

From: khpark@hct.co.kr
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2004 1:02 AM
To: Steve Cheng
Cc: ??? \(\HCT\); KiSoo Kim (HCT); MIKE KUO (CCSEMC); SCOTT WANG(CCS)
Subject: Re: TCB Review Questions for AN04T3579 (FCC ID: PP4TX-110C)

Dear Sir,

How are you ?

According to your requests on the below questions, we'd like to send the answers on each questions under each question as follows;

1. FCC ID: PP4TX-110C

- 1) Assessment no.: AN04T3579 (belows test report uploaded)
- 2) Upload date: January 19, 2004

This project should be completed within January 19, 2004 if as soon as possible.

2. How about as below project?

FCC ID : PP4TX-120C (Class II Permissive Change)

- 1) Applicant Name : Hyundai Curitel Inc.
- 2) Application Product : Tri-Mode Phone (AMPS/ CDMA/ PCS CDMA)
- 3) Model Name : TX-120C (Class II Permissive Change (Antenna have been changed))
- 4) Applicant ID: T11390
- 5) Application Assessment Number : AN04T3582
- 6) Application date: January 9, 2004

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Best Regards,

KiSoo Kim - HCT

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

From: Steve Cheng
To: '???' ; KiSoo Kim (HCT)

Cc: Mike Kuo ; Scott Wang ; ??? \ (HCT\
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2004 12:57 PM
Subject: RE: TCB Review Questions for AN04T3579 (FCC ID: PP4TX-110C)

Dear Mr. Kim,

Thanks very much for your timely response. But there are still some question remained, please resolve them ASAP. Thanks.

Question # 3 : Page 5 of part 15B report mentioned that EUT is tested under standby mode. However, per C63.4 section 11.1 that "all parts of the system shall be exercised. For example, in a computer system, tape and disk drives shall be put through a read-write-erase sequence ..." Please clarify why standby mode was used during the test.

====> We've revised the EMI Report. (page 5).

Please find the attached test report. (filename : Test-Report(Part 15) EMI)

<CCS> Please confirm, if charging mode represent the worst case among all possible operations? like up/down load the data between EUT and PC in camera mode.

====> We've revised the EMI Report. (page 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15).

Please find the attached test report. (filename : Test-Report(Part 15) EMI)

Question # 7 : SAR value quoted in the users manual, page 110, as listed below, is not agree with SAR test report. Please revise the manual.

"The highest SAR value for this model phone when tested for use at the ear is 1.31 W/Kg and when worn on the body, as described in this user guide, is 0.79 W/Kg."

====> We've revised the Users manual . (page 110).

Please find the attached file. (filename : ATT. M (User Manual))

<CCS> Please check again, no change was made.

====> We've revised the Users manual . (page 110 ※CH 8 124page).

Please find the attached file. (filename : ATT. M (User Manual))

Question # 5 : The data supplied in "ATT_Q _DIPOLE VALIDATION PLOTS" is not matching the date indicated on the report page 12. Please clarify/correct or retest if necessary.

====> We've revised the SAR Report. (page 12).
Please find the attached test report. (filename : ATT. N (SAR REPORT))

<CCS> The correction is Ok for SAR test plots 1 of 4 to 3 of 4, but please explain why 3 body worn tests in plots 4 of 4 take 3 days to finish and in different days?

====> We've revised the SAR Report. (page 12).
Please find the attached test report. (filename : ATT. N (SAR REPORT))

Best regards,
Steve

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

From: khpark@hct.co.kr [mailto:khpark@hct.co.kr]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 12:45 AM
To: MIKE KUO (CCSEMC); Steve Cheng
Cc: SCOTT WANG(CCS); ??? \ (HCT\); KiSoo Kim (HCT)
Subject: Re: TCB Review Questions for AN04T3579 (FCC ID: PP4TX-110C)

Dear Sir,

How are you ?

According to your requests on the below questions, we'd like to send the answers on each questions under each question as belows;

- 1) FCC ID: PP4TX-110C
- 2) Assessment no.: AN04T3579 (belows test report uploaded)
- 3) Upload date: January 16, 2004

This project should be completed within January 19, 2004 if possible.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Best Regards,

KiSoo Kim - HCT

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

From: Steve Cheng

To: '???'

