



Tim Dwyer <rfspectrum@gmail.com>

answer to 10U13106 TCB questions Barnes&Noble.com, FCC ID: XHHBNRV100, Assessment NO.: AN10T0469, Notice#1

3 messages

Claire Hoque <claire.hoque@ccsemc.com>

Thu, Jun 17, 2010 at 3:10 PM

To: Tim Dwyer - TCB <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>, "Timothy M. Dwyer" <tim.dwyer@ccsemc.com>

Cc: Ron Hsu <ron.hsu@ccsemc.com>, Devin Chang <devin.chang@ccsemc.com>, Sunny Shih <sunny.shih@ccsemc.com>

Hi Tim,

Our answer is embedded in below question.

Thanks,

Claire Hoque

-----Original Message-----

From: Timothy M. Dwyer

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2010 9:19 PM

To: Thu Chan

Cc: Timothy M. Dwyer; Claire Hoque

Subject: Barnes&Noble.com, FCC ID: XHHBNRV100, Assessment NO.: AN10T0469, Notice#1

Hello Thu, Claire,

Review of this C2PC application is complete. Please provide replies to the following item.

Q1: Average output power reported in the EMC and SAR reports match the original EMC & SAR report, but the new SAR values are considerably lower. Please confirm and explain. Since the C2PC changes are not to the RF section, this difference is not as would be expected.

<answer> Indeed, the SAR value is quite lower and not as normal expected. Therefore we redo SAR on both C2PC and original filling units and got the consistent results.

According to C2PC letter for this filling, there are some factors might affected the SAR results, e.g. modified PCB layout, discrete and replaced components around the antenna. Pls see attached pdf file of antenna comparison

between C2PC and original filling units.

Your reply will be included with the related IC filing.

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.

Besgt regards,

Tim Dwyer

Technical Reviewer



Antenna comparison(short-term confi).pdf

175K

Tim Dwyer <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>

Thu, Jun 17, 2010 at 3:57 PM

To: Claire Hoque <claire.hoque@ccsemc.com>

Cc: Ron Hsu <ron.hsu@ccsemc.com>, Devin Chang <devin.chang@ccsemc.com>, Sunny Shih <sunny.shih@ccsemc.com>

Hi Claire,

The reply states "Therefore we redo SAR on both C2PC and original filling units and got the consistent results. "

Does this mean:

(1) that the repeated tests confirm that both the original and C2PC results are valid

or

(2) that the repeat test on the original unit now show lower SAR.

Please indicate which of above is the correct interpretation of the statement.

Best regards,

Tim Dwyer

Technical Reviewer

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Tim Dwyer

Quasi-Peak Wireless

766 Pucker Street

Coventry, CT 06238 USA

(860) 558-1791

email: tdwyer@quasi-peak.com
timothy_dwyer@ieee.org
web: www.quasi-peak.com

Claire Hoque <claire.hoque@ccsemc.com>

Thu, Jun 17, 2010 at 4:12 PM

To: Tim Dwyer - TCB <Timothy_Dwyer@ieee.org>

Cc: Ron Hsu <ron.hsu@ccsemc.com>, Devin Chang <devin.chang@ccsemc.com>, Sunny Shih <sunny.shih@ccsemc.com>

Hi Tim,

The answer is

(1) that the repeated tests confirm that both the original and C2PC results are valid

Thanks,

Claire Hoque

UL CCS

47173 Benicia Street

Fremont, CA 94538, USA

Tel: (510) 771-1123

Fax: (510) 661-0888

From: rfspectrum@gmail.com [mailto:rfspectrum@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Tim Dwyer

Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 12:58 PM

To: Claire Hoque

Cc: Ron Hsu; Devin Chang; Sunny Shih

Subject: Re: answer to 10U13106 TCB questions Barnes&Noble.com, FCC ID: XHHBNRV100, Assessment NO.: AN10T0469, Notice#1

[Quoted text hidden]
