

from "tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com" <tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com>
to September.Radecki@ccsemc.com
cc tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com, Thu.Chan@ccsemc.com
date Oct 5, 2007 10:41 PM
subject Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
Hello September,
This is a combined notice for AN07T7251 & AN07T7252. All items except Q4 are relevant to both applications. I am sending this to you with cc: to Thu as all items relate to documentation.
Q1: User manual makes reference to SAR test, but no SAR test data was included with the application. Please remove the SAR statement from the user manual, page 22. Add at least general installation instructions and conditions for OEM's regarding RF exposure.
Q2: The modular request letter also makes reference to SAR testing. SAR test data was not included with the application. Please revise the modular request letter to remove reference to SAR testing and include acknowledgement that compliance with RF exposure requirements is the responsibility of the grantee and will be addressed for all final host configurations.
Q3: The label document does not show the location of the label on the device. Please provide a revised label document.
Q4: (15E APPLICATION ONLY) Please provide an attestation from the grantee verifying that the device does not have Ad Hoc capabilities on non-US frequencies and on DFS frequencies.
Best regards,
Tim Dwyer

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to "tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com" <tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 9, 2007 1:59 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
Hi September,
Please ask Mike H. to take a look at the DFS report in AN07T7252 to see if it should have been DFS tested in both 20 and 40 MHz bandwidths.
Best regards

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to "tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com" <tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 9, 2007 3:12 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
Hi again,
Tom C. is here at the workshop. Per Mike K., Tom was involved in this one so I will check with him also. Reason is that FCC listed this as an area that they were scrutinizing. I thought it did not apply to client only devices without radar detection, but it appears to be applicable.
Tim

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to "tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com" <tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com>
cc Thomas Cokenias <tom@tncokenias.org>
date Oct 10, 2007 4:07 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
Hello September,
The following should be added as item Q5: After additional research and review, it will be necessary to revise the application and exhibits to remove all reference to 40 MHz bandwidth operation. Please revise the application and any exhibits that include 40 MHz bandwidth information.
Best regards,

from September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
to "Timothy M. Dwyer" <tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com>
cc Thu Chan <thu.chan@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 10, 2007 8:01 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
Hi Tim,
Below are the answers to your questions on the referenced application.
Q1: User manual makes reference to SAR test, but no SAR test data was included with the application. Please remove the SAR statement from the user manual, page 22. Add at least general installation instructions and conditions for OEM's regarding RF exposure.
<CCS Answer:> SAR reference removed from end-user Installation and User Guide. General installation instructions for ODMs/OEMs regarding RF exposure in the Product Specification and Modular Installation Instructions Manual.
Q2: The modular request letter also makes reference to SAR testing. SAR test data was not included with the application. Please revise the modular request letter to remove reference to SAR testing and include acknowledgement that compliance with RF exposure requirements is the responsibility of the grantee and will be addressed for all final host configurations.
<CCS Answer:> SAR reference removed from Modular Request letter. Compliance with RF exposure requirements added as item 8.
Q3: The label document does not show the location of the label on the device. Please provide a revised label document.
<CCS Answer:> Placement for internal and external labels added to Regulatory Label document.
Q4: (15E APPLICATION ONLY) Please provide an attestation from the grantee verifying that the device does not have Ad Hoc capabilities on non-US frequencies and on DFS frequencies.
<CCS Answer:> Ad Hoc Attestation Letter attached.
Q5: (15 E Application only) Please add a note in the user manual that operation in the 5150-5250 MHz band is limited to indoor use.
<CCS Answer:> Added to footnote in end-user Installation and User Guide about channel usage.
Thanks and best regards,
September

September Radecki
Compliance Certification Services
47173 Benicia Street
Fremont, CA 94538
phone: 1-510-771-1090
fax: 1-510-661-0888
September.Radecki@CCSEMC.com <mailto:September.Radecki@CCSEMC.com>

5 attachments — Download all attachments
WFB400_Guide_WindowsClient_landU_640-00141-01.pdf
65-VE239-P2_MC423D_H_ProductSpec_ModularInst_640-00125-02.pdf
65-VE239-P2_MC423D_H_RegulatoryLabel_642-00013-02.pdf
J9C-65VE239P2_FCC_Modular_Request_Form_02.pdf
J9C-65VE239P2_AdHocAttestation.pdf

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
cc Thomas Cokenias <tom@tncokenias.org>
date Oct 11, 2007 9:35 AM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
Hi September,
As a correction to my email yesterday, the additional item should be added as Q6, not Q5 that was already used.
Best regards,

