

A) Please explain any differences in power from the HAC, SAR and EMC reports.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 5) addressing the SAR and EMC power correlation.

B) Please detail how drift was measured.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 15) showing how drift was measured.

C) Please describe the test sample to include the stage in production it is from.

Please find attached letter indicating the test sample stage of production.

D) Please justify probe measurement at the center of the sensor. C63.19 recommends measurement at the nearest element point. Please include additional illustrations of the probe/elements showing more detail of the probe tip area.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 8) justifying probe measurement distance and illustrating probe tip detail.

E) Please provide details of the WD's signal. Include wideband and 0 span spectrum analyzer plots. How was the signal set up and controlled? What settings were used i.e. power control modes, and radio service mode.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 20) showing WD device correlation with an Agilent ESG-D Signal Generator.

F) Please provide additional details justifying the conversion to peak; particularly the procedure used to measure power. Provide 0 span spectrum plots or power meter details if applicable.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 18-20) describing conversion to peak and plots.

G) Page 18 states that the location of the final rotation is given in figure 16. This location could not be clearly seen in figure 16. Please provide.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 22) showing the location of final rotation with an "X".

H) Please provide details of how the user will turn off the back light.

Under "Menu" -> "Display" -> "Backlight" -> "Off". For both backlight conditions, the device is HAC compliant under the rating stated.

I) Please provide system verification for all three signal types recommended by C63.19. For the WD signal please detail the source for the WD signal for system verification and how it compares to the actual signal from the WD.

Please find attached revised test Report (Page 19) for verification data. See Page 20 for plots showing correlation with WD signal.

J) Regarding 1309 probe calibration. How was the low, middle and high channel recommendation handled? How were the differences between E and H field recommendations handled?

Please find attach revised Test Report (Pages 9-10) indicating 1309 probe calibration handling.

K) To help clarify dynamic range issues, if possible, please state the highest measured voltage at the diode compared to its compression point.

Please find attached revised Test Report (Page 7) indicating the highest measured voltage at the diode is much less than the compression point.

CRN: 21079

TC289280

Original Date of Corr.: 6/20/05

---

L) Please describe the processing chain from diode output, to raw measurement, and conversion to final peak value. Please include a discussion of averaging and measurement time windows and similar.

[Please find attached revised test report \(Pages 9-13\) with processing chain description.](#)

N) Please demonstrate that 5 mm step size is sufficient for verification. One means might be though use of a two dimensional plot of field strength versus distance in a direction perpendicular to the length of the dipole. Was any interpolation used?

[Please find attached revised test report \(Page 17\) demonstrating 5 mm step size is sufficient for verification. Interpolation was used.](#)

O) For review of exclusion blocks please include field contour information inside the exclusion blocks.

[Please find attached revised test report showing contour information inside exclusion blocks \(Page 40-43\)](#)

P) Please clarify in your validation section any differences between this peak and peak as used in the device result section. One appears to be equivalent RF sinusoid peak calculated from an RMS field measurement while the device peak field seems to be based on a measured RMS field adjusted by the PMF which relates to a condition of PEP. Also, please further justify the procedure to average the two field values for the E field. Related to this later question, please explain the large variation in field values between the dipole tips. The standard suggests that dipole imbalance should be limited to approximately 3%.

[Please find attached revised test report validation section \(Pages 16-19\) and dipole certificate.](#)