Dear Contributor,

Thank you for participating in the public consultation of the ICNIRP draft guidelines.

Please note that it is important that ICNIRP understands exactly the points that you are making. To facilitate our task and avoid misunderstandings, please:

* be concise
* be precise
* provide supporting evidence (reference to publication, etc.) if available and helpful.

**How to complete the comments table:**

Please use 1 row per comment. If required, please add extra rows to the table.

This response document asks you to provide your ‘comment’, your ‘proposed change’, and the ‘context’ to this comment and proposed change. What is meant by these is the following:

**Comment :** A brief statement describing the issue that you have identified (and that you would like ICNIRP to take into account in the final version of the guidelines).

**Proposed Change:** A brief statement describing how you would like the document changed to account for this issue.

**Context:** A brief statement identifying relevant documents in support of your comment and proposed change.

**Please, provide your details below as per the online form and the provision of the privacy policy**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Last name, first name: Moore, Nicolette name | Email address: | Affiliation (if relevant): n/a |
| If you are providing these comments officially **on behalf** of an organization/company, please name this here: organization/company | | |
| I hereby agree that, for the purpose of transparency, **my identity (last and first names, affiliation and organization where relevant) will be displayed** on the ICNIRP website after the consultation phase along with my comments. Yes. (no facility to tick box)  I want my comments to be displayed anonymously. | | |

|  | **Document**  **(Guidelines, App A,**  **App B)** | **Line Number**  **#** | **Type of comment (General/ Technical/ Editorial)** | **Comment. Proposed change. Context.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | Appendix A | Line number | Editorial | The way the current guidelines stand, the industry is assumed to be adhering to safe limits until proved otherwise. It should be the other way round: it should be assumed that the limits are not safe until proved otherwise. There is growing scientific evidence that EMF, at the frequencies and intensities that are currently being emitted, are harmful to people and the environment. I do not have to include examples, there are thousands of studies available, which seem to get overlooked and ignored. We have seen this before: tobacco, asbestos, thalidomide, etc. |
| **2** | Appendix B | Line number | Technical | The cu;rrent levles of ‘Safe’ emissions seem to have been set according to extremely low frequencies. These tests at low frequencies have then been extrapolated to much higher frequencies and then declared safe. This is disingenuous. Smart phones, smart meters and wifi operate at 2.4 GHz. Setting safety limits across all frequencies based on frequencies of 100MHz is dishonest. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Add further rows if needed. For this copy the above row.

And paste it here.