## Technical Comments and Response 1:

1) Kindly explain if the TX module was external to the "pie tin electronics" for ALL configurations as it can not be seen in the radiated photographs of what is between the "pie tin" and the antenna". The only configuration that seemed to show the board external was bench testing.

The board that is shown during the bench testing is the EUT. The EUT was external to the tin enclosure. The intentional radiated test setup is similar to what you see for bench testing. The tin enclosure houses the Evaluation board for the EUT. The board that is shown during the bench testing is the EUT. The EUT was external to the tin enclosure. The intentional radiated test setup is similar to what you see for bench testing. The tin enclosure houses the Evaluation board for the EUT.

The distance between the EUT and enclosure is greater than 10 cm .


Also, please explain why some configurations show the "pie tin" and others do not.
Unintentional radiated emissions testing was conducted first and showed no need for the evaluation board to be shielded, it was during the intentional radiated testing that we found the evaluation board needed to be shielded. This is why all radio test setups show the tin enclosure while radiated spurious emissions do not show this.

4b

Please review. Additionally, note that emissions around restricted band of 7250 MHz may be suspect for channels slightly greater than the low channel given the results for lowest channel are $>74 \mathrm{dBuV} / \mathrm{m}$ just outside of the restricted band.

Channels 3,5,7 were checked to ensure the levels were lower than that measured on the lowest channel. Please see the data below. Plots are also available if needed:

| Frequency <br> $(\mathrm{MHz})$ | AF <br> Table | Test <br> Data <br> $(\mathrm{dBuV})$ | Additional <br> Factor | AF+CA- <br> AMP+DC <br> $(\mathrm{dB} / \mathrm{m})$ | Results <br> $(\mathrm{dBuV} / \mathrm{m})$ | Limits <br> $(\mathrm{dBuV} / \mathrm{m})$ | Distance $/$ <br> Polarization | Margin <br> $(\mathrm{dB})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $7208.80(\mathrm{Ch} 3)$ | 1 hn 3 mV | 63.88 | $1.00($ filter $)$ | 9.18 | 74.06 | 74.0 | $3 \mathrm{~m} . /$ | -.1 |
| $7212.85(\mathrm{Ch} 5)$ | 1 hn 3 mV | 63.20 | $1.00($ filter $)$ | 9.19 | 73.39 | 74.0 | $3 \mathrm{~m} . /$ | .6 |
| $7218.18(\mathrm{Ch} 7)$ | 1 hn 3 mV | 61.96 | $1.00($ filter $)$ | 9.21 | 72.17 | 74.0 | $3 \mathrm{~m} . /$ | 1.8 |

5) Output power appears higher than previously reported. Normally any changes to maximum power will require a new FCC ID and a new equipment authorization application to the FCC (see PC policy). Kindly review. Kindly note KDB 178919 \& 291699.
http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/oetcf/kdb/forms/FTSSearchResultPage.cfm?id=33013\&switch=P https://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/oetcf/kdb/forms/FTSSearchResultPage.cfm?id=29247\&switch=P

The client has stated that the there is no intentional increase in power and no degradation of performance was seen with the replacement of this PA. Please see the test report, Section 2.6 Conducted Power measurements.

