

Your response

Question

Question 1: Please provide feedback on the additions, amendments and clarifications we have made to the wording of the licence condition to implement our decisions on the scope of the licence condition in our October 2020 Statement, giving reasons for your response.

Your response

Confidential? – Y / N

"The ICNIRP was ruled biased by the Court of Appeal of Turin in 2020: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/court-appeal-turin.../5701050>
The ICNIRP conflicts of interest have been fully exposed by two MEPs in the following report: <https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/.../ICNIRP-report-FINAL...>
The ICNIRP bias and conflicts of interest are discussed in this article in the International Journal of Oncology: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28656257/>
Public Health England is currently the object of two legal cases regarding EMR emissions: <https://actionagainst5g.org>, <https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/5g-judicial-review-2020/>
Public Health England's own lawyers, DLA Piper, have stated in legal information that members of the public or other parties should use their own discretion, based on available evidence, when making decisions regarding RFR. Evidence available on request.
PHIRE Medical have produced this consensus statement, signed by 3500 medical doctors and bodies, stating that it is medical consensus that RFR from masts and devices

causes harm to health: <https://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/>
It is therefore unacceptable for Ofcom to proceed with proliferation of masts emitting EMR which has been shown in the majority independent science to cause harm to health, including serious harm such as cancer, based on the ICNIRP guidelines which are considered biased and even fraudulent by some of the world's leading experts in the biochemical effects of RFR."

Question 2: Please provide feedback on the additions and clarifications to our 'Guidance on EMF Compliance and Enforcement', giving reasons for your response.

Confidential? – Y / N

"The ICNIRP was ruled biased by the Court of Appeal of Turin in 2020: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/court-appeal-turin.../5701050>
The ICNIRP conflicts of interest have been fully exposed by two MEPs in the following report: <https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/.../ICNIRP-report-FINAL...>
The ICNIRP bias and conflicts of interest are discussed in this article in the International Journal of Oncology: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28656257/>
Public Health England is currently the object of two legal cases regarding EMR emissions: <https://actionagainst5g.org>, <https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/5g-judicial-review-2020/>
Public Health England's own lawyers, DLA Piper, have stated in

legal information that members of the public or other parties should use their own discretion, based on available evidence, when making decisions regarding RFR. Evidence available on request.

PHIRE Medical have produced this consensus statement, signed by 3500 medical doctors and bodies, stating that it is medical consensus that RFR from masts and devices causes harm to health: <https://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/>

It is therefore unacceptable for Ofcom to proceed with proliferation of masts emitting EMR which has been shown in the majority independent science to cause harm to health, including serious harm such as cancer, based on the ICNIRP guidelines which are considered biased and even fraudulent by some of the world's leading experts in the biochemical effects of RFR."

Question 3: Please provide feedback on the trial version of our EMF calculator, giving reasons for your response.

Confidential? – Y / N "The ICNIRP was ruled biased by the Court of Appeal of Turin in 2020: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/court-appeal-turin.../5701050>

The ICNIRP conflicts of interest have been fully exposed by two MEPs in the following

report: <https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/.../ICNIRP-report-FINAL...>

The ICNIRP bias and conflicts of interest are discussed in this article in the International Journal of Oncology: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.n>

ih.gov/28656257/

Public Health England is currently the object of two legal cases regarding EMR

emissions: <https://actionagainst5g.org>, <https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/5g-judicial-review-2020/>

Public Health England's own lawyers, DLA Piper, have stated in legal information that members of the public or other parties should use their own discretion, based on available evidence, when making decisions regarding RFR. Evidence available on request.

PHIRE Medical have produced this consensus statement, signed by 3500 medical doctors and bodies, stating that it is medical consensus that RFR from masts and devices causes harm to

health: <https://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/>

It is therefore unacceptable for Ofcom to proceed with proliferation of masts emitting EMR which has been shown in the majority independent science to cause harm to health, including serious harm such as cancer, based on the ICNIRP guidelines which are considered biased and even fraudulent by some of the world's leading experts in the biochemical effects of RFR."