

INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION

INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RADIO INTERFERENCE (CISPR)  
Subcommittee A: Radio Interference Measurements and Statistical Methods  
Working Group 1: EMC Instrumentation Specifications

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE 77: ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY  
Subcommittee 77B: High Frequency Phenomena

Joint Task Force: TEM Waveguides

## **ERRATUM IN EXAMPLE GTEM UNCERTAINTY BUDGET OF [1]**

It has been realized that the GTEM-to-FAR correlation component in the example radiated emissions budget of [1] is not entirely correct. A detailed version of Table 2 from [1] is shown below, where the “GTEM” component in row 3 has been replaced by the GTEM-to-FAR correlation and field uniformity components that were implicitly included in the previous 4.381 dB value. References [1] and [2] contain the sentence “It is permissible to use the number of test frequencies to derive and use the standard deviation of the mean, but that will not be done in this example.” Actually the standard deviation of the mean is the preferred quantity for use in this type of calculation. Rather than the 2.92 dB standard uncertainty value in row 3, the expanded uncertainty value ( $k=2$ ) corresponding to the standard deviation of the mean (SDoM) should have been used. For the Fig. 9 data of [2],  $n=370$  frequencies were used for the sample standard deviation, which gives a standard deviation of the mean equal to 2.92 dB divided by the square root of 370, or  $\text{SDoM} = 0.15 \text{ dB}$ . The corresponding expanded uncertainty of 0.3 dB in row 3 of the Revised Table 2 below gives a final overall expanded uncertainty of 4.1 dB.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] CISPR/A-IEC/SC77B(JTF-TEM-Harrington/Bronaugh)01-02, “Example TEM waveguide uncertainty budget,” August 2001.
- [2] T. E. Harrington, and E. L. Bronaugh, “EUT directivity and other uncertainty considerations for GHz-range use of TEM waveguides,” *IEEE Intl. Symp. Electromag. Compat.*, Montreal, Canada, pp. 117-122, 2001.

**Table 2. Example Uncertainty Budget for Slotted-box EUT 3-position GTEM-to-FAR Correlation**

Component Source		Tolerance or $\sigma$		Max VSWR				Spec. U (k=2)			Dist.	Type Eval.	Weighting	$u_s$
#	Name	dB	%	In	Out	$\Gamma_i$	$\Gamma_o$	dB	%	n	(A,N,R,U)	(A, B)	Factor	dB
1	spectrum analyzer	1.049		1.5		0.2		0		1	N	B	1.0000	1.049
2	pre-amp			2	2.2	0.333	0.375	1.23		19	N	A	0.2294	0.141
3	GTEM-FAR correl.				1.25		0.111	2.92		1	N	B	1.0000	1.46
4	GTEM field uniformity	4						0		1	A	B	0.4082	1.633
5	cable1	0.277						0		1	R	B	0.5774	0.16
6	cable2	0.212						0		1	R	B	0.5774	0.123
7	comb generator							0.8165		1		B	0.0000	0
Mismatch Calculation				$\Gamma_1$	$\Gamma_2$	--		Tot. Err.			--	--	--	--
7	pre-amp : spec ana	0.375	0.2	--		--		0.65	--	--	U	B	0.7071	0.462
8	GTEM : pre-amp	0.111	0.333	--		--		0.32	--	--	U	B	0.7071	0.228
Combined Standard Uncertainty, $u(c)$ :											N	A	--	2.495
Expanded Uncertainty, $U$ :											N	A	2	4.989

**Revised Table 2. Example GTEM Uncertainty Budget for Slotted-box EUT Based on GTEM-to-FAR Correlation Standard Deviation of Mean**

Component Source		Tolerance or $\sigma$		Max VSWR				Spec. U (k=2)			Dist.	Type Eval.	Weighting	$u_s$
#	Name	dB	%	In	Out	$\Gamma_i$	$\Gamma_o$	dB	%	n	(A,N,R,U)	(A, B)	Factor	dB
1	spectrum analyzer	1.049		1.5		0.2		0		1	N	B	1.0000	1.049
2	pre-amp			2	2.2	0.333	0.375	1.23		19	N	A	0.2294	0.141
3	GTEM-FAR correl.				1.25		0.111	0.3		370	N	B	1.0000	0.15
4	GTEM field uniformity	4						0		1	A	B	0.4082	1.633
5	cable1	0.277						0		1	R	B	0.5774	0.16
6	cable2	0.212						0		1	R	B	0.5774	0.123
7	comb generator							0.8165		1		B	0.0000	0
Mismatch Calculation				$\Gamma_1$	$\Gamma_2$	--		Tot. Err.			--	--	--	--
7	pre-amp : spec ana	0.375	0.2	--		--		0.65	--	--	U	B	0.7071	0.462
8	GTEM : pre-amp	0.111	0.333	--		--		0.32	--	--	U	B	0.7071	0.228
Combined Standard Uncertainty, $u(c)$ :											N	A	--	2.028
Expanded Uncertainty, $U$ :											N	A	2	4.057