



1601 FM 1460, Suite B  
 Round Rock, TX 78664  
 e-mail: [info@ptitest.com](mailto:info@ptitest.com)  
 512-244-3371  
 Fax: 512-244-1846

9 October 2006  
 FCC: TTPF0077900  
 IC: 6221A-F0077900  
 ATCB: Comments 100606

In response to your comments dated 6 Oct 2006 regarding the application for certification of the devices referenced above please find our responses below:

1	According to recent FCC interpretations, the confidentiality letter must be signed by either the contact given on the FCC site for the applicant, or someone listed in the technical or non-technical portions of the 731 form. Gerald W. Wuest does not appear to be listed on the FCC site as the appropriate contact (FCC site shows Mark Gentry). Please help correct the cover letters as necessary.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>Confidentiality letter revised with Mark Gentry as signatory and submitted.</i></b>
2	Users Manual mentions 0 dBm to 3.6 dBm and Operational Description mentions 1 mW (0 dBm). However output power appears much lower than that. FCC expects testing to be completed as maximum power, but given the measured power is significantly below the powers listed, it is uncertain if it was functioning properly. Please review/correct/explain as necessary.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>See reply to comment 4.</i></b>
3	Power appears quite low. Was both H and V polarities and positioning of the EUT investigated to obtain worse case.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>See reply to comment 4.</i></b>
4	To measure power, the RBW must be > 6 dB measured bandwidth. It is uncertain what RBW was used. Please explain/correct as necessary.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>Power was measured with RBW of 1 MHz, which is too low. Power was re-measured in a 3 MHz RBW/VBW, which is greater than the 6 dB bandwidth, and is included in the revised test report.</i></b>
5	Give the approval under 15.247, the users manual should state the following or similar: "The antenna(s) used for this transmitter must not be co-located or operating in conjunction with any other antenna or transmitter."
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>User manual revised and submitted for review.</i></b>
6	It does not appear that values are calculated for the bandedge. Please review.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>Values added to the revised test report, placed above each band edge plot.</i></b>
7	FYI....It is assumed the device is also tested as a PC peripheral under a DoC authorization. Please note that for DoC tests, the device is to be configured with a minimum test configuration as specified by ANSI C63.4 which includes complete computer + 2 I/O devices attached (one may be the EUT during this particular test. Test photos currently do not cover a correct PC peripheral device configuration, so please ensure testing has been properly performed.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>Noted and thank you.</i></b>
8	The application appears to be missing the REL listing letter required by IC. Please review.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>REL letter submitted for review.</i></b>
9	Labeling does not appear to show IC information. Note that to meet IC requirements, the label must include 3 items: a IC Certification Number preceded by "IC:", Model number as certified, and applicant under which certificate is issued. Please correct.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>Revised label art submitted for review.</i></b>
10	Bandwidth for the IC form should be the 99% bandwidth measured following methods specified in the attached document, or as provided by a spectrum analyzer for 99% bandwidth. Please review.
<b>Reply</b>	<b><i>Bandwidth was determined from existing bandwidth plots and added to the revised test report.</i></b>

Eric Lifsey

\*\*\*