(b) (6)

From: Hanna, Tania <thanna@harris.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 6:13 PM
To: Bruce Romano
Cc: (b) (6) Rashmi Doshi
Subject: FW: FCC response on Intended Operations

Hi Bruce,

Just want to make you aware of the question below we received regarding the application for the Sting Fish. I know many of these questions are generated automatically but it sounds as if there is some confusion about the purpose of the equipment authorization application. As you may recall, the purpose is only to provide state/local law enforcement officials with authority to utilize this equipment in emergency situations. We plan on responding by providing a copy of one of briefings to OET outlining the history (4 years now) of the process and OET's decision to have us submit an equipment authorization application. Also, we have slides outlining the operation of the equipment. I just don't want the application to be dismissed because someone may not be knowledgeable of the process. Hope this makes sense.

Please let me know how you'd like to proceed.
Best Regards,
Tania Hanna
Harris Corp

Question from FCC:

1) Additional details about intended operations within FCC licensed radio services as follows are also needed to faciliate continued OET-Lab application review and processing. As we understand this device transmits in e.g. (b) (4) from (b) (4) Other typical licensed operations use (b) (4) (b) (4) (b) (4) seems unique and not typical. Given that the basic purpose of FCC-OET Certification equipment authorization is to identify equipment acceptable for licensing, please explain how (b) (4) licensing for this unique operation is intended to be handled / applicable [47 CFR 1.903(c), etc.].

(b) (6)

From: Hanna, Tania <thanna@harris.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 5:07 PM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi
Subject: FW: FCC response on Intended Operations
Attachments: Submitted RayFish Intended Use and Operational Description Clarification.zip

Hi (b) (6)
I wanted to make sure you saw this. This was formally submitted through ULS as well. We addressed the two major issues that you raised—the labeling issue and the intended use/operations issue. Please let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.

Regards,
Tania Hanna
Harris Corp
202-729-3712 office
703-472-6657 cell

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 10:56 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc:
Subject: grant condition(s) - RE: FCC response on Intended Operations

(b) (5)

FYI I see at least SL filing in cover letter does show their requested / suggested grant condition:

> Harris Corporation ("Harris") requests that the Federal Communications Commission ("Commission") condition the grant of the equipment authorization application identified as FCC ID NK73092523 based on the language cited below. Harris has agreed with the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") to request that the Commission condition its equipment authorization for the StingRay® product in order to address concerns over the proliferation of surreptitious law enforcement surveillance equipment.
> *Requested Condition Language:*
> *"State and local law enforcement agencies must advance coordinate with the FBI for the acquisition and use of the equipment authorized under this Certification."*

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

[redacted]

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 6:13 PM
To: Bruce Romano
Cc: (b) (6) Rashmi Doshi
Subject: FW: FCC response on Intended Operations

Hi Bruce,

Just want to make you aware of the question below we received regarding the application for the Sting Fish. I know many of these questions are generated automatically but it sounds as if there is some confusion about the purpose of the equipment authorization application. As you may recall, the purpose is only to provide state/local law enforcement officials with authority to utilize this equipment in emergency situations. We plan on responding by providing a copy of one of briefings to OET outlining the history (4 years now) of the process and OET's decision to have us submit an equipment authorization application. Also, we have slides outlining the operation of the equipment. I just don't want the application to be dismissed because someone may not be knowledgeable of the process. Hope this makes sense.

Please let me know how you'd like to proceed.
Best Regards,
Tania Hanna
Harris Corp

Question from FCC:

1) Additional details about intended operations within FCC licensed radio services as follows are also needed to faciliate continued OET-Lab application review and processing. As we understand this device transmits in e.g. (b) (4) from (b) (4) Other typical licensed operations use (b) (4) (b) (4) (b) (4) seems unique and not typical. Given that the basic purpose of FCC-OET Certification equipment authorization is to identify equipment acceptable for licensing, please explain how (b) (4) icensing for this unique operation is intended to be handled / applicable [47 CFR 1.903(c), etc.].

