

in the statement you talk about regulating individual licencees in respect to the emissions from their individual equipment. However, how are you regulating the aggregate exposure through overlapping emissions from a variety of equipment and sources? It seems logical that licensees will be able to demonstrate that their equipment is emitting within limits, but there is still the risk of aggregate exposure across a range of frequencies being an issue.

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196\(18\)30221-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196(18)30221-3/fulltext)

Furthermore, in the statement there is a diagramme showing the EF spectrum and 5G wifi is at a higher and more dangerous frequencies than commercial equipment and will be the basis for IOT devices in and away from the home. How will the interaction between 5G wifi and 5G commercial equipment be managed? <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4425/10/6/479/htm>,  
<https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4425/10/6/479/htm>

I have seen a number of studies suggesting that the aggregate exposure across 5G IOT, 5G wifi, 5G commercial equipment and the existing non-5G EMF emitting infrastructure being very poorly studied to date. Indeed the WHO's own website particularly highlights the uncertainty regarding childhood brain development and EMF. <https://www.who.int/peh-emf/research/children/en/index4.html>

I also attach an email chain I had with Public Health England which also highlights much of what I am trying to cover here.

This consultation and subsequent regulation is a one off opportunity to protect the public in an environment where profit seeking may be clouding judgement and introducing bias in a realm that should be governed by the Precautionary Principle.

I hope you register my consultation feedback and incorporate it as appropriate.