Organisation:

Mast Sanity

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?

Just my name, e-mail address and any other personal details.

Additional comments:

Mast Sanity calls upon OFCOM to withdraw their proposals for a 3G Signal Power Increase.

Further Mast Sanity call upon OFCOM to immediately reduce all Mobile Phone signal levels to outdoor ?ALARA? levels (As low as reasonably acceptable) under the ?Precautionary Principle?, to encourage fixed-line telephony within buildings, encourage investment in fibre optics and passive alternatives such as Visual Light Communications and thus reduce the overall microwave load on the UK Population ? NOT increase it

Question 1: Are there any reasonable grounds why Ofcom should not grant the request to vary the five Wireless Telegraphy Third Generation Mobile Licences by increasing the permitted maximum in-band EIRP to 68dBm as soon as practicable? If so, please explain your reasoning for this:

Mast Sanity believe that Ofcom should not grant this request.

With OFCOM?s Proposed Signal Power Boost, the UK Population will be subjected to significantly more damaging microwave radiation ? at a time when other countries are reducing their exposure limits.

As the current 62dBm licenses will be increased to 68dBm on a logarithmic scale this represents just under 4 times as much microwave radiation over the entire area of the UK with current 3G coverage.

This is purely commercially driven for the mobile operators to enable indoor wireless use in order to compete against fixed-line telephony. There is no real need for it at all - good and far safer alternatives are already in use and work more than adequately. Outside 'roaming' works amply at current signal levels.

Particularly considering the advised 'Precautionary Approach' and the accompanying adverse health effects from microwave radiation this increase is totally unwarranted and unwelcome.

The Precautionary Approach was advocated by the "Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones" (IEGMP) in their 'Stewart Report' published in April 2000.

"We recommend that in making decisions about the siting of base stations, planning authorities
should have the power to ensure that the RF fields to which the public will be exposed will be kept to the lowest practical levels that will be commensurate with the telecommunications system
operating effectively." [6.61]

The telecommunications system as a whole already operates effectively without this signal boost.

There are 1000?s of studies (and this number is ever increasing) pointing to harm from microwave exposure even well below the UK exposure guidelines. This proposed increase will only make matters far worse.

The European Environment Agency are taking the research evidence seriously and are calling for exposures to be reduced citing the Bioinitiative Report (http://www.bioinitative.org/report) (a review of over 2000 published studies)

OFCOM is not in a position to consider the health aspect of this increase in exposures. It looks solely at the technical aspects.

Why is the UK Health Protection Agency (HPA) not involved in this consultation and why does their advice differ from that of the EU Environment Agency?

Anybody who is feeling the effects of existing mobile phone masts at existing signal levels in their own homes and offices with multiple symptoms of, for example, migraines, insomnia, itchy rashes, nose bleeds through to depression and the onset of cancer will find their symptoms increasing. And for the estimated 3-4% or so of the population who are Electro Sensitive (ES) or Electro Hypersensitive (EHS) their lives will become increasingly unbearable as the places they can go within the UK will effectively disappear over night.

Question 2: Are there any reasonable grounds why Ofcom should not also apply the increased permitted maximum in-band EIRP to future 2 GHz MSS/CGC licences? If so, please explain your reasoning for this:

Mast Sanity believes that these should be restricted to the same signal levels as for the current 3G operators, and for the same reasons as we gave to Question 1.