



MOTOROLA

Date: August 22, 2008

Subject: Request for additional information regarding FCC ID: IHDT56JV1

Reference:

Correspondence Reference Number: IHD806646
Confirmation Number: 807250664-66
Date of Original Email: August 15, 2008

Prepared by:

Andrew Bachler, Principal Staff Engineer
Motorola Mobile Device Business
Libertyville, Illinois 60048

Questions and responses follow:

1. Please submit an Operational Description for both the BT (DSS) and WLAN (DTS) transmitters. That which was submitted does not describe their actual functionality, only their interaction with the phone.

Response: [Please refer to the revised Operational Description attached with BT and WLAN functionality descriptions added in.](#)

2. The Part 22/24 EMC report lists the PCS EDGE EIRP as being greater than the PCS GSM EIRP, while its conducted output power is about 3 dB lower. Please clarify, and revise, if necessary.

Response: [The conducted output power measurements in our Part 22/24 EMC report were not measured using a peak detector.](#)

3. The BT test report lists numerous items past their cal due dates at the time of testing (the caveat explanation paragraph is not there). Please address.

Response: [Please refer to the revised BT EMC report attached.](#)

4. Both the BT and WLAN radiated emission test reports' plots show the system noise floor as being higher than the average limit, in the vicinity of 18 GHz (a restricted band). The test reports should explain how compliance was determined in these areas. Please address.

Response: Please refer to the supplemental BT EMC report and revised WLAN EMC report attached.

5. The WLAN output power was measured on a spectrum analyzer with RBW << emission bandwidth. Please re-measure, either using a (peak) power meter, or else on a spectrum analyzer with RBW > the emission bandwidth, and revise the report. If necessary, please revise the SAR report as well.

Response: Please refer to the revised WLAN EMC report and SAR report attached.

6. In the SAR report, the DASY4 is listed as being past its cal due date at the time of the July tests. Please address.

Response: Due to the fact that Wi-Fi testing was performed in July while the rest SAR testing was performed in April, we listed two sets of equipment in Section 3 of the SAR report, – i.e. SN 1524 and SN 3115 with SN 1524 being used in April and SN 3115 being used in July. By matching the date of test and DASY equipment on scans attached in Appendix 1, 2, 3, the scans performed in July have further cal due dates.

7. The SAR report includes several plots for non-U.S. bands. Please remove these plots and resubmit the report.

Response: Please refer to the revised SAR report attached.