Helen Zhao

Subject: FW: RE: FW: Netcore Technology Inc., FCC ID: T58520G2006M1, Assessment NO.: AN06T6042, Notice#1

-----Original Message-----
From: eric.wong [mailto:eric.wong@tw.ccsemc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2006 2:48 AM
To: Helen Zhao
Subject: Re:RE: FW: Netcore Technology Inc., FCC ID: T58520G2006M1, Assessment NO.: AN06T6042, Notice#1

Hello Helen,

Please find the replies below in Blue .

Thank you!!
Eric Wong

-----Original Message-----
From: Helen Zhao
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2006 3:32 PM
To: Helen Zhao
Subject: Netcore Technology Inc., FCC ID: T58520G2006M1, Assessment NO.: AN06T6042, Notice#1

Question #1: The internal photos show an aluminium foil shielding instead of spray shielding is used. Please specify the aluminium foil was added as modification during the test or it came with the sample. Please also explain whether final products will be used the same shielding method or not. The applicant needs to submit a marketing statement to address this issue.
(ERIC: Please find the photos of the mass production unit attached . FYI the most different between the testing sample and the mass production unit is the latter is plated a layer of British-made "silver conductive paint" (In grey color) instead of using the foil shielding. The shielding foil just onto the bottom side of the PCB has not changed between the testing and mass production. This is a typical methology on the EMI debugging and the picture is truly captured from the mass production unit, it would adopted on all the unit placing into the market.)

Question #2: This device is a PC peripheral, please confirm whether digital portion is authorized through DoC or Certification. If it is through DoC, please add FCC DoC on the FCC ID label. Otherwise please submit a separate application under equipment class of "JBP".
(ERIC: This device is subjected for the DoC and the DoC logo is added, please kindly find the revised label attached.)

Question #3: The test report (page 4) indicates "Model difference: Based on the same product". If there is any difference in design or appearance, please indicate clearly, if there is no difference, you can say "All models are identical to each other except for market designation for marketing purpuse. "
(ERIC: Please find the updates upon your comment on the revised report attached)

Question #4: The test report (page 6) indicates worst case at 11b mode is 11Mbps, the highest datarate; worst case at 11g is 6Mbps, the lowest datarate, please verify again: 11b mode: 11Mbps or 1Mbps? 11g mode: 6Mbps or 54Mbps?
(ERIC: Please find the updates upon your comment on the revised report attached)

Question #5: Test report (page 9) does not list AC/DC power supply as accessory. Please update the report, please also indicate clearly if any ferrite cores are incorporated.
(ERIC: Please find the updates upon your comment on the revised report attached)

Question #6: Test Report - The test report radiated emission above 1GHz, only peak results are provided, not average results. Please note when peak result exceeds average limit, you need to

provide average result to show average result is below the average limit. Please provide additional average test results whenever peak result exceeds average limit (page 54, 55, 58).
(ERIC: Please find the updates upon your comment on the revised report attached)

Question #7: Test report - power line conducted emission: Please provide plots.
(ERIC: Please find the updates upon your comment on the revised report attached)

Best Regards,
Helen Zhao

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.