



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

November 11, 2002

RE: FITRIGHT Industrial Co., Ltd.

FCC ID: QJIFR-CH0002

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

- 1) NOTE: We have copied all relevant information from the related filing possible.
- 2) Please provide a new label exhibit just for this application (base only).
- 3) Please provide a new schematic exhibit that is for this application only (base only).
- 4) Test results in section 3.4 of the report show average results that are slightly higher than peak results. Please explain why some average measurements are higher when peak measurements should always be worse case. (also see #4 below)
- 5) It appears that fundamental data appears in 2 locations in the report with a 30 dB difference between them. The results provided in section 3.4 are significantly below the limit (by about 30 dB). From previous discussions we believed that the power was going to be reduced to bring the EUT just into compliance with 15.249, but it appears that the fundamental is much lower than expected. However, section 6.4 of the test report shows values much higher within the 2.4 - 2.4835 GHz Band. Additionally some peak fundamental readings in the 2.4 - 2.4835 GHz band exceeded the average limit (Please note that the peak limit = 114 dBuV and the average limit is 94 dBuV for the fundamental emission), yet average measurements are not shown. Please explain and/or correct the appropriate sections of the test report.
- 6) Section 6.1 does not appear to show uncorrected average measurements. It is not clear if average measurements were also performed, or only average measurements + duty cycle correction was applied. Please explain.
- 7) Section 6.1 of the test report appears to utilize a duty cycle correction for averaging. However detailed information regarding operation of the transmitter and its duty cycles was not provided. Please provide information showing what the worse case duty cycle is and how the correction factor was calculated.
- 8) Please explain any changes or modifications that were necessary from the manufacturer to bring the device into compliance with 15.249 vs 15.247.

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.