To: Ms. Kim/ HCT
From: Gregory Czumak/ PCTEST TCB

Re: FCC ID: 06Y-CDM7025
Applicant: UTStarcom Inc.

Application Received: 11/14/2005
Correspondence Reference Number: 151114A.06Y
Confirmation Number: 1511140548

Date of Original Email: 11/29/2005

Subject: Request for additional information

In regards to your recent TCB application referenced above, we kindly request that you provide the following additional information.

1. Does the EUT support EV-DO operation? If so, please note the following interim directive from the FCC regarding EV-DO operations and SAR:
   Body-worn SAR should be repeated in EV-DO (Rev. 0 only) using the CDMA 2000 body-worn channel configuration that resulted in the highest SAR among the various Radio Configurations in this frequency band (that is, just a single SAR test for EV-! DO, as a sanity check). If this EV-DO SAR is greater than the highest body-worn SAR in CDMA 2000, perform body-worn SAR for the other 2 channels (among the required H, M, L channels).
   Note: EV-DO operates independently of CDMA 2000 with different modulation, channel and protocol structures. It is not an integral part (seamless) of the CDMA 2000 structure, but overlays the 1x structure. EV-DO Rev A allows 307 kbps and higher order modulations; therefore, may need additional considerations. The above procedures applies to single band CDMA 2000 1x handsets with built-in EV-DO (Rev. 0) using the same transmit path hardware. Please contact us if the device in question operates in other configurations or EV-DO does not apply to body-worn conditions.
   If the EUT supports EV-DO, please submit the additional SAR data, as described above.

   ==> CDM7025 doesn't support EV-DO operation.

2. Please submit the calibration report for the probe(s) used for SAR testing.

   ==> Please refer to the attachment file.

3. Of the available cdma2000 RC/SO combinations for which output power measurements were made, which was used for the actual SAR tests? Why?

   ==> RC2 / SO9
   You can find this in the attachment file.

4. The tissue parameters listed on the SAR plot pages vary from one test to the next, and do not correspond to the values listed in the table on p.12/22 of the SAR report. Please address.

   ==> As you know, the DASY4 software calculate the tissu parameters automatically. It means that different liquid parameters are used for the different frequency bands.
   Values listed in the SAR report are target value. (validation frequency 835MHz, 1900MHz). Therefore the values are different from test data plot.
   Please recheck this.

5. The tissue parameters for 800 MHz body SAR tests, as listed on the SAR plot pages, do not appear to be within the permitted 5% variance from the target. Please address.

   ==> It seems that there is no problem. Please recheck this.

6. In the List of Test Equipment (p.27/29 of the RF report), does "Calib. Date" signify the cal due date, or the date on which the last cal was performed? In that list, the first spectrum analyzer is listed as having a "Calib. Date" of Dec 05. Please address.

   ==> I revised the RF report. Please find the attachment files.

7. FYI: (a) In the future, please remove "boilerplate" language from the test reports that refer to unrelated tests (e.g., in this test report, Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, the procedure in 4.3.4 is wrong for digital modulations, etc.); (b) It is not necessary to submit the SAR plot for every single SAR test. Instead, only submit the SAR plot for the worst case channel for each different configuration (e.g., left head touch, left head tilt, right head touch, etc.).

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 fees.

Sincerely,

Gregory Czumak
Quality Manager
Senior Certification Engineer

PCTEST Engineering Laboratory, Inc.
6660-B Dobbin Road
Columbia, MD 21045
410-290-6652
410-290-6654 (Fax)
gregory@pctestlab.com