(b) (6)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

[redacted]

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 11:54 AM
To: Rashmi Doshi; Bruce Romano
Subject: FW: Follow Up
Importance: High

Just a quick recap:

1. All the applications have been filed formally within ULS.
2. The outstanding issue is the status of the confidentiality requests.
3. We are working on revising the confidentiality requests pursuant to our last call in December.
4. The above documents represent Harris's revisions of the requests pursuant to those calls. These documents will be filed for all of the applications once we all agree that this comports with what we discussed.

Please let us know ASAP if this is acceptable and we will move forward with revising the remaining confidentiality requests.

Best Regards,
Tania

From: Morris, Evan
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 5:14 PM
To: Hanna, Tania; (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Follow Up
Importance: High

Dear (b) (6) [redacted]

Attached are the modified unzipped exhibits and four lists containing the requested confidential treatment of documents that have been submitted to the FCC (both correspondence and exhibits). If you have any questions or problems opening the files please let me know.

Regards,

Evan Morris

Evan S. Morris, Esq.
Harris Corporation

Counsel, Government Relations
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
Suite 850E
Washington, D.C. 20024
O: (202) 729-3702
(b) (6)
evan.morris@harris.com

http://www.harris.com

From: Hanna, Tania
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 10:18 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: Morris, Evan
Subject: Fw: Follow Up

(b) (6)
I will ask Evan Morris to email them to you in non-zip format.
Thanks,
Tania

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 10:13 AM
To: Hanna, Tania; Rashmi Doshi <Rashmi.Doshi@fcc.gov>; Bruce Romano <Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Hi Tania,
We never received the exhibits. Can you please resend in non-zip file format?
Thanks,
(b) (6)

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6) Bruce Romano
Subject: FW: Follow Up
Importance: High

Dear FCC Team,
Please see below. We have resubmitted the exhibits for NK73100176. If this looks acceptable to you—we will refile for the remaining applications.

Many thanks,
Tania

From: Gutowski, Stanley
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2011 5:35 PM
To: 'rashmi.doshi@fcc.gov'; 'Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov'; (b) (6)
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Morris, Evan; Hanna, Tania
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Dear Bruce, (b) (6) Dr. Doshi,

Prior to the holidays, we submitted revised exhibits for NK73100176 incorporating the changes discussed in the December 9, 2010 conference call. Please let us know if you had any difficulty receiving the attachments to the email sent on December 21, 2010. We look forward to your response on these changes.

This email is in response to the second action identified during the December 9th conference call. Specifically, the Commission requested a list of correspondence for Confidential treatment. Attached are four lists containing our request for confidential treatment for responses to Commission correspondence. For purposes of completeness we have also included in these lists our requested confidential treatment of all other submitted exhibits. Our requested confidential treatment of each document has been divided into three categories under the header "Action Requested":

1. Return Document- Harris requests the document be returned as it will either be replaced in the near future (i.e., revised RF Reports, Test Reports and ID Labels) or has already been replaced by a revised version.
2. Hold as Confidential- Harris requests the document, in its entirety, be retained by the Commission and withheld from public disclosure.
3. Needs to be Redacted- Harris requests permission to redact a portion of the document pursuant to the parameters outlined in our December 9th conference call. Specifically, removal of product names, protocol references, Harris Wireless Products Group references, and statements related to Confidentiality, ITAR, and Title 18 restrictions. Following redaction the document can be made publicly available.

Best Regards,

Stan Gutowski

From: Gutowski, Stanley
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2010 3:02 PM
To: 'rashmi.doshi@fcc.gov'; 'Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov'; (b) (6)
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Morris, Evan; Hanna, Tania
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Bruce (b) (6) Dr. Doshi,

In follow-up from the December 9th conference call, we revised the FCC Label, RF Exposure and Test Report exhibits for NK73100176 to provide a sample of the changes discussed. Please find the attached zip files containing the original exhibits and modified exhibits. If you agree with these changes, we will proceed with the exhibit modifications on the other applications (NK73092523, NK73166210, NK73186795) and submit according to your instructions.

