

Mike Kuo

From: Claire Hoque
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 4:14 PM
To: Mike Kuo
Cc: Alvin Ilarina; Christine Vu; Chi Tsou; Michael Heckrotte
Subject: answer: Sierra Wireless Inc., FCC ID: N7N-MC5720, Assessment NO.: AN06T5795, Notice# 1

Attachments: 06U10280-1B FCC PART 22 & 24 FINAL Report.pdf



06U10280-1B FCC
PART 22 & 24 ...

Hi Mike,

Pls see answer below and pls issue grant today.

Question #1: section 5.1 of Part 22/24 test report, MC-5725 model name is stated which does not agree with the model name listed in the test report cover page. Please explain.
<answer> Section 5.1 has been updated to address the appropriate equipment covered by the report.

Question #2: This is Class II permissive change filing. Based upon the original theory of operation on file, this module is only capable of 1xEVDO Rev. 0 but section 5.1 of test report stated this device is capable of 1xEVDO Rev.0/A . Please explain the changes made on this module by comparing to the original filing.
<answer> Section 5.1 has been updated to address the appropriate equipment covered by the report.

Question #3: Section 5.2 of test report listed the Class II permissive changes that applicable to this filing which does not agree with the request for Class II permissive change cover letter. Please make necessary correction.
<answer> Section 5.2 has been corrected to incorporate change cover letter information.

Question #4:Section 5.6 of test report mentioned 1xEVDO Rev. A investigation which is related to the question 2 above. Please address.
<answer> Section 5.6 has been updated to address the appropriate equipment covered by the report.

Question #5: Per section 5.2 of test report, this module is intended to be installed in four different laptop computers. In section 5.6 - the worst case investigation, there is no indication what are the steps have been taken to determine the worst-case in term of different laptop computers. In addition, fundamental ERP/EIRP and radiated spurious emission tests, there are not information provided to disclose which lap top computers were used during final tests. Please provide strong justification on the selection of various lap top computers for radiated tests and clearly indicated which lap top computer was used during the final tests.
<answer>Section 5.6 has been updated to clearly state the laptop used for the final testing and the justification for selection.

Thanks,

Claire

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

From: Mike Kuo
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 12:27 PM
To: Mike Kuo
Subject: Sierra Wireless Inc., FCC ID: N7N-MC5720, Assessment NO.: AN06T5795, Notice#1

Question #1: section 5.1 of Part 22/24 test report, MC-5725 model name is stated which

does not agree with the model name listed in the test report cover page. Please explain.

Question #2: This is Class II permissive change filing. Based upon the original theory of operation on file, this module is only capable of 1xEVDO Rev. 0 but section 5.1 of test report stated this device is capable of 1xEVDO Rev.0/A . Please explain the changes made on this module by comparing to the original filing.

Question #3: Section 5.2 of test report listed the Class II permissive changes that applicable to this filing which does not agree with the request for Class II permissive change cover letter. Please make necessary correction.

Question #4:Section 5.6 of test report mentioned 1xEVDO Rev. A investigation which is related to the question 2 above. Please address.

Question #5: Per section 5.2 of test report, this module is intended to be installed in four different laptop computers. In section 5.6 - the worst case investigation, there is no indication what are the steps have been taken to determine the worst-case in term of different laptop computers. In addition, fundamental ERP/EIRP and radiated spurious emission tests, there are not information provided to disclose which lap top computers were used during final tests. Please provide strong justification on the selection of various lap top computers for radiated tests and clearly indicated which lap top computer was used during the final tests.

Best Regards

Mike Kuo

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information within 30 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.