

Mike Kuo

From: eric [eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com] on behalf of eric.wong [eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2005 12:39 AM
To: Mike Kuo
Cc: eric.wong
Subject: Re .G RE: Re : FW: SHENZHEN AWING ROC INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FCC ID: TPU052720010, Assessment NO.: AN05T5301, Notice#1
Attachments: 99 Occ BW.pdf; SZ051017B03-RP_1208.pdf

----- 轉信者 eric/ccsemc 於 2005/12/13 04:34 PM -----

eric.wong

寄件人 : eric 收件人 : "Mike Kuo" <mike.kuo@ccsemc.com>
2005/12/10 12:19 副本抄送 : "eric" <eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com>, jim.chang/ccsemc@ccsemc
AM 主旨 : Re : RE: Re : FW: SHENZHEN AWING ROC INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FCC ID: TPU052720010, Assessment NO.: AN05T5301, Notice#1 [連結](#)

Hello Mike,

Please find our replies below in **RED**, thank you!!

Have a nice weekend!! ^^\n

Eric

"Mike Kuo"
<mike.kuo@ccsemc.com> 收件人 : "eric" <eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com>
2005/12/02 10:33 AM 副本抄送 :
主旨 : RE: Re : FW: SHENZHEN AWING ROC INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FCC ID: TPU052720010, Assessment NO.: AN05T5301, Notice#1

Hi Eric :

Please address additional questions below :

Question #9 : Reply to Question #4 is not acceptable. 6.34kHz is based upon 26dB BW. If you want to use measurement to justify the necessary bandwidth, per section 2.202 of FCC rules, you may use 99% BW measurement. Please submit 99% BW plot. The emission designator of F8D does not match with design function, suggest to use F1D.

(Eric: Per your info I have quote another emission designator as 4K20F1D--, attached please also find the 99%BW plot for your reference, thanks!!)

Question #10 : Page 18 of Test report, please explain how -26dB limits is calculated. Please also update the note section on Page 18.

(Eric: Per your info, I have modified the report and attached as the attachment, please kindly find the most updated one

12/15/2005

just been sent, thanks!!)

Question #11 : The fundamental frequency on Page 18 is 72.49MHz but the fundamental frequency measured on Page 22 is 72.3MHz. The test result for both measurement is identical, please explain.

(Eric: Per your info, I have modified the report and attached as the attachment, please kindly find the most updated one just been sent, thanks!!)

Best Regards

Mike Kuo
Compliance Certification Services
561F Monterey Road
Morgan Hill CA 95037
Tel: (408)463-0885 x: 105
Fax: (408)463-0888

e-mail:mike.kuo@ccsemc.com
<http://www.ccsemc.com>

From: eric [mailto:eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2005 1:20 AM
To: Mike Kuo
Cc: eric
Subject: Re : FW: SHENZHEN AWING ROC INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FCC ID: TPU052720010, Assessment NO.: AN05T5301, Notice#1

Hello Mike,

Please kindly find our replies below in **BLUE**, thank you very much...!! ^~

Eric

"Mike Kuo"
<mike.kuo@ccsemc.com> 收件人 : "eric" <eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com>
2005/11/29 10:46 AM 副本抄送 :
主旨 : FW: SHENZHEN AWING ROC INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FCC ID: TPU052720010, Assessment NO.: AN05T5301, Notice#1

Best Regards

Mike Kuo
Compliance Certification Services
561F Monterey Road
Morgan Hill CA 95037

12/15/2005

Tel: (408)463-0885 x: 105

Fax: (408)463-0888

e-mail:mike.kuo@ccsemc.com

<http://www.ccsemc.com>

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

From: Compliance Certification Services [mailto:mike.kuo@ccsemc.com]

Sent: Monday, November 28, 2005 6:35 PM

To: Mike Kuo

Subject: SHENZHEN AWING ROC INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FCC ID: TPU052720010,

Assessment NO.: AN05T5301, Notice#1

Question #1: Same device filed twice under assessment no:AN05T5301 and AN05T5299. AN05T5299 application will be cancelled and assessment will be based upon the information submitted under assessment no:AN05T5301.

Please confirm.

(ERIC: FYI, AN05T5299 was finished with a numbers of wrong documents (such as wrong ID on the label format, Confidentiality req, and report etc). In order to avoid the misunderstanding during the review, I have made another TCB filing with the assessment# 5301. Please kindly discard the assessment# 5299 and review only on the submittals of the assessment# 5301, sorry and thanks for your understanding.)

Question #2: Please modify EUT description by only showing transmitter in the test report. Receiver is not part of review.

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, please find the updates on the revised report just attached by this mail)

Question #3: Two external photos are submitted for 4 channel and 6 channel operation but only one internal photo file is submitted. The internal photo is for 4 channel or 6 channel ? Please submit internal photos for 4 channel and 6 channel and indicate on the internal photos the differences by comparing 4 channel and 6 channel operation.

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, please find 2 separate internal photo for 4CH and 6CH just attached by this mail, they are already remarked with a suffix 4CH & 6CH respectively.)

Question #4: Please provide emission designator and justify the necessary bandwidth by using Carson rules (2M+2DK).

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, the emission designator is 6K34F8D--)

Question #5: Page 18 and page 22 of test report: please provide calculated formula. Please verify the output power in dBm Vs watts.

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, please find the updates on the revised report just attached by this mail)

Question #6: Please provide tune up procedures.

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, please find the tune-up procedure just attached by this mail)

Question #7 : Section 7.5 of test report, the reference fundamental frequency is 72.13 MHz which does not agree with fundamental frequency tested.

(ERIC:

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, please find the updates on the revised report just attached by this mail)

Question #8 : Please provide the channel list for 6 channel and 4 channel operation.

(ERIC: Thanks for your info, please find the CH table just attached by this mail. FYI, the so-called "CH" only stands for how many "function" they are communicating between the transmitter and receiver over the same frequency of the spectrum, not standing for how many channel they have.)

Best Regards

12/15/2005

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.