Here is a summary of the changes incorporated in the modified exhibits:

- All: Removed references to product names and protocols (GSM, CDMA)
- All: Removed Confidential, Title 18 and ITAR statements
- FCC Label Exhibit: Replaced equipment pictures with box diagrams.
- Test Reports: Removed equipment photos. These are duplicates of the photos submitted in the Test Setup exhibit.
- Test Reports: Replaced Spectrum Analyzer plots with new plots utilizing additional averaging

As requested, we generated a Confidential addendum to the Operational Description exhibit containing the original Spectrum Analyzer plots and several equipment photos removed from the Test Reports.

We look forward to your response. Have a Happy Holidays.

Best Regards,

Stan Gutowski

From: Hanna, Tania
Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2010 7:44 AM
To: 'rashmi.doshi@fcc.gov'; 'Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov'
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Gutowski, Stanley; (b) (6)
Subject: Re: Follow Up

Dr. Doshi: here is a summary. We need to discuss correspondence.

1) Test Reports· Remove references to product names. Reference by FCC ID instead.· Remove "Confidential – Not for Public Inspection" statements· Remove product photos. These are duplicates of photos submitted in Test Setup Photo exhibit.· Remove spectrum analyzer plots

2) RF Exposure Reports

- Remove references to product names. Reference by FCC ID instead.
- Remove "Confidential – Not for Public Inspection" statements· Remove Title 18 and ITAR statements

3) FCC Label Exhibit

- Remove references to product names. Reference by FCC ID instead.· Remove "Confidential – Not for Public Inspection" statements· Remove Title 18 and ITAR statements· Replace product pictures with generic box diagrams

---

From: Rashmi Doshi [mailto:Rashmi.Doshi@fcc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 03:55 PM
To: Hanna, Tania; Bruce Romano <Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov>
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Gutowski, Stanley; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Hanna,

We can have a conference call around 10 AM tomorrow (Thursday). It would be useful if you can outline your proposal prior to that so that we can have a chance to look at the filings.

Thanks,

Rashmi Doshi

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 12:19 PM

To: Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Gutowski, Stanley
Subject: Follow Up

Bruch and Dr. Doshi,

Thank you so much for following up with us yesterday. My apologies about having to drop off the call. We have been having numerous discussions regarding the issues you raised and we believe we have a path by which to move the process forward. Is it possible to arrange another call at your convenience to discuss what we have in mind?

Please let me know what date/time work best for you and I'll arrange something.

Many thanks,

Tania Hanna

Harris Corp

(b) (6)

202-729-3712 direct

(b) (6)

From: Morris, Evan <emorri05@harris.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 3:40 PM
To: (b) (6) Rashmi Doshi
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

(b) (6)

Yes. I have also been working with Stanley on processing those submissions via OET's website. We have already received and submitted 2 rounds of requests for additional information and submitted responses and requested attachments. He is currently working on a third round that we received yesterday.

-Evan

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 3:38 PM
To: Morris, Evan; (b) (6) Rashmi Doshi
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Hello Evan,
We will send future correspondences to Stanley Gutowski. Will he be submitting replies to pending requests for additional information?
Thanks,
(b) (6)

From: Morris, Evan [mailto:emorri05@harris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 3:21 PM
To: (b) (6) Rashmi Doshi
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Dear (b) (6)

I just wanted to let you know we have worked with Timco and have submitted letters under all four equipment authorizations as advised below. Thank you for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions please let me know.

All the best,
Evan Morris

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2010 8:44 AM
To: (b) (6) Morris, Evan
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Hi Evan,

By requesting the emails that Timco received we were attempting to verify that Timco wasn't erroneously getting automated emails. When an application is filed by a TCB the TCB gets automated notifications. For applications such as these which are submitted for FCC approval, the individual FCC reviewer makes a determination for each information request they send, which recipients they want to send it too. Any of the contacts listed on the Form 731 are eligible recipients. Timco provided one example of an email they received and it was not an automated FCC email but a manually generated email.

