-----Original Message-----
> From: Mike Kuo
> Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2002 1:52 PM
> To: 'Nancy'
> Subject: RE: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
> AN02T2013
>
>
> Question #19:
>
> The processing gain data submitted is for 900MHz DSSS not for 2.4GHz.
Since
> FCC has released public notice today that eliminate processing gain
> requirement for DSSS, the processing gain data will not be submitted to
FCC.
> However, it is your best interests to contact the applicant to inform them
> this mis-representative of Data.
>
> Best Regards
>
> Mike Kuo / TCB Certifier
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Nancy [mailto:fnancy@cclab.com.tw]
> Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2002 6:45 PM
> To: Mike Kuo
> Subject: Re: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
> AN02T2013
>
>
> Dear Mike,
>
> The response as below.
>
> Question 18: Processing Gain:In the processing data, it indicates "S/I =
> Signal to noise required for a given error probability. In this case 1 x
> 10-4 was used. ". However, according to FCC guideline, for data systems
it
> is typically around 1x10ee(-5), while for voice systems it may be as high
as
> 1x10ee(-2). If the selected BER varies greatly from such values,
> justification must be provided for its choice. Please redo the processing
> gain with 10-2 or provide the justification.
>
> The Answer:
>
> A BER of 1X10-3 is considered good quality for an voice-ADPCM codec. The
> justification is that this is a voice system, and therefore, the BER of
> 1X10-4 that was used for the processing gain measurement is even better
> quality for a voice/ADPCM codec, and this surpasses the minimum
requirement
> for voice of 1X10-2 that the FCC requires.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Nancy
>

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Mike Kuo" <MikeKuo@CCSEMC.com>
> To: "Nancy (E-mail)" <fnancy@cclab.com.tw>
> Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2002 7:58 AM
> Subject: FW: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
> AN02T2013
>
>
> >
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: CERTADM
> > Sent: Monday, May 13, 2002 4:57 PM
> > To: 'mkuo@ccsemc.com'
> > Subject: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
> > AN02T2013
> >
> >
> > Notice_content
> >   ------------
> > Question 18: Processing Gain:In the processing data, it indicates "S/I =
> > Signal to noise required for a given error probability. In this case 1
x
> > 10-4 was used. ". However, according to FCC guideline, for data systems
> it
> > is typically around 1x10ee(-5), while for voice systems it may be as
high
> as
> > 1x10ee(-2). If the selected BER varies greatly from such values,
> > justification must be provided for its choice. Please redo the
processing
> > gain with 10-2 or provide the justification.
> >
> > Best Regards
> >
> > Mike Kuo / TCB Certifier
> > The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can
continue
> > on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested
> > information within 60 days of the original e-mail date may result in
> > application dismissal and forfeiture of the filing fee. 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 e-mail address listed below the name of the sender.
> >

From: Nancy [fnancy@cclab.com.tw]
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 10:58 PM
To: Mike Kuo
Subject: Re: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
AN02T2013 Part 3

----- Original Message -----
From: "Mike Kuo" <MikeKuo@CCSEMC.com>
To: "Nancy (E-mail)" <fnancy@cclab.com.tw>; <houliwen@ms5.hinet.net>
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2002 7:24 AM
Subject: FW: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
AN02T2013

>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: CERTADM
> Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2002 4:10 PM
> To: 'mkuo@ccsemc.com'
> Subject: Shanghai Zi Bei Telesystems Co., Ltd., FCC ID:N6536570,
> AN02T2013
>
>
> Notice_content
> -------------
> Question #1: Modifications were made during final compliance tests.
Please
> provide a cover letter signed by the applicant to acknowledge that all
> modifications listed in this modification report will be incorporated into
> each unit sold in the U.S..
>
> Question #2: Section 6 of test report referred to 15.249 modification.
This
> is direct sequence spread spectrum which is subject to 15.247 requirement
> not 15.249.
>
> Question #3: Since the handset is considered as portable transmitter. In
> accordance with ANSI C63.4 section 13.1.4.1 procedure, handheld device
shall
> be investigated with three orthogonal axes. Through out the test report,
> there is no place to indicate such procedure was followed.
>
> Question #4: Radiated emission tests / 15.205/15.209 : the distance
> correction factor is 0 dB for harmonics and spurious emission up to 24
GHz.
> Apparently you were testing with 3 meter distance so there in no distance
> correction factors were used. There are several harmonic emission are
very
> close to the limits. Please perform additional radiated emission tests
for
> second and third harmonics on low, middle and high channel for both
handset
> and base station at distance of 1 meter and apply distance correction
> factor. Submit such data.
>
> Question #5: Output power: As indicated in the test report, the design
goal
> for base station is 15dBm. However, the measured conducted output for
base
> station has max. 5.62dBm. Please explain the differences.

>
> Question #6: Test data contain in Page 57 - 60 of test report can not be
> read. Please provide a clear copy of test data.
>
> Question #7: Processing gain section of test data can not be read. Please
> provide a clear copy of processing gain information.
>
> Question #8: The processing gain tests are performed by the manufacturer
as
> indicated in the test report. The model name used in this processing gain
> is different than the model name documented in the test report. There is
no
> evidence to show that such processing gain test data were tested on the
same
> type of product for FCC compliance. Please provide / show information to
> prove such processing gain tests were made on the identical to the one
> subject to FCC compliance tests.
>
> Question #8: Please provide antenna conducted emission tests from 30MHz to
> 10th harmonics when device tuned to low, middle and high frequency for
both
> handset and base station. Submit spectrum plots.
>
> Question #9: Indicate compliance with the field strength requirements in
the
> restricted band of 2483.5-2500 MHz with device operating on the highest
> channel. Provide peak and average measurements. The conducted plots show
> that the peak level should be at about 2483.5 MHz.
>
> Question #10: Proposed FCC ID label format does not contain information
> required under 15.214 (c) of FCC rules. Please provide revised FCC ID
> label format.
>
> Question #11: In accordance with 15.214 (a) of FCC rules, both base
station
> and handset need to be labeled with FCC ID with required information. The
> proposed FCC ID label locating only indicates the ID label on the base
> station, please also provide ID label location for handset.
>
> Question #12: As indicated in the block diagram, the design RF power for
> base station and handset are 20dBm. However, in the test report indicates
> the design power is 15dBm. Please explain.
>
> Question #13: Request for confidentiality letter: request for
> confidentiality must provide with a reason. In this letter, only schematic
> diagram is requested. However, the operational description is labeled
with
> confidential wording. Is operational description file going to be one of
> confidential document ?
>
> Question #14: All internal photos submitted are too small and also
unclear.
> Please provide another sets of internal photos for base and handset and
make
> sure all chip set marking can be seen.
>
> Question #15: Please provide MPE calculation for demonstrating RF exposure

> compliance for Base Station.
>
> Question #16: User manual does not contain RF exposure warning statement
to
> user. Please provide it.
>
>
> Best Regards
>
> Mike Kuo / TCB Certifier
> The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue
> on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested
> information within 60 days of the original e-mail date may result in
> application dismissal and forfeiture of the filing fee. 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 e-mail address listed below the name of the sender.
>