

1. No parts list exhibit has been submitted with this application but the parts list is shown as one of the exhibits for which confidentiality has been requested in the confidentiality request letter. Either provide the parts list exhibit or revise the confidentiality request letter to eliminate this exhibit.

Answer: the part list has been uploaded.

2. The test report exhibit contains photos of the EUT during testing but the test setup photos have been listed as requiring short term confidentiality in the confidentiality request letter. Please provide a test report with the EUT test setup photos removed from it because the FCC will not provide short term confidentiality to the test report exhibit.

Answer the test set up has been removed from the test report.

3. The UTAM agreement is labeled or titled with the word "confidential" but this exhibit has not been listed in the letter requesting confidentiality of exhibits. The FCC will not afford confidentiality to this exhibit. Please note that this exhibit will be uploaded as an attestation exhibit with no confidentiality afforded to it. Please acknowledge if this is acceptable or propose another solution.

Answer: This exhibit should not to be confidential in this case .

4. The RF exposure exhibit is also labeled or titled with the work "confidential" but this exhibit has not been listed in the letter requesting confidentiality of exhibits. The FCC will not afford confidentiality to this exhibit. Please note that this exhibit will be uploaded as an RF exposure exhibit with no confidentiality afforded to it. Please acknowledge if this is acceptable or propose another solution.

Answer: This exhibit should not to be confidential in this case .

5. The IC application form is missing the following required information:

(a) Emission designator and

(b) Transmitter spurious (worst case).

Answer: The IC application has been updated please note that the form does not allow to place values in dBm. The values have been calculated to show in dBc.

6. The occupied bandwidth (99% BW) listed on the IC application form does not agree with the 26 dB bandwidth shown on page 26 of the test report. Either provide a 99 % BW measurement that agrees with the number listed in the IC application form or change the 99 % BW listed on the IC application form to agree with the 26 dB bandwidth shown in the test report.

Answer: The values for the 99% BW have been corrected. The value for the 99% could be found on the test report.

7. The receiver spurious (worst case) emission listed on the IC application form does not agree with the worst case receiver emission shown in the test report. Page 64 of the test report shows a receiver emission that is greater than 104.7 uV/m @ 3m. Please amend the IC application form accordingly.

Answer: The worst case emission for the receiver has been corrected

8. Power spectral density (PSD) measurements on Page 48 and 49 of the original and amended test reports show a sweep of 1 mS and 800 uS respectively on the spectrum analyzer plots. But the text describing PSD tests says a 500 second sweep was used.

Neither the actual sweep times nor the stated 500 seconds agree with the test method in ANSI C63.17 section 6.1.5. Please explain or retest if necessary.

Answer: The text has been corrected.

9. The note after Table 21 on page 77 of the amended test report does not define TU and UM. Neither does the C63.17 test procedure (that I can find). What do these symbols represent and what are their respective values or levels?

Answer: A clear statement has been placed on the test report

10. Please explain how the results in Tables 23 and 24 which are reported in Hertz and microseconds respectively show compliance with the limits of 10 PPM.

Answer: The table has been updated to show clearly the limit and the value

11. For Your Information - Tables 4 and 5 in the amended test report which contain the results for the 26 dB bandwidth show only a 20 dB bandwidth on the 1924.994 MHz (middle) channel not a 26 dB bandwidth. Since the occupied bandwidth plot is so steep at the 20 dB point, it will not appreciably affect the reported 20 dB bandwidth to reach a 26 dB bandwidth so these plots are acceptable to show compliance with the appropriate limit. Please take note of this for future applications.

Answer: Thank you for the information

12. For Your Information – The Class A digital device emissions (radiated and AC line conducted) were not reviewed as part of the Certification for this UPCS device. Class A digital devices are subject to Verification and test data is submitted to the FCC for review upon request in accordance with Section 2.953(b) of the FCC Rules.

Answer: Thank you for the information