



American Telecommunications Certification Body Inc.
6731 Whittier Ave, McLean, VA 22101

June 19, 2005

RE: Quanta Computer Inc.

FCC ID: HFS-KMP6J1BH1

After a review of the submitted information, I have a few comments on the above referenced Application.

1) This device is capable of connection to a PC and is therefore also considered a PC peripheral device (in addition to the TX requirements, i.e. Part 24, etc.) and is subject to either a Certification or DoC as a PC peripheral. Therefore the application must clarify if you are asking for:

- a) Certification of the device as a TX, and a DoC has been performed by an appropriately accredited test lab for a PC peripheral
- b) Certification as a TX + PC peripheral.

Note 1: The option b) would be considered as a composite application and 2 certificates (one for the TX, one for the PC peripheral portion) would be issued. Note that there are additional review costs associated with this additional certification.

Note 2: To qualify to perform DoC applications, the test lab must be accredited (i.e. NVLAP or A2LA) to perform testing under the DoC procedure.

Note 3: Note that for DoC tests, the device is configured with a minimum test configuration as specified by ANSI C63.4 which includes complete computer + 2 I/O devices attached (one may be the EUT) during this particular test..

Note 4: Each path (DoC or Certification) has particular labeling requirements that must be followed. For DoC authorizations, the label should also include specific DoC labeling information and also the users manual should include information regarding Part 2.1077. If the device is Certified, the FCC ID and current labeling requirements for the TX will cover the labeling requirements. However, additional grants are generated and review costs are higher. Currently labeling and users manual do not support a DoC Authorization.

The manufacturer does have a choice of DoC or Certification, however the device labeling must match the appropriate methods used.

- 2) Digital device tests do not appear to define RBW/VBW settings used for Radiated tests. Please explain.
- 3) Please provide both the DC voltages and currents applied into the several elements of the final radio frequency amplifying device for normal operation over the power range. If this is already in the application, kindly point to where this information may be found.
- 4) There is a 200-300% difference between SAR values obtained on each model, yet the differences between models is supposed to be relatively small. Is there any explanation for this difference.
- 5) SAR test report does not appear to define forward power input to the reference source/dipole. Please comment or correct.

- 6) Please provide a list of any manufacturer body worn supplied accessories for this device (holsters, etc.). Additionally, are there any accessories included with the device which may affect SAR (battery options, etc.). Please explain.
- 7) Please explain reference to "Main Unit Class: 4" found on the label. This implies a different class than reported in the SAR report. Please confirm worse case class for this device.



Timothy R. Johnson
Examining Engineer

[mailto: tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com](mailto:tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com)

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information may result in application termination. Correspondence should be considered part of the permanent submission and may be viewed from the Internet after a Grant of Equipment Authorization is issued.

Please do not respond to this correspondence using the email reply button. In order for your response to be processed expeditiously, you must submit your documents through the AmericanTCB.com website. 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 sender.