

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Do you agree with our proposal to take steps to mitigate risks related to EMF and be in a position to hold licensees, installers and users to account if issues are identified? Please explain the reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Confidential - N</p> <p>EchoStar/Hughes operates very small aperture satellite terminals (VSATs) in the UK, as well as 2 GHz mobile-satellite service (MSS) portable data terminals. EchoStar/Hughes supports OFCOM's proposal to take steps to mitigate risks related to EMF exposure and to place license conditions on equipment operating at 10 W EIRP or higher. EchoStar/Hughes currently tests its equipment against various EMF exposure requirements, including EN 50665: 2017 "Generic standard for assessment of electronic and electrical equipment related to human exposure restrictions for electromagnetic fields (0 Hz - 300 GHz)", EN 62311: 2020 "Assessment of electronic and electrical equipment related to human exposure restrictions for electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)" and the reference levels in Table 7 of the ICNIRP guidelines issued in 1998 depending on the equipment and scenario considered. EchoStar/Hughes also provides guidance on installation and use of our equipment to ensure that EMF requirements are met through various means, such as labelling of equipment and including guidance in installation manuals.</p>
<p>Do you agree with our proposal (a) to include a condition in spectrum authorisations requiring compliance with the basic restrictions for general public exposure identified in the ICNIRP Guidelines; and (b) that this condition should apply to equipment operating at powers greater than 10 Watts?</p>	<p>Confidential - N</p> <p>In several places in the consultation document, such as Sections 4.31 and 4.41, OFCOM recognizes that compliance with the reference levels for general public exposure in Table 7 of the ICNIRP guidelines should ensure compliance with the basic restrictions. Further, the ICNIRP guidelines themselves state, as OFCOM quotes in Section 4.31 of the consultation document, that the reference levels "are given for the condition of maximum coupling of the field to the exposed individual, thereby providing maximum protection."</p> <p>EchoStar/Hughes requests that the license condition be modified to recognize that</p>

	<p>compliance with the reference levels in Table 7 of the ICNIRP guidelines is a means to show compliance with the basic requirements in Tables 4 and 5 of the ICNIRP guidelines issued in 1998. Specifically, the following sentence should be added to the end of the first paragraph of the license condition: “Ensuring compliance with the reference levels for general public exposure identified in Table 7 of the ICNIRP guidelines is a means for ensuring compliance with the basic restrictions in Tables 4 and 5 of the ICNIRP guidelines.”</p> <p>OFCOM defines, in Annex A1, the ICNIRP Guidelines as those “dated April 1998, as they may be amended.” If the license condition refers to certain Table numbers in the ICNIRP Guidelines, those reference may need to be updated to point to the correct references in updated ICNIRP Guidelines. Further, if there are substantive changes to the requirements in amended ICNIRP Guidelines, another OFCOM consultation would be warranted to review the updated requirements and implement grandfathering of already deployed and tested equipment against the prior standard.</p> <p>In addition, EchoStar/Hughes requests that OFCOM identify other similar standards as acceptable for managing EMF exposure. Specifically, EN 50665: 2017 and EN 62311: 2020 should be included in the license condition as acceptable alternatives to the ICNIRP Guidelines.</p> <p>At a minimum, EchoStar/Hughes requests that OFCOM also accept compliance with EN 50665: 2017, EN 62311: 2020 or the ICNIRP guidelines issued in 1998 for already deployed equipment.</p>
<p>Do you agree with our proposed guidance on EMF compliance and enforcement? Please explain the reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Confidential - N</p> <p>EchoStar/Hughes operates large numbers of earth stations in the United Kingdom. Further, as noted above, we already perform testing and provide the type of guidance OFCOM describes for installation and use of our equipment to ensure EMF exposure limits are met. We support OFCOM’s approach of relying on product test data and installation/operation</p>

instructions and performing compliance checks on a random basis.

Further, we recommend that OFCOM factor in whether an installation was made prior to the license condition being added in determining any potential enforcement action. Installations made prior to application of the new license condition should be provided more leeway in simply fixing an issue versus other more punitive enforcement action.