

Hi all. Actually the back of the EUT was tested but as documented in my details of evaluation and with the included pictures and layout of the antenna relative to the form factor, the back side evaluation was not included since the measured values were at or near the noise floor of the DASY. Please see attached plot of the back of the EUT. The SAR measured on the rear of the EUT relative to the position which produced the greatest exposure on the face of the EUT was on the order of 20dB less. The reason the SAR was so low was due to the fact that antennas are mounted on the face of the EUT and the distance from the antenna to the rear of the EUT was substantially greater. This also applies to the edge of the EUT. This particular EUT has rubber bumpers on each corner which prevent the edge of the EUT from being placed at 0cm separation from the phantom. In addition, it can be seen from the SAR distribution plots that there are no currents residing on the EUT other than the antenna itself. A large enough scan was carried out to demonstrate this. It has to be understood that the FCC guidelines are just that, guidelines. There has to be engineering judgment applied to all devices since most EUTs do not fall into a generic category.

Shawn McMillen  
Regulatory Compliance  
408-919-0587