
Dear Steve,

Below are the reply for Q1, Q5, Q9 and Q14 for DTS portion.

For Q1, we have retested and please refer to the attached revised test report for details.

For Q5, the way we used for measuring the restricted band edge was conducted method and please refer to the DTS test report for details.

For Q9, 54Mbps is the worst case data rate used for test and please refer to the revised DTS test report, page 9 for details.

For Q14, after checking with Quanta, the original user manual is divided into two parts, one is user manual and another one is OEM installation guide. Please refer to attached for the revised user manual and OEM installation guide.

Best Regards,

Jonson

----- Original Message -----

From: [Steve Cheng](#)

To: 'Lucy' ; jonson@cclab.com.tw

Cc: [Mike Kuo](#) ; ? ?? ; [Scott Wang](#) ; ? ??

Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2003 11:00 AM

Subject: RE: Quanta Computer Company Ltd. FCC ID: HFS-BCM94309MP

Q1: I mean power spectrum density on p47 of DTS report.

Q5: UNII report is OK, but DTS is not acceptable.

Q9: Question not answered completely, please clarify if worst-case data rate tested.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lucy [mailto:lucy_tsai@cclab.com.tw]

Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2003 2:59 AM

To: Steve Cheng

Cc: Mike Kuo; ? ??; Scott Wang; jonson@cclab.com.tw; ? ??

Subject: Re: Quanta Computer Company Ltd. FCC ID: HFS-BCM94309MP

Dear Steve,

Please refer to the below for the reply for Quanta Computer Company Ltd. FCC ID: HFS-BCM94309MP .

Q#1, please refer to the page 42 of DTS test report and page 18 of UNII test report for details.

Q#2,3,4, please refer to attached Q#2-3-4 Antenna type list for details.

Q#5, this is the typing error and please refer to page 30 of UNII test report for the revise.

Q#6, please refer to the page 41of DTS for revise.

Q#7, this is the typing error and please refer to the page 34 of DTS test report for revise.

Q#8, please refer to the attached report for details.

Q#9, it's 54Mbps and please refer to the report of Page 9 for details.

Q#10, please refer to the attached for modular request letter for details.

Q#11, please refer to the attached for revised operation description for details.

Q#12, regard this, we have informed our engineers and will follow it in future submission.

7/28/2003

Please help to review them firstly and thank you.

Best Regards,

Lucy

----- Original Message -----

From: Steve Cheng

To: 'Lucy'; jonson@cclab.com.tw

Cc: Mike Kuo; ? ??; Scott Wang

Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2003 6:18 AM

Subject: RE: Quanta Computer Company Ltd. FCC ID: HFS-BCM94309MP

RT for project: AN03083

Notice_content

Question #1: According to "FCC Guidance on Measurements for Direct Sequence Spread Spectrum Systems". When perform Power Spectrum Density test, the VBW need to great than RBW, but VBW=RBW was used in the report. Please redo the test.

Question #2: Antenna data sheets include OA2, OA5L, OA6L, YA1A, PA1 and PA-1. But In test report, it mentioned only OA2, OA5L, OA6L, YA1A, and PA1. Is PA-1 same as PA1 or it is an additional antenna, which intended to be covered by this application?

Question #3: There are total of 5 different antennas. Please explain why tested only two antennas in radiated emission are enough to cover all 5 different antennas?

Question #4: Which antennas were used during the Radiated Emission test?

Question #5: Restricted Band edge tested with Wrong RBW and VBW setting (Shall be RBW=1M and VBW=1M or 10H for peak and average) and radiated method is preferred. Please explain how supplied data can demonstrate the compliance with 15.205.

Question #6: Test report; page 41 section 8 - Peak power measurement. Test method / equipment described is not matching the data supplied. Please clarify. (Included data is Channel Power Method, but the description/equipment is Power Meter direct measurement)

Question #7: Page 34 – section 6.2 of EMC report stated that EUT was plug in the host Notebook via PCMCIA port, but product is a mini-PCI. Please clarify.

Question #8: Test report page 35, section 6.4 - a non-calibrated spectrum, R3261A, was listed, please clarify if this equipment had been use in the final test. And what is the purpose of including this equipment in the list.

Question #9: What data rate was used during the test? Is it the worst-case data rate?

Question #10: Please supply Modular Approval Request letter. (Since test report cover several different Notebooks)

Question #11: Operational description is not complete; block diagram and description are missing

Question #12: For your info, middle channel used is not consistent. Some tested to ch6 and some tested to ch7. Please use the ch6 in future submission.

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced

application. Failure to provide the requested information within 60 days of the original e-mail date may result in application dismissal and forfeiture of the filing fee. 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 e-mail address listed below the name of the sender.

Best Regards

Steve Cheng
Compliance Certification Services
561F Monterey Road
Morgan Hill, CA 95037
Tel:(408)463-0885 x:119
Fax:(408)463-0888
scheng@ccsemc.com
<http://www.ccsemc.com>