

**XM Satellite Radio Inc Additional Information**  
**Provided in Response to ATCB Questions 1-6 dated May 19, 2009**  
**FCC ID RS2XMHSARX1**  
**May 20, 2009**

- 1) **FYI....The frequency range used will be the same as the TX (908.75 – 921.25 MHz), not just 915 MHz.**  
**The frequency range has been updated in the designated form and uploaded.**
- 2) **The proper format for IC labeling is “IC:”and not “IC ID:”. Please review.**  
**A new label with the proper format has been uploaded with a file ending with “Rev3”.**
- 3) **The following previous questions do not necessarily appear to be addressed. Please provide response, comments, or corrections as necessary to address:**
  - a) **It is uncertain if the device was receiving an appropriate signal to demodulate or even signal generator as specified by ANSI C63.4 during the test. Please review.**

**This was actually addressed in the last response dated May 20, 2009. It is answered again below;**

**An unmodulated CW signal at 915 MHz was injected during this receiver’s testing using the signal generator listed in the equipment list (as requested in ANSI C63.4). The test report has been updated to detail the procedure employed i.e. section 5.1 & 5.2 on page 5 of 11 of the report. Note that this receiver is a super heterodyne up-converter with a self-stabilized LO.**

- b) **Average only measurements were provided > 1 GHz. There are also limits on Peak requirements. However Peak measurements or information regarding peak to average ratios were not provided. Please review.**

**This was actually addressed in the last response dated May 20, 2009. It is answered again below;**

**The only detectable receiver emissions above 1 GHz (peak and average) were harmonics of the device’s LO signal. Since the LO signal is CW, peak and average detected emissions for such are equivalent, and the average detected numbers have been provided to demonstrate compliance with average limits. No pulsed signals were observed.**

- c) **A standard off the shelf AC/DC converter does not appear to be provided for AC powerline emissions testing. Using a lab supply typically offers additional filtering that would not be present in a typical device. Ideally – here since there is a known docking station – this should have been used. Alternatively, information regarding the filtering of the supply should be evaluated. Please review.**

**This was actually addressed in the last response dated May 20, 2009. It is answered again below;**

**All laboratory power supplies used by our test lab are linear, un-filtered supplies. We feel use of such best exhibits the conducted emissions from the EUT rather than the emissions resulting from the internal buck/boost circuitry of an off the shelf converter, particularly in the event that such may or may not be used with the product.**

**It is understood that a large number of potential docking stations exist for the device in question. Please note that testing with a docking station would make it more challenging to discriminate emissions from the docking station from those emanating from the EUT. In this approach, it is evident that the emissions from the EUT are very low, providing the manufacturer and the reviewer with confidence that its use with any compliant docking station will continue to meet emissions limits.**