known as the European Union (EU), which has developed the EMC Directive 89/336/EEC. Starting January 1, 1996 only the EMC Directive will be used eliminating the national standards, which also eliminates the need to retest in different European countries.

In paragraph 12 of ET Docket No. 95-19 it states that the FCC sees a growing interest in the international harmonization of standards and it further states that the FCC believes that this proposed DoC plan would advance the possibility that the U.S. product approvals for personal computers and their associated peripherals may one day be accepted throughout the world. I take this statement where it mentions throughout the world to include Europe. At this time the way I see the European approvals going, they will not accept anything less than their own requirements.

There will always be small companies manufacturing products intended for the U.S. market only. Most American companies small and large are developing products intended to be sold on the world market. This means they will need to meet the U.S. compliance requirements as well as the European requirements. For the most part a product meeting the European requirements will also meet the U.S. requirements, but the reverse is not true.

If the FCC truly wishes to become in harmony some day in the compliance world with other countries and feels that they must do something at this present time like the DoC plan to decrease their work load, then I recommend the following slow but positive move for the FCC to take which can be a win for all parties:

Standards

At this time the FCC has only concerns for radiated and conducted emissions. Keep these concerns but adopt the European standards that cover this area only.

A company with a U.S. only type product still needs to be in compliant, but only with the emission standards. This company doesn't need to go through the time and cost of doing all the other tests required by another country.

A company with a product that is going to be marketed world wide needs to meet world wide compliance requirements, even if the FCC decides to drop compliance testing altogether.

By accepting the European standards of concern, this type of product once in compliance with the European requirements would also meet the FCC requirements. There would be no additional testing needed, therefore the compliance time would be shortened, decreasing the over all cost and time to market. Later in time the FCC can adopt other if not all parts of the European standards. Most of the industry would not feel the cost due to the fact they would already be testing to these standards.

Lab Accreditation

From time to time over the years conversation about NVLAP accreditation has come up in meetings. I have yet to hear anyone say anything good about this accreditation program. To make my point clear, paragraph 9 even states that out of approximately 500 labs listed with the FCC less than two dozen labs are currently accredited to NVLAB for FCC testing. If the industry thought that having NVLAB accreditation was necessary they would have required it of labs long ago.

As stated earlier most companies are looking at the world market for their products and they need testing that meets world wide compliance standards. Europe is the leader in these standards and they do not recognize NVLAB as someone to oversee a lab accreditation program.

Test labs like ourselves are setup to meet and serve the needs of our clients efficiently both in time and cost. I'm told that for small labs to bring in NVLAB could cost around \$5000 and for labs like ours around \$20,000 to \$30,000, plus annual fees. For the present bringing NVLAB in the picture will only increase the cost of testing, which will be past on to the industry.

If FCC feels that NVLAB is needed then I would like to ask that the FCC include alternative accreditation programs such as one that Europe recognizes. As I mentioned in the beginning of this letter we have been audited to EN45000 by not one but three different European competent bodies and listed as an EMC subcontractor for U.L. I don't care for the idea of one more auditor coming in and having to jump through more hoops, and hear our clients complain about the increase in cost to cover NVLAB expenses.

More than once FCC has stated that they not only have concern to control the interference from computing devices but concern for the cost and time that the industry must go through in order to meet current compliant requirements.

If the FCC really cares about these problems then adopting the European standards is the most efficient way to go for the industry as a whole.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kent L. Chesley".

Kent L. Chesley
C & C Labs, President