



November 17, 2000.

Mr. Errol Chang
Authorization & Evaluation Division
Federal Communications Commission Laboratory
7435 Oakland Mills Road
Columbia, MD 21046

Re: Form 731 Confirmation Number: EA 98411 with FCC ID: AZ489FT5799.

Dear Mr. Chang;

Motorola Inc., 8000 West Sunrise Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33322, herein submits its response to your 3 November, 2000 request for information correspondence numbers 16955, and 7 November, 2000 request for information correspondence numbers 16991 and 16992.

1) Regarding Correspondence No. 16955

As indicated in the cover letter which accompanied the application, and in the Exhibit 10 NOTE, authorization is requested to use either of two mechanically and electrically interchangeable different RF power Amplifier modules from two different vendors for U500 to assure mass production of a given model without interruption. Measured data was provided in Exhibit 6.1 for each of the two configurations which, for convenience, have been termed primary and alternate. The *Primary U500 Data* provided in Exhibit 6.1 was measured using the U500 device listed in the Device List of Exhibit 10 as *RFPA (primary)*; the *Alternate U500 Data* provided in Exhibit 6.1 was measured using the device listed in Exhibit 10 as *RFPA (alternate)*. The reported performance of these two nearly identical units differed within the production variance that is expected, and both met the specified maximum *Output Power of 700 milliwatts (Pulse average)* intended to be specified in revised Exhibit 12.1.A that was attached to our reply dated 30 October, 2000.

To clarify the variable power nature of the transmitter item 12.1.A has been restated in attached Exhibit 12 (revision 2) to state the Output Power Range. The maximum and minimum values of the variable output power range remains unchanged at 700 and 0.221 milliwatts respectively.

Different models may bear the stated FCC identifier, not because of the two different power amplifiers, but for product differentiation reasons such as those stated in the callout text in Photograph 3.2 of Exhibit 3.

2) Regarding Correspondence No. 16991

Attached as new Exhibit 6.7 is the radiated performance data requested which was inadvertently omitted from our October 30, 2000 reply. This data was obtained using the methodology described in item A1 of that reply with the exception that the discussion therein referred to cell references in an Excel spreadsheet. To facilitate electronic communication these have been pasted into the word processing document submitted for Exhibit 6.7.

3) Regarding Correspondence No. 16992

1) The revised SAR report was inadvertently omitted from our October 30, 2000 reply. Further, it is now observed that the reference in that reply should have been to attached version B, not version A.

2) Thank you for your observation of the extraneous word 'is' in the *Data Operation* paragraph in the preliminary version of the user manual. It has been deleted in the current draft.

3) The value 1.0 W/kg listed in the preliminary user manual provided with our previous reply as the maximum calculated SAR is the correct value. It agrees with the value stated in Section 7.1 of the revised SAR report that was inadvertently omitted. Given this clarification then it is recommended that your Proposed Grant Conditions be revised to agree with Section 7.1 of SAR Report revision B.

It is further recommended that the words "...is limited to..." in the third sentence of the Proposed Grant Conditions be changed to "...has been certified..." or some equivalent so the sentence would read "*SAR compliance for body-worn operating configurations has been certified for the specific Motorola belt-clip and leather carry - case tested for this filing.*" This revision affirms the fact that compliance data was submitted and accepted for these configurations only, but does not preclude use of other technically compliant body-worn devices (e.g. - a case made from nylon mesh or vinyl) as possibly inferred from your proposal. Additionally, the proposed condition about informing end-users about body-worn requirements is redundant. Such information is already set forth in detail in the Safety and General Information section of the User's Manual.

Please contact me at (954) 723-5793 if you require any additional information.

Regards,

Mike Ramnath

FCC Liaison

Email: emr003@email.mot.com

Attachments:

Exhibit 12, revision 2

Exhibit 6.7

SAR Report, revision B