



American Telecommunications Certification Body Inc.
6731 Whittier Ave, McLean, VA 22101

July 5, 2005

RE: ASUSTek Computer Inc.

FCC ID: MSQV66

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

Note: We show that many uploads were tried but rejected by our server. Note that our system rejects file names of the same name if they are upload more than once. Therefore each new revised exhibit should be renamed with an extension that denotes it is new such as "rev 1", "revised 070105", etc. We show we only received the following documents since 6/27/05:

Confidential_V66 circuit diagram.pdf
Confidential_V66 RF circuit Block diagram.pdf
05-0368-E-00-02-01 ASUS V66_20050628.pdf
05-0368-SEO ASUS V66_test configuration photographs.pdf

and via email, 2 sets of responses and an updated SAR report.

- 1) New 731 form for previous item 1 does not appear to have been received. Please provide. This should have addressed the following issues:
 - a) Section I - 3(a) and 3(b) must list the FCC ID to be Certified. Please correct.
 - b) Section II - Please fill in correct address for ATL or the appropriate company in section 2(a).
 - c) Section III - Section 6 of the 731 form must be filled in for (a)(b)(c)(d). For Part 22, (a) would be listed for ERP. For Part 24, (b) would be listed as EIRP. Additionally, please fill in Section 4(a)/(b), 7, 8, or 9.
 - d) Section IV must be filled in as appropriate.
- 2) New confidentiality letter not yet received for previous item 2. Please provide. This should have addressed the following issues:

Confidentiality is given under section 0.456 and 0.459 of the FCC rules, not Part 15 and 24. Please correct the confidentiality letter as appropriate.
- 3) The RF block diagram should show the frequencies of all oscillators in the TX device (CFR 2.1033(a)(5)). Since this device is also being certified as a PC peripheral device, the main host block diagram should also include oscillator information. Please correct.
- 4) New internal photos for previous item 4 does not appear to have been received. This should have addressed the following issues:

It appears that complete internal photographs have not been provided. The top and bottom of all boards must be provided. Additionally, photographs showing beneath all subshields should also be provided. Please provide.
- 5) New confidentiality letter for previous item 5 does not appear to have been received. This should have addressed the following issues:

It would be recommended that the operational description and BOM also be added to the confidentiality letter. If this is desirable, please provide an updated confidentiality letter that included these items.
- 6) New BOM for previous item 6 does not appear to have been received. This should have addressed the following issues:

The parts list appears incomplete and only lists some of the RF components. Please provide a complete parts list.

--- Continued on Next Page ---

- 7) New users manual for previous item 12 & 13 does not appear to have been received. This should have addressed the following issues:
 - a) FCC ID specified within the users manual does not match this application. Please correct.
 - b) Page 66 of the users manual mentions a 20 cm spacing which is not applicable to this device and should be removed. Please correct.

Part 24 Review

- 8) Your response to previous question 14 references currents/voltages that are ratings of the device. The FCC is concerned with the DC voltages and currents applied into the several elements of the final radio frequency amplifying device for normal operation over the power range. This is typically different than the devices ratings and will likely need to come from the manufacturer. Please provide.
- 9) Minimum Passing Margin for power on page 5 of the Part 24 report does not appear to be stated correctly. Please review.
- 10) A response to previous question 20 does not appear to have been provided. Please provide. This should have addressed the following issues:

The plots on page 16, 19, and 22 do not appear to show a high fundamental carrier as expected (i.e. close to 29.2 dBm as specified by the tune up procedure). Note it appears that the sweep time may have been inadequate (too fast) to adequately capture the emissions. Please review/correct/or explain as necessary.
- 11) Page 22 appears to shows some other spurs of interest other than the fundamental and base station that were not reported and are higher than the reported values. Please review and/or explain as necessary..
- 12) 99% power bandwidth does not appear to be measured based upon below the transmitter power (maximum conducted power – 29.1 dBm as specified in tune up procedure). I have attached an document that helps explain this testing better. In short, the 26 dB down from the reference level should be measured....This usually gives something near 250 kHz.
- 13) While you explained for previous question 24 the loss of cable and splitter to be 4.5 dB, it is uncertain if the cable loss and power divider loss were factored into the plots of page 45 and 46. Please explain.

SAR Review

- 14) New users manual for previous item 31 does not appear to have been received. This should have addressed the following issues:
 - a) When information reported in the users manual reports SAR values, it should match the SAR values measured. Please correct the users manual to report the correct SAR values.
- 15) Because of the issue involved with using the 1800 MHz dipole with an injection frequency of 1900 and 1900 MHz fluid, a retest per our discussions today will be necessary for a minimum of the worse 2 case points previously measured. If data is similar, then we will accept the data as correct. If the data is found to be significantly different, then an entire retest will be required.
- 16) FYI...please note that many times we have seen the FCC ask that tissue parameters be measured across the band and not just at the center frequencies. Please take this into consideration for future tests.
- 17) FYI...The FCC asks that ambient and liquid temperatures be placed on all test plots. Please consider this in future tests.
- 18) Previous question 39 does not appear to be answered documented. For Course Scan results, the test report should document:
 - a) that the distance between the measurement point (distance + offset) at the probe sensor location (geometric center behind the probe tip) and the phantom surface is < 8.0 mm and maintained at a constant distance of +/- 1.0 mm during an area scan to determine peak SAR locations

- b) if probe boundary effect compensation is used or not. If not the probe tip should be positioned at least half a probe tip diameter from the phantom surface during area and zoom scans.



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.