

Mike Kuo

From: SUN-HEE KIM (HCT) [alondra@hct.co.kr]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 3:37 AM
To: Chris Harvey
Cc: kentkim (HCT America); khpark (HCT); Mike Kuo; Chris Harvey
Subject: Re: PANTECH&CURITEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC., FCC ID: PP4PN-810, Assessment NO.: AN06T6289, Notice
Attachments: HAC RF Emission Report Rev.2.pdf

Hello Chris,

Please review the revised HAC RF Emission report.

1. Please find the RC1/SO2 test data in the worst case mode page 14 of 35.
2. We added the 1/8 rate test data and data plot in the worst case mode page 19, 33 of 35.
3. We think that the power for the 1xEVDO mode doesn't need to be measured.

Because 1xEVDO mode cannot be operated at once.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best Regards,

SunHee, Kim

=====

Sun-hee Kim

Product Compliance Division
Hyundai Calibration & Certification Co.,Ltd (HCT)
San 136-1, Ami-ri , Bubal-eup, Icheon-si,
Kyounki- do, Korea (467-701)

TEL.: (82-31) 639-8565/ 8518
FAX : (82-31) 639-8525/ 8535
C.P: (82-11) 9558-9875

E-mail : alondra@hct.co.kr
[http :// www.hct.co.kr](http://www.hct.co.kr)

=====

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

From: <charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com>
To: <alondra@hct.co.kr>
Cc: <charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com>; <mike.kuo@ccsemc.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 7:54 PM
Subject: PANTECH&CURITEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC., FCC ID: PP4PN-810, Assessment NO.: AN06T6289, Notice#2

11/22/2006

> Sun-Hee,
> In addition to the information requested in the last notice, the following information is also needed in accordance with communication from the earlier FCC audit (Martin Perrine) of an HCT/Pantech&Curitel application.
>
> You seem to only measure "full rate" modes in determining the worst case. Please address other rates if applicable.
>
> Also, please include text describing the devices capabilities both from a users perspective and a radio interface perspective.
>
> The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information within 30 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.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Chris Harvey
> charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com
>
>

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

From: <charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com>

To: <alondra@hct.co.kr>

Cc: <charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com>; <mike.kuo@ccsemc.com>

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 5:23 AM

Subject: PANTECH&CURITEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC., FCC ID: PP4PN-810, Assessment NO.: AN06T6289, Notice

> Sun-Hee, we have reviewed your response to the questions posed by Mike Kuo on 11/15/2006. I have the following continued questions:
>
> 1. Regarding the issue raised in question #1 in the previous e-mail, you have provided a revised HAC measurement report with both Peak and Average conducted power measurements. The FCC's guidance on HAC measurements indicates that:
>
> "Subset testing should be justified as mentioned for EMC. The key parameters to focus on for RF emission testing are peak field, and peak power (defined in C63.19 section 4). Conditions where modulation rates fall into the audio spectrum are of special interest. Sample testing of the various modes can be performed at the worst case probe location for each band and field type (E or H) as part of subset testing justification. Sample testing of conducted RF peak power can also be used to help in the justification."
>
> The HAC testing was documented as being performed in RC3/SO55 combination; however, the peak power data shows that RC1/SO2 has a higher peak power for both CDMA800 and PCS modes. Please provide HAC compliance data for the worst case modes per FCC requirements and Martin Perrine's previous requests.
>
> 2. The revised HAC report does not contain the power measured data for the 1xEvDO modes. Was this data omitted in the revised report? Please explain.
>
> The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information within 30 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.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Chris Harvey
> Charvey-tcb@ccsemc.com
>
>
>

11/22/2006