



American Telecommunications Certification Body Inc.
6731 Whittier Ave, McLean, VA 22101

July 8, 2003

RE: Nokia Corporation

FCC ID: LJPKNW-1X

After a review of the submitted information, I have a few comments on the above referenced Application.

- 1) Please provide a Cover letter explaining the changes made and the justification for a Permissive Change Application. Please include a justification as to what tests needed to be performed (i.e. please explain why the EMC portion has not been retested, etc.).
- 2) For permissive change applications, the conducted power is expected to be within 0.5 dB of the original conducted power. It appears that the conducted power in this application exceeds this amount.

Original EMC/SAR –	25.5 dBm AMPS, 27.5 dBm TDMA 800, 27.1 dBm TDM 1900
Current SAR –	25.1 dBm AMPS, 28.4 dBm TDMA 800, 27.8 dBm TDM 1900

Note that since this is a delta of 0.9 dB, this is not considered acceptable as a permissive change application. Additionally, the FCC desires the conducted power setting for SAR testing to be greater than what was listed in the EMC report but it should also agree with the tune up procedure. Please note that while the TDMA measurements were higher than the original EMC values, the AMPS was lower. Additionally, the TDMA appears to be > 1 dB above what was given in the tune up procedure. Please recheck the power measurements, software settings, etc. to ensure proper output levels were reported. If the output power is not within 0.5 dB of the original, this application will likely require submittal under a new FCC ID.

- 3) It appears that the verification test date (6/2/03) for Muscle at 835 MHz given in section 4.1 does not match the information given on the verification plots in Appendix A (6/5/03). Please correct the report as appropriate.
- 4) The test dates for measurements of the muscle tissue parameters given in section 4.2.2 (6/2/03) do not appear to match the verification and test dates of 6/5/03. Please correct the report as appropriate.
- 5) the HWID Number given for the body word configuration in section 7.3 of the report does not appear to match that in the plots. Please correct.
- 6) For purposes of reviewing the users manual information regarding SAR, please explain if this device is considered a model 1260 or 1261 (users manual page 63).
- 7) Review of the users manual lists multiple accessories (LPS-3 Inductive Loopset, HAD-9 TTY Adapter, HDC-5 Headset, HDE-2 Headset, HDB-5 Headset). However it appears that only the HDE-2 Headset was tested. Since not all combinations have been tested, please provide a justification as to the determination of the worse case configuration(s).
- 8) The original SAR report contained in the original application for this device shows a CSM-6 body worn accessory that does not appear to be tested in this application. Please explain.
- 9) Please provide a justification as to why SAR plots were not provide for each set of data listed in sections 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3 of the report.

--- Continued on Next Page ---

10) Please provide information regarding the procedures to establish the test signals (e.g., base-station simulator vs internal test codes)?



Timothy R. Johnson
Examining Engineer

[mailto: tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com](mailto:tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com)

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information may result in application termination. Correspondence should be considered part of the permanent submission and may be viewed from the Internet after a Grant of Equipment Authorization is issued.

Please do not respond to this correspondence using the email reply button. In order for your response to be processed expeditiously, you must submit your documents through the AmericanTCB.com website. Also, please note that partial responses increase processing time and should not be submitted.

Any questions about the content of this correspondence should be directed to the sender.