Typically when there is a technical testing related question on an application, the information is requested from the testing lab. Other contacts are also sent the request to ensure it is received. If you are requesting that this procedure should not be followed for the pending applications on file, a cover letter needs to be submitted in the filings indicating that all information requests should go through the applicant and not the testing lab or other Form 731 contacts. The request needs to include how the technical questions will be answered. Please let us know when that is done.

Thanks,
(b) (6)

From: Morris, Evan [mailto:emorri05@harris.com]
Sent: Monday, June 07, 2010 3:07 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Dear (b) (6)

I have been notified that Timco has provided you an example (or perhaps since I was notified several more examples) of e-mails that they have been receiving connected with our four equipment authorization applications. I wanted to follow-up to see if submitting an attachment amending Harris' FCC Form 731 is still necessary, or if this can be resolved through other means.

Thank you for your help on this matter.

All the best,
Evan Morris

From: Morris, Evan
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 1:09 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Certainly.

-Evan

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 11:25 AM

To: Morris, Evan
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Dear Evan,
Can you have Timco forward what they received to me so I can verify that they are only receiving manually generated emails and not automated emails.
Thanks
(b) (6)

From: Morris, Evan [mailto:emorri05@harris.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 10:38 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Dear (b) (6)

Thank you for that clarification. However, through our communications with Timco they have informed us that they have been receiving all correspondence e-mails regarding our EA application (i.e., notifications of submissions and other FCC correspondences). Timco has requested that they be removed from general correspondences and only be contacted regarding questions concerning the testing of the equipment. We have drafted a letter to submit to amend our Form 731 to remove their e-mail address from the section entitled 'Test Firm'. Is this not necessary or the proper means of resolving Timco's request? Please advise.

Regards,
Evan Morris

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:01 AM
To: Morris, Evan; (b) (6)
Cc: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Just to clarify, as these are EA filings and not TCB filings Timco only gets emails when the FCC reviewer manually selects Timco as contact. Automated emails to the TCB only go out for TCB filed applications.

From: Morris, Evan [mailto:emorri05@harris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 10:15 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

(b) (6)

Thank you for getting back to me. I will work Timco to submit an attachment to the application making the relevant request.

All the best,
Evan Morris

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 10:38 AM
To: (b) (6) Morris, Evan

Cc: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Correspondence E-mail List

Hello Evan,
Since the application's are pending, you need to submit an attachment to the applications requesting that the changes be made.
Regards,
(b) (6)

From: Morris, Evan [mailto:emorri05@harris.com]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2010 11:19 AM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: Correspondence E-mail List

Dear (b) (6)

Below are the four FCC IDs in which the testing firm, Timco Engineering has requested that we remove their e-mail (info@timcoengr.com) from the FCC's correspondence list on these applications. These e-mails are going to Timco's general inquiry mailbox and they do not want receive e-mails at that address every time documents are uploaded, modifications are made to the application, or information not related to the testing of the equipment is sent. Any assistance you can provide in resolving this matter would be greatly appreciated.

All the best,
Evan Morris

	FCC ID	Form 731 Confirmation Number
StingRay	**NK73092523**	**EA994680**
KingFish	**NK73100176**	**EA504770**
StingRay II	**NK73166210**	**EA580451**
2100/1700 Converter	**NK73186795**	**EA674946**

Evan S. Morris, Esq.
Harris Corporation
Legal Analyst, Government Relations
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
Suite 850E
Washington, D.C. 20024
O: (202) 729-3702
(b) (6)
evan.morris@harris.com

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2010 2:12 PM
To: (b) (6) 'Hanna, Tania'; Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: FCC response on Intended Operations

Tania,
To clarify, make sure all filings are updated regarding the labeling and show where the label will be located on the device.
Also, don't forget the information on each device per below.

"A short description on who will be using the device, in what type of operation(public safety, emergencies…) and basic description on how it works such as, it works like a base station but is not permanently fixed and will be placed at the location of the emergency. Or something like that. "

Thanks,
(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2010 9:52 AM
To: 'Hanna, Tania'; Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: FCC response on Intended Operations

Tania Thanks. Can you or Stanley please update all the filings?
(b) (6)

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2010 9:38 AM
To: (b) (6) Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi
Subject: Re: FCC response on Intended Operations

(b) (6)
We are going to put it on the box and rely on confidentiality request to protect equipment.

