

From: jonson [jonson@cclab.com.tw]
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2003 4:54 AM
To: Mike Kuo; Jonson Lee (E-mail); Eric (E-mail); Ting (E-mail)
Cc: Shirley Kang
Subject: Re: Quanta Computer Inc., FCC ID:HFS-G50, AN03T3103 (Third Notice)

Hi Mike,

For Q#15, please find attached for the revised test report again. (B30624212-RP.pdf)

For Q#16&17, please refer to the SAR test report, test plot and SAR system validation plot again that the test date, liquid parameter and temperature are consistent now.

For Q18, please find attached for the Probe calibration file.

For Q19, the accessory placed on that table is a ear phone and the purpose is to simulate the standing position.

For Q20, the part list is also listed as a confidential document and please find attached for the revised confidential letter.

For Q21, sorry for our misunderstanding and please refer to the attached file for revised user manual.

Best Regards,

Lucy

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

From: CERTADM
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2003 10:23 AM
To: 'mkuo@ccsemc.com'
Subject: Quanta Computer Inc., FCC ID:HFS-G50, AN03T3103 (Third Notice)

Notice_content

Third Notice

Question #15: In the revised Part 24 test report, section 5.5 of test report is to report the RF conducted output power in GSM and GRPS Class 10 measurement. However, in the revised test report, you have replaced previously reported RF conducted power measurement with EIRP measurement for GRPS mode. Please take a look the revised test report and compare with the original test report. Please revised test report again.

Question #16: In the SAR plots and SAR system validation plots provided in your e-mail and compare with SAR main test report. There are several major disagreements on when you performed the measurement. In the SAR test report, the system validation tests were performed on 07/2, 07/4 and 07/07 which are in agreement with system validation plots. In the SAR test report, actual SAR measurement on the device were performed on 07/2, 07/4, 07/07. These test dates do not agree with the SAR data plots provided. In the SAR test plots, the tests were performed on 07/22, 07/18. All the liquid parameter indicated on the SAR plots can not be verified with liquid

parameter listed in the SAR test report. Please go over your SAR test

report and SAR data plots to harmonize the difference on the date and liquid parameter. If the SAR measurements were performed other than 07/2, 07/04, 07/22, please provide SAR system validation plots as well.

Question #17: In your reply to question #10 about the ambient temperature during the SAR measurement, no explanation was provided and the temperature listed in the revised SAR test report have be revised. By comparing the revised SAR test report with SAR test plots, all temperature listed in the SAR plots indicated the air temperature are above 26 degree C and do not agree with revised SAR test report. When the question is addressed to the measurement procedure, please do provide your explanation to address the question.

Question #18: Please provide Probe calibration file (only DAE system calibration file and Dipole calibration file were provided).

Question #19: Test setup photos for Part 24: In the test setup photo, in addition to the EUT, there is another table placed on the top of turn table, please explain what are the accessories placed on this table and what is the purpose of such table. Also in the AC conducted setup photos, the ear phone was attached to the vertical pole. In the future tests, please do not set up such device in this way. Even though you may try to use vertical pole to simulate standing position, but you did not consider that person may use the ear phone at sitting position. In the future, please place the ear phone on the table which is closed to the EUT .

Question #20: Please confirm Parts list is not a confidential document. If it is confidential document, please revised your request for confidentiality letter.

Question #21: Please take a look your revised user manual again. From page 1 to the last page, most of upper portion of information have been cut off. Please provide revised user manual again and make sure to address this problem before submitting.

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 60 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.