

Chris Harvey

From: amanda.wu [amanda.wu@tw.ccsemc.com] on behalf of application [application@tw.ccsemc.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 7:22 AM
To: charvey@ieee.org
Subject: Re jG RejG RE: Re jG TATUNG CO., FCC ID: BJM-M1, Assessment NO.: AN06T5448, Notice#1

Dear Charvey:

Please see my reply as below. Thank you.

The correct FCC ID is: BJM-M1

Best Regards

Amanda

"Chris Harvey" <Chrisharveyemc@comcast.net>

2006/02/01 12:34 AM

? ? ? ? charvey

? ? ? : "application" <application@tw.ccsemc.com>, <charvey@ieee.org>

? ? ? ? : <application@ccsemc.com.tw>, "Claire Hoque" <claire.hoque@CCSEMC.com>

? ? : RE: Re ? TATUNG CO., FCC ID: BJMM1, Assessment NO.: AN06T5448, Notice#1

Dear Anthony Yao:

I have reviewed the above referenced TCB application and have the following issues that need to be addressed before the review can be completed:

1. The application submitted contains the technical documentation for the composite operation of the GSM/GPRS handset (Equipment Class PCE) and Bluetooth (Equipment Class DSS). Since this composite device operates in 2 different Equipment Classes, 2 separate applications for Certification must be submitted, even though they can use the same FCC ID. Please submit another application using the CCS TCB web based system for the Bluetooth Portion of this device. This will require a separate Certification fee as well as uploading the documentation for the Bluetooth portion of this handset. Please notify me at charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com when this Bluetooth application has been filed.

Ans: Well noted it & Thank you for your information.

Bluetooth application has been filed of Feb, 6, 2006 and the ass. no. is AN06T5495.

Please check it and if there is any comments , please kindly advise us.

2. For the Bluetooth portion, there are several FCC requirements that are not yet declared as being compliant in the application referenced above. These requirements are automatically deemed compliant if the device meets the Bluetooth Specification. The device is uses the Bluetooth name; however there is no statement that the headset complies with the Bluetooth Specification. Please either provide a declaration of compliance with the Bluetooth Specification (please include version) or provide individual

2/12/2006

declarations of compliance with the following items needed for FCC 15.247 compliance:

Ans: We had asked customer provide a declaration of compliance with the Bluetooth Specification. However it seems very difficult to them...

So, they are applying to the BQB certificate now and it could meet the Bluetooth Specification.

We estimate that we will receive the BQB certificate from customer on Feb. 7th and once get the certificate will offer you immediately.

- Is the hopping sequence pseudorandom, based on the technical description?
- Is each channel used equally on average, based on the technical description?
- Does the associated system receiver have a compliant input bandwidth, based on the measured 20 dB emission bandwidth?
- Does the associated system receiver have the ability to hop in synchronization with the transmitter, based on the technical description?
- Does the design of the frequency hopping system allow it to comply with all pertinent requirements when presented with a lengthy data stream?
- Does the frequency hopping system comply with the non-coordination requirement?

3. The Label is required to contain the term "FCC ID", not just the FCC logo and below the term "ID". Please correct the label to contain the term "FCC ID: BJM-M1" in a continuous string.

Ans: The label format had been modified. Please have the attachment.

4. The RF Transmit Power (ERP/EIRP) data in the EUT Description summary on page 4 of the RF report is not the maximum listed in the data tables of pages 15 & 16. Please update this information in the test report.

5. The Occupied bandwidth measurements document the 26dB bandwidths to be approximately 240 kHz; however the emission type on page 4 of the test report is listed as 997KGXW, which would indicate a necessary bandwidth of 997 kHz. Please update the

Q4&5 Ans: Sorry, it's typo. it had been revised on page 4. Please see the revised test report as attachment.

6. The SAR testing was performed using the Bluetooth transmitter turned on for the body-worn configuration, without any explanation as to why the Bluetooth was not also turned on for the held-to-head operating mode. If the Bluetooth is only used for headset connection then this would be a logical choice, but this is not explained. Please either provide an explanation as to why this was done or provide data for the worst case SAR positions/settings for the held-to-head mode with the Bluetooth transmitter turned on.

Ans: We had confirmed the worst case with bluetooth at any conditions (included held-to-head and body-worn) (named : Bt+GSM or BT+GPRS)

7. The ConvF probe factors used in many of the SAR plots are different than the calibration factors provided (for example the 835MHz band use a value of 9.75 or 9.47; however the probe calibration lists a value of 7.94 for the ConvF at 835MHz Head). The date of calibration on the probe is listed as November 19, 2004, which is greater than 1 year from the date of testing. Please explain and correct as necessary.

Ans: The calibration date of probe SN3552 is march ,2005. Please refer to the attached file.

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information within 30 days of the original e-mail date may result in application dismissal and forfeiture of the

2/12/2006

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,

Chris Harvey
charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com

2/12/2006