Thanks (b) (6)
Tania

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6) Hanna, Tania; Bruce Romano <Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov>; Rashmi Doshi <Rashmi.Doshi@fcc.gov>

Sent: Tue Jul 13 09:23:09 2010
Subject: RE: FCC response on Intended Operations

Hi Tania,

Any status on the labeling issue?

Thanks,

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 4:08 PM
To: 'Hanna, Tania'; Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: FCC response on Intended Operations

Hello Tania,

The rules require the label on the device. You can request to have it in the manual but you need to provide sufficient justification. Any confidentially held information will not be available even with someone with the FCC identifier so more justification would need to be considered if you still want to pursue that.

With regard to letting the reviewer know the intended use of the device, you can submit that in the filing(s) as a separate exhibit. A short description on who will be using the device, in what type of operation(public safety, emergencies…) and basic description on how it works such as, it works like a base station but is not permanently fixed and will be placed at the location of the emergency. Or something like that.

While some of this information has been discussed outside of the filing, ultimately they need to be submitted for the records.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 12:30 PM
To: Bruce Romano; (b) (6)
Subject: FW: FCC response on Intended Operations

Bruce,

Another issue has come up regarding the StingRay/Fish applications. We need your guidance:

1. We proposed putting the FCC label in the operations manual—we were concerned that an FCC ID would enable bad guys to get access to the equipment authorization application. We are concerned about having it on the box because it may compromise the Title 18 applications.

2. The FCC inquiry is requesting information about intended operations and justification that it is acceptable for licensing. :

   1) Additional details about intended operations within FCC licensed radio services as follows are also needed to facilitate continued OET-Lab application review and processing. As we understand this device transmits in e.g.

(b) (4) from (b) (4) Other typical licensed operations use (b) (4) (b) (4) (b) (4) seems unique and not typical. Given that the basic purpose of FCC-OET Certification equipment authorization is to identify equipment acceptable for licensing, please explain how (b) (4) licensing for this unique operation is intended to be handled / applicable [47 CFR 1.903(c), etc.].

I plan to respond by providing the following:

1) A slide showing the history and timeline of meetings/discussions between Harris and the FCC, indicating that the FCC provided direction to complete the Equipment Authorization Application
2) Slides describing the intended operation of the equipment based on material previously provided to the FCC.

Here is a link to the slides:
(b) (4)

We need guidance on how to proceed. With regard to the label issue—can we request that it be included in the operations manual? Also, regarding the reasons we are seeking equipment authorization—we need to let the folks reviewing the application know that this equipment is only intended for public safety use. Please advise as to how to best proceed.

Thanks,
Tania

(b) (6)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 4:10 PM
To: 'Hanna, Tania'; 'Morris, Evan'; 'sgutowski@harris.com'
Cc: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Harris FW: Follow Up

Hello Tania, Evan and Stan,

The exhibits are acceptable. The below RT correspondence will be sent shortly for each filing. Please wait and use the appropriate correspondence number for each filing when you reply.
Thanks,
(b) (6)

RT correspondence.

Please submit corrected exhibits as proposed via correspondence dated 1/28/2011.
Please note that once the documents are in the system, we do not have means to "return" them. However, we will supersede them and they will not be available to public. Do not submit the word document that requested to return specific exhibits.

Finally, provide a "clean" confidentiality letter. We will supersede previous ones and all other correspondences.

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 11:54 AM
To: Rashmi Doshi; Bruce Romano
Subject: FW: Follow Up
Importance: High

Just a quick recap:

1. All the applications have been filed formally within ULS.
2. The outstanding issue is the status of the confidentiality requests.
3. We are working on revising the confidentiality requests pursuant to our last call in December.
4. The above documents represent Harris's revisions of the requests pursuant to those calls. These documents will be filed for all of the applications once we all agree that this comports with what we discussed.

Please let us know ASAP if this is acceptable and we will move forward with revising the remaining confidentiality requests.

