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

November 7, 2005

RE: ASUSTek Computer Inc.

FCC ID: MSQV66S

After a review of the submitted information, I have a few comments on the above referenced Application. Depending on your responses, kindly understand there may be additional comments.

1) Please provide a separate test configuration photograph exhibit for the Part 15 testing.
2) Please correct the various items on the 731 form:
    a) Section III - Section 6 of the 731. For Part 22, (a) would be listed for ERP (0.596 W ERP). For Part 24, (b) would be listed as EIRP.

Part 22 Review

3) Conducted power on page 7 of the report (32.5 dBm / 32.6 dBm in SAR) suggests higher power than given in tune up procedure (32.2 dBm +/- 0.2 dB). Note all measured power should be <= theory of operation/tune up procedures.
4) Information presented in section 12.4 does not make sense. First the bandedge emissions are generally very close to the limit and you are showing 20+ dB margin. Second, a reading of -20 dBm corrected by 31 dB would appear to be over the limit. Please reverify the information presented in 12.4. Additionally, please note that results must be integrated so that RBW >= 1% of the occupied bandwidth test (i.e. add back in a 10 log (3.2 / 3) = 0.28 dB). This does not appear to be done and will affect the results be a small amount. However the results already appear margin, although final numbers can not easily be resolved.

Part 24 Review

5) Conducted power on page 7 of the report (29.7 dBm/29.8 dBm SAR) suggests higher power than given in tune up procedure (29.2 dBm +/- 0.2 dB). Note all measured power should be <= theory of operation/tune up procedures.
6) Information presented in section 12.4 does not make sense. First the bandedge emissions are generally very close to the limit and you are showing 20+ dB margin. Second, a reading of -20 dBm corrected by 13.1 dB would appear to be over the limit. Please reverify the information presented in 12.4. Additionally, please note that results must be integrated so that RBW >= 1% of the occupied bandwidth test (i.e. add back in a 10 log (3.2 / 3) = 0.28 dB). This does not appear to be done and will affect the results be a small amount. However the results already appear margin, although final numbers can not easily be resolved.

SAR Review

7) SAR values reported on the front page for 1900 MHz head do not appear to match report.
8) FYI…It appears that an 1800 MHz validation dipole was used. Although in the past the FCC has stated verification frequency(s) must be within ± 100 MHz of device center frequency(s), most actually provide this at 1900. Please consider this in future applications.
9) Please confirm that the first 2 measurements points in a zoom scan, closest to the phantom surface, should be within 1 cm of the surface.
10) Please confirm the DASY version of the system as this affects the validity of the Probe factors.

Timothy R. Johnson
Examining Engineer

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.