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 11, 2007 11:51 AM
subject Fwd: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
Hi September,
I am re-snding the email I sent yesterday. This is based on clarifications presented during the workshop this week.
There is one correction. I used Q5 in the email yesterday. It should be Q6.
Best regards,

from September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
to Tim Dwyer - TCB <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
date Oct 11, 2007 11:56 AM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
I'm glad you are resending this as I did not receive it yesterday at all. So much for our expedited application... wow..... big changes!
Thanks,
September

from September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
to Tim Dwyer - TCB <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
cc Michael Heckrotte <michael.heckrotte@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 11, 2007 12:00 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
Hi Tim,
I never received the email dated October 9 or October 10. I have no idea where they went.
Thanks for resending. I will work with Mike H to resolve these questions.
Best regards,

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 11, 2007 11:59 AM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
As additional information, this has been discussed at length with Mike K., so is final, not just my opinion.

from September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
to Tim Dwyer - TCB <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
date Oct 11, 2007 12:04 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
Do I ever argue with you, the grand expert? :-D
-----Original Message-----
From: rfspectrum@gmail.com [mailto:rfspectrum@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Tim Dwyer
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2007 9:00 AM
To: September Radecki

from Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
to September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
date Oct 11, 2007 12:02 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
mailed-by gmail.com
Not you, but the applicant might.

September Radecki to Tim
Oh, well, good luck with that. :-D
-----Original Message-----
From: rfspectrum@gmail.com [mailto:rfspectrum@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Tim Dwyer

from September Radecki <september.radecki@ccsemc.com>
to Tim Dwyer - TCB <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>
date Oct 15, 2007 12:36 PM
subject RE: Qualcomm Incorporated, FCC ID: J9C-65VE239P2, Assessment NO.: AN07T7251&AN07T7252, Notice#1
Hi Tim,
Q1: User manual makes reference to SAR test, but no SAR test data was included with the application. Please remove the SAR statement from the user manual, page 22. Add at least general installation instructions and conditions for OEM's regarding RF exposure.
<CCS Answer:> Revised User Manual is attached.
Q2: The modular request letter also makes reference to SAR testing. SAR test data was not included with the application. Please revise the modular request letter to remove reference to SAR testing and include acknowledgement that compliance with RF exposure requirements is the responsibility of the grantee and will be addressed for all final host configurations.
<CCS Answer:> Revised Modular Request Letter is attached.
Q3: The label document does not show the location of the label on the device. Please provide a revised label document.
<CCS Answer:> Revised label exhibit attached.
Q4: (15E APPLICATION ONLY) Please provide an attestation from the grantee verifying that the device does not have Ad Hoc capabilities on non-US frequencies and on DFS frequencies.
<CCS Answer:> Revised AdHoc Attestation exhibit is attached.
Revised DTS and UNII Reports are attached as well as MPE Reports. This should be everything!
Thanks and best regards,
September

September Radecki
Compliance Certification Services
47173 Benicia Street
Fremont, CA 94538
phone: 1-510-771-1090
fax: 1-510-661-0888
September.Radecki@CCSEMC.com

13 attachments — Download all attachments
UNII MPE.pdf
DTS MPE.pdf
07U11134-11 FCC UNII Report.pdf
07U11134-11 FCC UNII Test Setup Photos.pdf
07U11134-1B FCC DTS Report_setup photos.pdf
07U11134-1B FCC DTS Report_Part 1.pdf
07U11134-1B FCC DTS Report_Part 2.pdf
65-VE239-P2_MC423D_H_TheoryOfOperations_643-00022-02.pdf
65-VE239-P2_MC423D_H_RegulatoryLabel_642-00013-02.pdf
J9C-65VE239P2_AdHocAttestation.pdf
WFB400_Guide_WindowsClient_landU_640-00141-01.pdf
65-VE239-P2_MC423D_H_ProductSpec_ModularInst_640-00125-02.pdf
J9C-65VE239P2_FCC_Modular_Request_Form_02.pdf

129K View as HTML Download
125K View as HTML Download
3333K View as HTML Download
297K View as HTML Download
244K View as HTML Download
2905K View as HTML Download
2875K View as HTML Download
173K View as HTML Download
59K View as HTML Download
30K View as HTML Download
562K View as HTML Download
554K View as HTML Download
13K View as HTML Download

13K View as HTML Download

10/16/2007 12:05:43 PM

September Radecki to Tim [show details](#) 2:22 pm (51 minutes ago) 

I'm SO sorry this has turned into such a freak application. Now I have just looked over the ID Label and Location document previously sent and it violates their request for short term confi so I've prepared a new one which is attached here. Also, please replace the Theory of Operations with the one attached here because they changed a note at the bottom of page 2. I have a product specification document that is new, not sure what changed, but I don't know if you need that. If you do, please advise.

Their goal is now to get the grant by Friday... if we can beat that (and get the exhibits to stop changing) that would rock.

Thanks in advance!

Best regards,
September

[- Show quoted text -](#)

2 attachments — [Download all attachments](#)



ID Label and Location Revised.pdf

41K [View as HTML](#) [Download](#)



65-VE239-P2_MC423D_H_TheoryOfO

perations_643-00022-02.pdf

57K [View as HTML](#) [Download](#)