

Subject: RE: Wallace applications ATCB004406 & ATCB004405 status request  
From: "Rupp, Susan" <SRupp@tuvam.com>  
To: Timothy R. Johnson <tjohnson@atcb.com>

Hi Tim

OK, I think I have the label and the app matching - the model for the Vu Qube is VQV10 and the model for the Remote is VQV10R. This is the same on both label and RSP-100 for both application. Uploading now. I'll get the manual revised and reuploaded. The rest of your comments have been forwarded to Joel to answer.

Thank you,

Sue

---

**From:** Timothy R. Johnson [mailto:tjohnson@atcb.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 17, 2007 11:38 PM  
**To:** Rupp, Susan  
**Subject:** RE: Wallace applications ATCB004406 & ATCB004405 status request

Susan,

- 1) The model on the IC for and the device still does not match. Please confirm how we are listing this device and ensure the labels match.
- 2) the manual co-location statement should identify that the non-colocation is to meet the FCC's RF exposure requirements, or must be stated in a firm manner such as "this device must not be co-located with other transmitters to ensure compliance with FCC RF exposure requirements", etc.
- 3) Regarding the response regarding average measurements to previous comment 4, the concern is that the 10 Hz method is only valid on signals that are CW in nature, or at least that the Ton time is  $> 1/\text{VBW}$ . Yes the device should be tested for worse case mode, but the validity of the measurement depends on the behavior of the carrier and the settings used during the test. If the device was pulsed, a 10 Hz method is likely not acceptable. Further information is necessary to ensure compliance. Note the previous comment was  
**ATCB Comments:** A large difference is noted between peak and average readings. This suggests that the signals may have actually had a duty cycle associated with them. If so, the average should have actually been derived using worse case duty cycle calculations. Please review/explain/correct as necessary.
- 4) Regarding previous issue 5, we need confirmation that device tested was a maximum expected output power.
- 5) If applicable from response to issue 5, please correct 731.
- 6) Please ensure final output power result is in the report. It appears that only a margin and field strengths are shown.
- 7) Output power still appears to show 31.5 dB margin, which does not match data on pages 17-18 as cites. Please review.

Tim

At 12:00 PM 1/17/2007 -0500, you wrote:

Hi Tim

I've uploaded the attached response and referenced revised documents for the Vu Qube, remote will follow shortly. Wallace asked me to ask about status as they are very anxious for grants and certificates on these products.

Thank you,

Sue

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

From: Timothy R. Johnson [<mailto:tjohnson@atcb.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2007 12:54 AM

To: Rupp, Susan

Subject: Re: Wallace applications ATCB004406 & ATCB004405 status request

Susan,

I've complete the review, but have been without internet for many hours (something has gone down in my area). I am sending this via email, hoping it will go out overnight when it may come back up.

See attached.

Thanks,

Tim

Susan,

I've completed about 1/2 the first review today....So far the only concern is:

1) Regarding equipment labeling for Canada, the label must contain 3 items. The label should contain the applicant, Certification Number, and model number as certified and shown on the IC form. Currently the label does not show a complete certification number, model number as shown on the form, or the applicant. Please correct.

Tim

At 11:07 AM 1/12/2007 -0500, Rupp, Susan wrote:

> Hi Tim

>

>I uploaded all exhibits just over a week ago and our client is asking  
>for status. I don't see any activity on-line and wondered if maybe I  
>forgot to click that button that these were ready for review?

>

>Thank you,

>

>She