

Walter Dittel GmbH – Postfach 101261 – 86882 Landsberg

FCC OET
Office of Engineering and Technology
445 12TH Street SW
Washington DC 20554

Telefon +49 - 8191 - 33 51 57
Telefax +49 - 8191 - 33 51 70
Email moessinger@dittel.com

October 12, 2001/M.

FCC OET
Office of Engineering and Technology
7435 Oakland Mills Road
Columbia MD 21046-1609

Copy: Ing. Werner Weiler, Walter Dittel GmbH, Head Aviation Products

Application for Equipment Authorization / Type Approval
Additional Product Family Information
FCC Registration number FRN 0004-9987-79

Attn: Linda Elliott
lelliott@fcc.gov
FCC Application Processing Branch
Re: FCC ID BVYFSG90
Applicant: Walter Dittel GmbH
Correspondence Reference Number: 20744
731 Confirmation Number: EA102416

Dear Mrs. Elliot,

Thank you very much for the above identified mail information, that additional details shall be submitted by us.

In order to comply with your request, this is to ask FCC for further clarification:

Since we do not know, which FCC ID is allowed / accepted by FCC (due to the 24 different variants of the FSG 90 and 24 different variants of the FSG 200 system family, we have FCC asked for, we have only sent with our initial application some draft type label information to show, where the particular finally to be assigned FCC ID Number is to be placed.

We have however not received up to now any comment from FCC whether all 24 models FSG 90(X) and all 24 models FSG 200(X) may receive FCC ID / Approval / Acceptance (please see our two accompanying letters attached to the Form 731 application which state in detail the transceiver family details.

To explain it to FCC again in short, there is ONLY ONE TRANSCEIVER DESIGN which is used to form a family of total 48 different variants. All of the 48 models have almost identical functionality.

This family is called FSG 90.

All variants are based on this design. Differences are only in CASE SHAPE, FREQUENCY RANGE and 8.33 kHz channel spacing capability enabled / installed or not. Software determines these variants.

The only real hardware design difference is in the TRANSMITTER RF OUTPUT POWER level: 6 Watt uses transistor type BLF 244, and the 10 Watt modes use BLF 245, plus different case / shape arrangement. Even out of the same family RF PA Transistor types are used, together with slightly different RF PA matching network.

The **FSG 90 / FSG 200 CETECOM test report has obviously not reached you as a *.pdf file**. Therefore, it is mailed as zip file today again.

This test report refers to the worst case design variants with 10 Watts RF power output and confirms, that the formerly tested 6 Watt performance data through all the extremely extensive JTSA and FAA/TSA and ETSI tests performed are not exceeded by these 10 Watt versions (except of nominal higher RF output power). As you may know, such tests are however partially much more stringent than FCC test requirements.

The only missing formal information in this FCC test report is mentioning of the FCC ID (which is applicable to our understanding only after FCC has confirmed that the intended FCC ID numbering on the equipments will be accepted by FCC).

On the other hand, the applicable further required documentation mentioned in §2.1033 (3), (4), (5), (7) is already submitted in separated files, because of the established electronic file transfer size limits.

Based on your (early ?) reply to this letter, we will submit any further data / documents required.

Type label information will be submitted soon for the models which may become FCC approved, once we get your comments.

Sincerely yours

WALTER DITTEL GmbH
LUFTFAHRTGERÄTEBAU

Ing. W. Weiler	i.V. Fritz Mössinger
Head Aviation Dept.	Radio Projects

Attachment

CETECOM Test Report 2-2332-A/00 as *.ZIP file