

## Your response

Question	Your response
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>As a responsible organisation RAYNET-UK obviously supports the underlying principle that licensees need to be aware of the risks relating to EMF exposure, and of the ways to mitigate those risks. Indeed, RF Safety is an integral part of the existing UK amateur radio licence and our (Ofcom-approved) exam training syllabus.</p> <p>However, Ofcom are already in a position to hold licensees to account if issues are identified and have a range of sanctions available to them. What is missing from this proposal is a detailed impact assessment which covers the entirety of the spectrum Ofcom manages on behalf of the Crown and the widely varying usage.</p> <p>Within Amateur Radio Emergency communications this ranges from 1.8MHz to at least 5GHz and a number of use case scenarios from a single operator station, to operating a temporary station from a hilltop where other services may also be operating. Under the proposals, the person making the last installation to a shared site is responsible for ensuring the whole site meets exposure guidelines.</p> <p>While it may be argued that nothing is impossible, determining and demonstrating compliance for a collection of ( potentially temporary ) installations, with appropriate substantiation appears disproportionate for the Amateur Service, more so when there may be interactions with professional services, or equipment rented from Hire companies where the characteristics may be unknown.</p> <p>Recognition needs to be made to existing practice for the Amateur Service in other countries where the trigger limit for assessment varies appropriately by frequency and that simplified assessments can be carried out in good faith.</p> <p>That Ofcom on page 2 of their FAQ on this consultation had to provide clarification to the</p>

	<p>question “This new condition could involve a lot of extra paperwork” is a welcome recognition that a one size fits all enforcement approach may not be appropriate.</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>a) In principle, RAYNET-UK would strongly support the appropriate and technically correct application of ICNIRP 2020 Guidelines. However the broad brush manner in which Ofcom proposes to achieve this within the Amateur licence raises many concerns over how this may be implemented which we are sure are reflected by other Services.</p> <p>b) The selection of 10W eirp appears arbitrary and the foundation for the selection of this power level unjustified. Further, it lacks the dimension of time or duty cycle which is critical when RF exposure is an averaged power level. The ICNIRP limits, and those from the former National Radiological Protection Board which were referenced in earlier Amateur licences, recognise variations in frequency which would in turn lead to more appropriate frequency dependent limits being set.</p> <p>This principle can be seen in the current rules applied to the Amateur Service in the USA by the FCC where formal assessments are not required unless output power exceeds 500W at MF, dropping to 50W at HF/VHF then rising again. It is acknowledged that the USA rules are based on different standards and are currently under review, but the principle that one threshold is appropriate across the spectrum where the Amateur Service has allocations is difficult to substantiate.</p> <p>The threshold also fails to recognise the variation in usage by the Amateur service ranging from permanent installations through to Mobile and other forms of temporary operation which are not addressed at all by the proposed regulations.</p>
<p><b>Do you agree with our proposed guidance on EMF compliance and enforcement? Please explain the reasons for your response.</b></p>	<p>The broad brush approach taken in the ‘guidance’ does at least reflect that the approach should at least be to discuss issues</p>

first and work towards compliance before introducing sanctions such as fixed penalty notices and pursuing convictions. However, this would ideally be documented in some form of inspection guide or assessment principles so that licensees were aware of what an inspector was looking for. This approach is well used in the Health and Safety field but it is notable that in the introduction to the Ofcom "Wireless Telegraphy Act Licensing Policy Manual" it states "Due to the diverse range of licences Ofcom issues it is not possible to encompass the policy and procedures for every licence class within one policy manual." On that basis this consultation needs to be reconsidered as it tries to provide guidance which is either already expressed in the licensing policy manual, needlessly duplicates it, or is potentially at odds with it.