



MOTOROLA

Date: Aug 31, 2010

Subject: Request for additional information regarding FCC ID: IHDT56LA1

Reference:

Correspondence Reference Number:	IHD100981
Confirmation Number:	Y1008170981-3
Date of Original Email:	Aug 20, 2010

Prepared by:

Andrew Bachler, Principal Staff Engineer
Motorola Mobile Device Business
Libertyville, Illinois 60048

Questions and responses follow:

1. Please submit an operational Description for the BT transmitter that describes the RF functionality of the device.

Response: [Please refer to the revised operational description submitted online.](#)

2. The FCC has stated that, given modern phone design, when body SAR data is provided with the front of the phone facing the phantom, it should be made clear that it is to cover the use of potential accessories that may cause the front of the phone to face the user (in other words, it is not because the assumption is being made that the phone may be kept in a pocket with the front facing the user, as a separation distance of 0.5 cm is more realistic for this configuration). As a result, since the SAR report contains body data with the front of the phone facing the phantom, please provide the referenced attestation. Alternatively, you may remove all references and data for the phone facing the phantom configuration from the SAR report and resubmit it.

Response: [Please refer to the added statement in Sec 6.2 of the revised SAR report submitted online.](#)

3. Please additionally provide RF emissions data with the 5x5 grid centered at the T-coil axial location, since it is at a significantly greater distance (>2mm) from the acoustic center. See C63.19-2007 Sec 4.4:

"If the assessment T-Coil location is in a different location from the acoustic output, then two different 50 mm by 50 mm areas may need to be scanned, the first for the microphone mode assessment and the second for the T-Coil assessment ".

Response: [Please refer to the Supplemental Response attached here.](#)

FYI: The FCC is now requiring that, for SAR dipoles with calibration more than 1 year old, additional justification for an extended calibration cycle must be provided. This includes a comparison of return loss and impedance values from one calibration to the next. Please see the attached KDB, and, if appropriate, include the required data in future submittals.

Response: [Noted.](#)