Best Regards,
Tania

From: Morris, Evan
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 5:14 PM
To: Hanna, Tania; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Follow Up
Importance: High

Dear (b) (6)

Attached are the modified unzipped exhibits and four lists containing the requested confidential treatment of documents that have been submitted to the FCC (both correspondence and exhibits). If you have any questions or problems opening the files please let me know.

Regards,

Evan Morris

Evan S. Morris, Esq.
Harris Corporation
Counsel, Government Relations
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
Suite 850E
Washington, D.C. 20024
O: (202) 729-3702
(b) (6)
evan.morris@harris.com

http://www.harris.com

From: Hanna, Tania
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 10:18 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: Morris, Evan
Subject: Fw: Follow Up

(b) (6)

I will ask Evan Morris to email them to you in non-zip format.
Thanks,
Tania

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 10:13 AM
To: Hanna, Tania; Rashmi Doshi <Rashmi.Doshi@fcc.gov>; Bruce Romano <Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Hi Tania,

We never received the exhibits. Can you please resend in non-zip file format? Thanks,
(b) (6)

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6) Bruce Romano
Subject: FW: Follow Up
Importance: High

Dear FCC Team,
Please see below. We have resubmitted the exhibits for NK73100176. If this looks acceptable to you—we will refile for the remaining applications.

Many thanks,
Tania

From: Gutowski, Stanley
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2011 5:35 PM
To: 'rashmi.doshi@fcc.gov'; 'Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov'; (b) (6)
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Morris, Evan; Hanna, Tania
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Dear Bruce, (b) (6) Dr. Doshi,

Prior to the holidays, we submitted revised exhibits for NK73100176 incorporating the changes discussed in the December 9, 2010 conference call. Please let us know if you had any difficulty receiving the attachments to the email sent on December 21, 2010. We look forward to your response on these changes.

This email is in response to the second action identified during the December 9th conference call. Specifically, the Commission requested a list of correspondence for Confidential treatment. Attached are four lists containing our request for confidential treatment for responses to Commission correspondence. For purposes of completeness we have also included in these lists our requested confidential treatment of all other submitted exhibits. Our requested confidential treatment of each document has been divided into three categories under the header "Action Requested":

1. Return Document- Harris requests the document be returned as it will either be replaced in the near future (i.e., revised RF Reports, Test Reports and ID Labels) or has already been replaced by a revised version.
2. Hold as Confidential- Harris requests the document, in its entirety, be retained by the Commission and withheld from public disclosure.
3. Needs to be Redacted- Harris requests permission to redact a portion of the document pursuant to the parameters outlined in our December 9th conference call. Specifically, removal of product names, protocol references, Harris Wireless Products Group references, and statements related to Confidentiality, ITAR, and Title 18 restrictions. Following redaction the document can be made publicly available.

Best Regards,

Stan Gutowski

From: Gutowski, Stanley
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2010 3:02 PM
To: 'rashmi.doshi@fcc.gov'; 'Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov'; (b) (6)
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Morris, Evan; Hanna, Tania
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Bruce (b) (6) Dr. Doshi,

In follow-up from the December 9th conference call, we revised the FCC Label, RF Exposure and Test Report exhibits for NK73100176 to provide a sample of the changes discussed. Please find the attached zip files containing the original exhibits and modified exhibits. If you agree with these changes, we will proceed with the exhibit modifications on the other applications (NK73092523, NK73166210, NK73186795) and submit according to your instructions.

Here is a summary of the changes incorporated in the modified exhibits:

- All: Removed references to product names and protocols (GSM, CDMA)
- All: Removed Confidential, Title 18 and ITAR statements
- FCC Label Exhibit: Replaced equipment pictures with box diagrams.
- Test Reports: Removed equipment photos. These are duplicates of the photos submitted in the Test Setup exhibit.
- Test Reports: Replaced Spectrum Analyzer plots with new plots utilizing additional averaging

As requested, we generated a Confidential addendum to the Operational Description exhibit containing the original Spectrum Analyzer plots and several equipment photos removed from the Test Reports.

