

Helen Zhao

Subject: FW: Re : RE: Re : RE: Re : RE: Re : FW: DELTA NETWORKS, INC., FCC ID: PD5TYPEIII, Assessment NO.: AN05T5355, Notice#1

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

From: amanda.wu [mailto:amanda.wu@tw.ccsemc.com]**On Behalf Of** application

Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 12:22 AM

To: Helen Zhao

Subject: Re : RE: Re : RE: Re : RE: Re : FW: DELTA NETWORKS, INC., FCC ID: PD5TYPEIII, Assessment NO.: AN05T5355, Notice#1

Dear Helen:

Please my reply as below. Thank you!!

Regarding question#1, after discussion, client decided to apply for modular approval. Attached please find the user manual. Please check.

Regarding question#2, In this case, the internal antenna and external diople antenna will be connected with EUT all the time but not optional. Moreover, why the output power measured would be different is because the antenna terminator and cable loss are different for internal and external antenna. Different power setting with different antenna is not because of reducing output power to comply with FCC limit. The external antenna connector is mounted on the main PCB not via cable. During RF conducted tests, the measuring point was made at external antenna connector. There is no need for end user to reduce the output power to comply with FCC limits. Since the measured points are different, we just think it's better to report two of them. MPE estimate was calculated with highest antenna gain without cable loss. During the radiated spurious and restricted band edge tests, the antenna cable used is less than 20 cm in length with approx. 2 dB loss. In the actual installation, the cable length will be longer than the cable length used during the tests. With above information provided, we do not think grant note 36 should apply.

Additional Question: Please provide one more antenna port conducted test setup photo when measured at the end of internal antenna.

Ans: Attached please find the revised set up for photo for additional conducted test set up photo. Also, because the NB pc used for testing internal antenna port's output power is different from external, test report page 11 of the support equipment has been modified as well.

Best Regards,

Amanda

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

From: Compliance Certification Services [mailto:helen.zhao@ccsemc.com]

Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2005 3:27 PM

Subject: DELTA NETWORKS, INC., FCC ID: PD5TYPEIII, Assessment NO.: AN05T5355, Notice#1

Question #1: This module meets all eight modular approval criteria, is qualified to get full modular approval, but the modular approval cover letter applies for a limited modular approval. There is a cover letter in the filing to explain why the system manual can replace module manual for certification filing. Unfortunately, it is not acceptable.

-) This module is not used and installed in Delta Network systems, it is sold to Airspan, so OEM installation manual is required.
-) The test report and test setup photos all shows the device was tested stand-alone, has nothing to do with the system.

Please submit a user manual for the module.

Question #2: The test report provides two sets of RF conducted test data, one for external 2 dBi external antenna, one for 1.77dBi internal antenna. It shows the power output is reduced when using 2dBi external antenna. In that case, a grant note "36 - Certain antennas used with this equipment require a minimum cable length, or have output power limitations as documented in the application." will be added on the grant. This will require professional installation, and based on FCC modular approval policy, any device requiring professional installation won't be granted a modular approval.

Please let me know if you wish to modify the test report or change for a system approval.

12/20/2005

Best Regards,
Helen Zhao

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 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.

12/20/2005