

Your response

Question	Your response
Question 1: Are there other trends in the space sector (or the broader spectrum environment) that we should monitor and/or take account of in our strategy?	<p>Confidential? – No</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ofcom’s strategy should include an assessment of the total amount of radio frequency radiation (RFR) from space in addition to terrestrial sources. At present this has not been done.2. Ofcom should ensure that this total and cumulative RFR complies with international scientific RFR guidelines, such as Bioinitiative, EUROPAEM 2016, IGNIR, Seletun 2010, which include long-term and non-thermal effects. It should no longer use ICNIRP’s obsolete, unprotective and unscientific guidelines based on Schwan’s invalidated heating-only myth of 1953.3. Ofcom should undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment for RFR from space and terrestrial sources combined. This has not yet been done in the UK.4. Studies show that much of the 75% decline in the insect population in the last two decades is a direct result of RFR pollution from man-made sources, which include space and terrestrial antennas. In remote unpopulated areas where there has been no habitat change and no pesticides used, insect populations have still declined by up to 33%. Man-made radiation from space is a factor, along with changes because of space and terrestrial man-made RFR to the geomagnetic field used by humans and all other life and changes to the global electrical circuit on which life on earth depends.5. The earth’s biosphere could degrade so far that no human or other life is possible within it, if man-made RFR continues to increase as rapidly as it has over the last quarter of a century. Ofcom’s principal duty to furthering the interests of citizens should include ensuring their health and well-being for the future, rather than permitting the needless extinction of all life within earth’s biosphere.

	<p>6. In particular, people intolerant of environmental pollution from low levels of RFR should be protected by Ofcom. This requirement would prevent discrimination against them from increasing levels of RFR caused by space deployment of radiation satellites. Some 1.2% of the UJK's population is severely disabled by man-made RFR, some 25% are moderately sensitive, and 100% are subconsciously sensitive and thus susceptible to the cancers, infertility and EHS which RFR has long been established as causing.</p>
<p>Question 2: Do you agree with the broad areas we have prioritised for our work?</p>	<p>See above, answer to question 1.</p>
<p>Question 3: Are there other issues and actions that are likely to be important over the next 2 – 4 years?</p>	<p>See above, answer to question 1.</p>
<p>Question 4: Do you have any evidence on whether specific actions should be a high priority?</p>	<p>See above, answer to question 1.</p> <p>The rate of decline of the insect population, some 75% in two decades, suggests that studying its relationship to RFR, and especially RFR from space, should be a high priority.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you have any other issues you wish to comment on?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ofcom should actively involve people with sensitivity to RFR who are directly affected by Ofcom's permission for RFR from space. 2. Ofcom should seek ways to prevent people intolerant of RFR from being harmed and discriminated against. 3. Ofcom should revisit Rick Hill's refusal in 2021 to allow Ofcom's Advisory Committee for Older and Disabled People (ACOD) to help or advise on helping people disabled by one of Ofcom's key responsibilities.
<p>Question 6: Are there other issues and actions specifically relating to NGSO communication systems that are likely to be important over the next 2 – 4 years?</p>	
<p>Question 7: Do you have any evidence on whether specific actions relating to NGSO</p>	

communication systems should be a high priority?	
Question 8: Do you have any other comments relating to NGSO systems?	