We look forward to your response. Have a Happy Holidays.

Best Regards,

Stan Gutowski

From: Hanna, Tania
Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2010 7:44 AM
To: 'rashmi.doshi@fcc.gov'; 'Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov'
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Gutowski, Stanley; (b) (6)
Subject: Re: Follow Up

Dr. Doshi: here is a summary. We need to discuss correspondence.

1) Test Reports· Remove references to product names. Reference by FCC ID instead.· Remove "Confidential – Not for Public Inspection" statements· Remove product photos. These are duplicates of photos submitted in Test Setup Photo exhibit.· Remove spectrum analyzer plots

2) RF Exposure Reports

- Remove references to product names. Reference by FCC ID instead.
- Remove "Confidential – Not for Public Inspection" statements· Remove Title 18 and ITAR statements

3) FCC Label Exhibit

- Remove references to product names. Reference by FCC ID instead.· Remove "Confidential – Not for Public

Inspection" statements· Remove Title 18 and ITAR statements· Replace product pictures with generic box diagrams

---

From: Rashmi Doshi [mailto:Rashmi.Doshi@fcc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 03:55 PM
To: Hanna, Tania; Bruce Romano <Bruce.Romano@fcc.gov>
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Gutowski, Stanley; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Hanna,

We can have a conference call around 10 AM tomorrow (Thursday). It would be useful if you can outline your proposal prior to that so that we can have a chance to look at the filings.

Thanks,

Rashmi Doshi

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 12:19 PM
To: Bruce Romano; Rashmi Doshi
Cc: Wendling, Kelle; Gutowski, Stanley
Subject: Follow Up

Bruch and Dr. Doshi,

Thank you so much for following up with us yesterday. My apologies about having to drop off the call. We have been having numerous discussions regarding the issues you raised and we believe we have a path by which to move the process forward. Is it possible to arrange another call at your convenience to discuss what we have in mind?

Please let me know what date/time work best for you and I'll arrange something.

Many thanks,

Tania Hanna

Harris Corp
(b) (6)

202-729-3712 direct

(b) (6)

From: Bruce Romano
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 10:43 AM
To: 'Morris, Evan'
Cc: Hanna, Tania; Rashmi Doshi
Subject: RE: Questions Regarding Confidentiality Request Process

Mr. Morris,

I believe that Tania has been in touch with Dr. Rashmi Doshi, chief at the lab, since your inquiry.

Bruce Romano
Assoc. Chief, Legal
Office of Engineering and Technology
Federal Communications Commission
202-418-2124
bruce.romano@fcc.gov

From: Morris, Evan [mailto:emorri05@harris.com]
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 2:54 PM
To: Bruce Romano
Cc: Hanna, Tania
Subject: Questions Regarding Confidentiality Request Process

Dear Mr. Romano,

I am following up on a phone message that I left on your voicemail this afternoon. While we have never met, you may be familiar with my colleague in the Harris Corporation Government Relations Department Tania Hanna. I am writing in regards to four equipment authorization applications that Harris is currently working on submitting. The request involves a line of Harris products used by law enforcement officials as a geographic location and tracking device using cell signals. The box acts as a base station and law enforcement officials use it to locate suspects or find victims.

As you may be familiar with, over the past two years my colleague Tania has had several meetings with OET and the FCC regarding these products. When she came in for one of her visits Mr. Knapp asked that because of the numerous confidentiality and Title 18 issues, that we submit the application ourselves directly to the FCC instead of getting approval from the testing body. We have completed testing and as referenced have started our equipment authorization application online. Prior to filing our exhibits and artifacts I wanted to discuss with you the best way to go about requesting that our application and all included exhibits be withheld from public disclosure. I am familiar with the FCC's confidentiality process and I know that there are a number of items that we are requesting be withheld from public disclosure to which the FCC may not routinely grant confidentiality. As a result, I would like to take discuss with you our unique situation and determine the most appropriate way to make our confidentiality request.

