



American Telecommunications Certification Body Inc.

6731 Whittier Ave, McLean, VA 22101

December 3, 2001

RE: ASUSTek Computer Inc.

FCC ID: MSQAPEAC300

After a review of the submitted information, I have a few comments on the above referenced Application.

- 1) Is the Digital Device Portion of the product considered to be Class B? If so, then the label should also include the appropriate Part 15 DoC labeling information since the EUT is considered to be a PC peripheral. Also, the compliance information sheet (either separate sheet or in the manual) should be uploaded as part of the manual exhibit.
- 2) The internal photographs may not normally be held confidential strictly on the basis of trade secrets. Please remove this justification from the letter of confidentiality or provide a better justification. As an alternative, you may use a black marker to "black out" the top of any readable components and provide new internal photographs.
- 3) In the users manual under specifications, please provide more specific information with respect to the frequency band. For instance add 2.4 - 2.4835 (USA/Canada) under the frequency specifications since the frequency band listed exceeds the FCC allowable band.
- 4) The power listed on the 731 should be listed in the same manner as the limit set by the FCC (i.e. ERP, EIRP, or conducted). For this application, the power listed on the 731 form should be specified as the maximum conducted power measured (16.1 dBm = 41 mW) and not the EIRP measurement. Please provide a corrected copy of the 731.
- 5) Also with respect to the output power, the FCC gets concerned with inconsistencies in reported/measured power output (especially when the measured tends to be lower by any significant amount). Given the fact that ASUSTek Computer Inc. are stating 100 mW & TRC measured 41 mW, this inconsistency can bring up questions such as a) was the radio tested actually at full power or correct data rate that would yield highest power, or b) is their a particular model that has a higher power and the same FCC ID that should have been tested instead, etc? The best question to ask here is, "Is ASUSTek Computer Inc. acceptable to claiming the 41 mW as the normal expected output power?", since the 41 mW is what the FCC will consider to be the maximum power the EUT will run under normal conditions (except for minor variations due to temperature &/or tolerances). If the answer is "yes" then I would recommend adjusting the manual to state that the output power as "50 mW EIRP" or "less than 50 mW EIRP". If the answer is "no", then the question to ask is "Why is there such a difference between the technical specification and the measured value?". Please let me know how we wish to resolve this issue.
- 6) The manual makes mention of an external antenna connector and antenna (section 2.3 & page 20). The only antennas that will be approved with this product are the integral antennas documented in the filing. For any antennas that have not been approved (i.e. the external connector mentioned), the Grantee will have to file a Class II permissive change to approve the new antenna. Alternatively, the connector may be removed from the product and a separate FCC Equipment authorization for the access point with the new antenna may be obtained when this version is tested. Currently, the device with any other antennas other than the internal ones will be considered unauthorized equipment. The Grant will be conditional on acceptance of these terms. Please comment.
- 7) The MPE calculations should be made with the maximum antenna conducted measurement made and not the EIRP measurement. Also the calculated gain (1.19 dBi = 1.315) is not the same as shown in the equation. Please correct these items within this exhibit.
- 8) Please provide calculations showing compliance with the restricted bands at the band edge for 2.4835 GHz.
- 9) Please confirm if the RBW and VBW settings were set to RBW = 1 MHz and VBW = 10 Hz for average detection > 1 GHz.
- 10) Please upload test configuration photographs exhibit.

Timothy R. Johnson
Examining Engineer

[mailto: tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com](mailto:tjohnson@AmericanTCB.com)

The items indicated above must be submitted before processing can continue on the above referenced application. Failure to provide the requested information may result in application termination. Correspondence should be considered part of the permanent submission and may be viewed from the Internet after a Grant of Equipment Authorization is issued.

Please do not respond to this correspondence using the email reply button. In order for your response to be processed expeditiously, you must submit your documents through the AmericanTCB.com website. 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 sender.