

To: "Timothy R. Johnson" <tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com>
 Subject: FW: American TCB review of Z-Com XI-735 FCC ID: M4Y-00735

Dear Timothy,

Thanks for your kindly advise.
 Regarding to your review comments, please see
 the explanation below:

1) Please find the label with higher resolution attached
 for your reference.

for the item 2) to 7), please see the explanation below provided
 by our client for your review.

I hope the response satisfy all your requirement
 for reviewing this application, if you have further question,
 please don't hesitate to let me know.

Best Regards,
 Julia

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

From: Shirley Kang [mailto:SKang@CCSEMC.com]
 Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2003 11:00 AM
 To: 120 neil (½²¥°P³)
 Cc: Scott Wang; Steve Cheng; Mike Kuo; Helen Zhao; Sunny Shih
 Subject: FW: American TCB review of Z-Com XI-735 FCC ID: M4Y-00735
 Importance: High

> Dear Sir,
 >
 > Please see the answers :

2) The antenna;s shown in the schematic appear to be for 2850 and 3030 MHz, not 2400-
 2483.5

MHz. Please explain.

----->2850 and 3030 MHz means the resonant frequency for antenna(which tested
 with PCB only),since the resonant frequency will be shifted to lower frequency if whth
 surrounding
 component and phstic cover next to antenna , hs kind of ceramic antenna
 characteristic,there fore ,
 we choose antenna which resonant at 2850 and 3030 MHz separately for xi-735 ,then
 practically the
 antenna which labeled as 2850 and 3030 MHz ,will work 2.4GHz ISM band frequency.

> 3) The EMC report listed a maximum power output measured of 17.85 dBm,
 > while the SAR report
 > listed 17.42 dBm. Please note that the FCC has stipulated that the
 > conducted power in SAR report

- > must be greater than or equal to what's in EMC report, but not exceeding
- > tune-up/tolerance power
- > specified.
- > <CCS response>
- > EUT output 17.65 at cold start but drop to 17.25 in about 10 minutes. The
- > reported 17.42 dBm is after 5 minutes warm up.
- > CCS uses Peak Power Meter measured the RF conducted output power, CCS does
- > not know which instrument was used during EMC tests.
- >
- > 4) The Operational Description lists a power output of 15 dBm. The output
- > power is expected to be
- > within 0.5 dB of the claimed power. Please explain.
- > <CCS response>
- > Normally the manufacturer will list the average output power on the
- > product specification sheet. If the output power listed in the
- > operational description is average power (confirm with manufacturer),
- > please reply to ATCB to indicate the rated power in the operational
- > description is average power.
- >
- > 5) Section 3 of the test report lists a ET3DV6 (S/N 1577) probe, while
- > section 3.2 lists an ET3DV5
- > probe. The test equipment listed in Section 9 do not show a probe with
- > that serial number or
- > model as listed in previous sections of the report. The probe information
- > supplied is for a model
- > ET3DV6 (S/N 1578). This report has been reviewed assuming the probe
- > information supplied was
- > the actual one used during test since it was listed on the SAR plots.
- > Please correct sections 3 and
- > 3.2 of the test report with the proper information for the probe used.
- > <CCS response>
- > ET3DV6 (S/N 1578) is the probe used in the test. Other are typo inherited
- > from the previous report.
- >
- >
- > 6) For testing to 2.4 GHz devices, the FCC has informed us that for the
- > liquid confirmation (see test
- > report section 7.3) 10% for both permittivity and conductivity are not
- > acceptable. The permittivity
- > must be $\leq 10\%$, while the conductivity must be $\leq 5\%$. The conductivity
- > measured exceeded
- > these values.
- > <CCS response>
- > Per OET Bulletin 65, supplement C, it is allowed to have 10% tolerance for
- > certain difficult tissue recipes and 2.4G tissue is one of well recognize
- > one. Previously applications submitted directly to FCC or FCC audited TCB
- > application have never mentioned such requirements. 2.4GHz liquid is one
- > of the most difficult tissue to be tuned to.
- >
- > 7) The photographs show the distance of 0.7 cm for the 2 nd configuration
- > tested, however the table

> 7.5 states 1.5 cm. Please explain.
> <CCS response>
> 0.7cm is correct number and 1.5cm is typo.
>
>
> Best regards,
>
Shirley Kang
>



[label3.doc](#)