Sincerely,
Evan S. Morris

Evan S. Morris, Esq.
Harris Corporation
Legal Analyst, Government Relations
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
Suite 850E
Washington, D.C. 20024

(202) 729-3702
evan.morris@harris.com
http://www.harris.com
Harris is an international communications and information technology company serving government and commercial markets in more than 150 countries. Headquartered in Melbourne, Florida, the company has annual revenue of $5.4 billion and 16,000 employees — including nearly 7,000 engineers and scientists. Harris is dedicated to developing best-in-class assured communications® products, systems, and services.

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 11:07 AM
To: Rashmi Doshi; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Revised WPG Request for Confidentiality

Hi Rashmi,

Attached is a table that reflects the confidentiality allowed for each exhibit type.
The fields that indicate "never allowed" or "never available" are enforced by the system programming. All other cases are enforced by application reviewers.

If an exhibit is marked as "superceded" it is not publicly available.
If looking for exceptions to the chart and policies I found that LoJack regularly requests confidentiality on "test setup photos" in their confidential request letters but haven't been granted confidentiality for them. TC646383 and TC994534 requests confidentiality for test setup photos but the TCB didn't grant it or require the request letter to be corrected.

I'm not aware of any other exceptions that are not on the chart.
(b) (6)

From: Rashmi Doshi
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 9:14 AM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Revised WPG Request for Confidentiality
Importance: High

(b) (6)

You may know that we have some pending applications where the applicant, Harris, is asking to hold their application in "entirety". Can we go through the list of exhibits and make a table that indicates which ones we have held confidential - it would be good if you could indicate if it is required by rule, or based on routine request or based on special justification?

Thanks,

Rashmi

```
*** Non-Public: For Internal Use Only ***
-----Original Message-----
From: Bruce Romano
Sent: Sunday, October 24, 2010 6:06 PM
To: Rashmi Doshi
Subject: FW: Revised WPG Request for Confidentiality
Importance: High


i looked at these.  will try to call you on monday.  send a text to my phone so I know
when you've read them - one of them - they are all the same.  (not urgent, though)  202-
744-7164.
BAR

-----Original Message-----
```

From: Hanna, Tania [mailto:thanna@harris.com]
Sent: Thu 10/14/2010 5:27 PM
To: Bruce Romano
Subject: Revised WPG Request for Confidentiality

Hi Bruce,

Attached are revised copies of the Requests for Confidentially for the StingRay (FCC ID NK73092523), KingFish (FCC73100176), StingRay II (FCC ID NK73166210) and 1700/2100 Converter (FCC ID NK73186795).

I have resubmitted them through the on-line fling system.

<<Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3092523 _Revised_.pdf>>
<<Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3100176 _Revised_.pdf>>
<<Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3166210 _Revised_.pdf>>
<<Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3186795 _Revised_.pdf>>

Thanks for everything!
Tania Hanna

Harris Corp

(b) (6) [redacted]

<< File: Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3092523 _Revised_.pdf >> << File: Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3100176 _Revised_.pdf >> << File: Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3166210 _Revised_.pdf >> << File: Request for Confidentiality of Harris Corporation FCC ID NK7-3186795 _Revised_.pdf >>

Exhibit Type Confidentiality

Exhibit Type	**Confidentiality-Permanent**	**Confidentiality-Short Term**
ID Label/Location Info	Never allowed	Never allowed
Attestation Statements	Never allowed	Never allowed
External Photos	With Extra justification	Routine with justification
Block Diagram	Routine with justification	Routine with justification
Schematics	Routine with justification	Routine with justification
Test Report	Never allowed	Never allowed
Test Setup Photos	Never allowed	Routine with justification
Users Manual	With extra justification	Routine with justification
Internal Photos	With extra justification	Routine with justification
Parts List/Tune Up Info	Routine with justification	Routine with justification
RF Exposure Info	Never allowed	Never allowed
Operational Description	Routine with justification	Routine with justification
Cover Letters	Never allowed	Never allowed
SDR Software/ Security Info	Never available	Never available
Correspondence	Never allowed	Never allowed
Short Term Confidential Requests-Post Grant	Never allowed	Never allowed