Cc: KiSoo Kim (HCT) ; Scott Wang ; Mike Kuo

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 12:56 PM

Subject: RE: TCB Review Questions for AN04T3579

TCB Review Questions for AN04T3579 HCT Cellphone PP4TX-110C

-EMC-

Question # 1 : Operational description page 2. Section 2. Presented the DC voltage into final amplifier, but DC current is missing. Please supply this required information.

====> We've revised the Operational Description (page 2).
Please find the attached file. (filename : ATT. L (Operational Description))

Question # 2 : EMC and SAR test report used different power measurement scheme. Please explain the relation between RF conducted and ERP/EIRP power and confirm that both tests used the same maximum RF power?

====> We've same maximum power tested. (EMC and SAR test)

Maximum Conducted Power: 0.501W AMPS (27.0dBm) / 0.355W CDMA (25.5dBm) / 0.316W PCS CDMA (25.0dBm)

Please find the attached file. (filename : SAR test mode (TX-110C))

Question # 3 : Page 5 of part 15B report mentioned that EUT is tested under standby mode. However, per C63.4 section 11.1 that "all parts of the system shall be exercised. For example, in a computer system, tape and disk drives shall be put through a read-write-erase sequence ..." Please clarify why standby mode was used during the test.

====> We've revised the EMI Report. (page 5).
Please find the attached test report. (filename : Test-
Report(Part 15) EMI)

-SAR-

Question # 4 : test report page 13, both 835M_system_verification_record shown exceeding 5%. However, according to OET BULLETIN 65 supplement C, APPENDIX D: SAR MEASUREMENT PROTOCOL that "The relative permittivity and conductivity of the tissue material should be within 5% of the values given in Appendix C". Please explain what happen to the system and retest the related record if necessary.

====> We've revised the SAR Report. (page 13).
Please find the attached test report. (filename : ATT. N (SAR
REPORT))

Question # 5 : The data supplied in "ATT_Q _DIPOLE VALIDATION PLOTS" is not matching the date indicated on the report page 12. Please clarify/correct or retest if necessary.

====> We've revised the SAR Report. (page 12).
Please find the attached test report. (filename : ATT. N (SAR
REPORT))

Question # 6 : Users manual P123 included following language.

====> We've revised the Users manual . (page 123).
Please find the attached Users manual. (filename : ATT. M
(User Manual))

"A minimum separation distance of 7.9 inches (20cm) must be maintained between the user/bystander and the vehicle mounted external antenna to satisfy FCC RF exposure requirements.

VEHICLE MOUNTED EXTERNAL ANTENNA

(OPTIONAL, IF AVAILABLE)"

However there was no test data or MPE assessment found in the report to support it. Please supply either test data or MPE assessment to support this statement.

Question # 7 : SAR value quoted in the users manual, page 110, as listed below, is not agree with SAR test report. Please revise the manual.

====> We've revised the Users manual . (page 110).
Please find the attached file. (filename : ATT. M (User
Manual))

"The highest SAR value for this model phone when tested for use at the ear is 1.31 W/Kg and when worn on the body, as described in this user guide, is 0.79 W/Kg."

====> We've revised the Users manual . (page 110).
Please find the attached file. (filename : ATT. M (User
Manual))

Question # 8 : Test setup photo shown 25mm was used on Body worn configuration. However, Test report has other photos shown 20mm. Please clarify which separation distance was used during the test.

====> We've revised the SAR Report and SAR test set-up photo. (SAR Report: page 8 / SAR test set-up photo: page 9).
Please find the attached test report. (filename : ATT. N (SAR
REPORT / ATT. P (SAR TEST SET-UP PHOTO))

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.

Best Regards

Steve Cheng / TCB Technical Reviewer

Compliance Certification Services

561F Monterey Road

Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Tel:(408) 463-0885 x: 119

Fax:(408) 463-0888

scheng@ccsemc.com

<http://www.ccsemc.com>