



**Contact address:** Chairman Mr. Brian Stein,  
Radiation Research Trust, Chetwode House,  
Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray,  
Leicestershire, LE13 1GAUK

6<sup>th</sup> December 2023

Sent via Email **From:** [eileen@radiationresearch.org](mailto:eileen@radiationresearch.org)

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 6, 2023 5:33 PM

**To:** 'BEIS Correspondence' <[correspondence@energysecurity.gov.uk](mailto:correspondence@energysecurity.gov.uk)>;

'Claire.coutinho.mp@parliament.uk' <[Claire.coutinho.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:Claire.coutinho.mp@parliament.uk)>

**Cc:** 'consumersaffairs@ofgem.gov.uk' <[consumersaffairs@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:consumersaffairs@ofgem.gov.uk)>

Brian Stein CBE Chairman EM Radiation Research Trust

Bill Esterson MP' <[Bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:Bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk)>

Dear Department of Energy Security and Net Zero,

**Your ref: TOB2023/21968**

For the Attention of The Rt Hon Claire Coutinho MP, Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero

[Claire.coutinho.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:Claire.coutinho.mp@parliament.uk)

Cc. Ofgem: [consumersaffairs@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:consumersaffairs@ofgem.gov.uk)

Bill Esterson MP [Bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:Bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk)

Brian Stein CBE, EM Radiation Research Trust Chairman

Your response received on 4<sup>th</sup> December to the EM Radiation Research Trust letter sent to the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2023 does not answer concerns regarding non-thermal effects. You continue to rely on the heavily criticized ICNIRP guidelines. I request that you read the information contained within the RRT letter again and respond to the questions raised. **Energy customers would like to know if the Government will protect customer choice ensuring analogue meters remain available.** The Radiation Research Trust letter is available to download here: <https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/Response-to-Energy-Security-and-Net-Zero.pdf>

Thank you for that link to the publications stating that smart meters are safe. We strongly disagree.

My colleagues and I looked at the following papers (Part 1,2 &3) that the link points to:

Part 1 says:

The maximum equivalent power density measured during transmission around smart meter devices at 0.5 m and beyond was  $15 \text{ mWm}^{-2}$ , with an estimation of maximum duty factor of only 1%. One outlier device had a maximum power density of  $91 \text{ mWm}^{-2}$ . All power density measurements reported in this study were well below the  $10 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  ICNIRP reference level for the general public.

Part 2 says:

The highest observed whole body specific energy absorption rate value was  $1.87 \text{ mW kg}^{-1}$ , within the child model at a distance of 15 cm from a 2,450 MHz device. The higher values were attributed to differences in dimension and dielectric properties within the model. Specific absorption rate (SAR) values were also estimated based on power density levels derived from electric field strength measurements made at various distances from smart meter devices. All the calculated SAR values were found to be very small in comparison to International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection limits for public exposure.

Part 3 says:

Power densities and duty factors were assessed for smart meter devices installed in 20 homes across England. The maximum 6-min averaged RMS power density for all the devices measured in the homes was found to be  $0.26 \text{ mW/m}^2$  at 0.5 m, which is less than 0.003% of the ICNIRP general public reference level.

Are you aware that the Austrian Medical Association (AMA) standard and the Building Biology (BBB) Standard both state that any exposure to power densities at the milliwatt level are "**very far above normal limits**" and of "**extreme concern**" respectively? The normal and safe levels for AMA and BBB are within the microwatt level, not at the milliwatt level, which is too high.

See attached screenshots available here: [Austrian Medical Association standards – Radiation Research](#) and here: [The Building Biology standards v ICNIRP – Radiation Research](#) are from a paper written by Dr Shirin Joseph, a molecular biologist advisor for the RRT, which compares weak ICNIRP guidelines to the considerably more stringent AMA & BBB standards which take into account adverse biological effects due to non-thermal electromagnetic radiation. ICNIRP guidelines are biased towards the telecoms industry, and do not take non-thermal biological effects into account.

Therefore, power densities of  $15 \text{ mW/m}^2$  (Part 1) and  $0.26 \text{ mW/m}^2$  (Part 2) constitute a criminal assault on our health, as per the AMA and BBB stringent standards which state that exposure to such power density levels 24/7 by smart meters, would be of "extreme concern" and "very far above normal limits."

The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero says it has the following priority:

"Deliver current schemes to support energy consumers with their bills and develop options for long-term reform to **improve how the electricity market works for families** and businesses". <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-energy-security-and-net-zero/about#who-we-are>

How are you going to improve how the electricity market works for families and businesses if you supply smart meters which ultimately are likely to make them sick in the long term?

Families are currently being exposed to unsafe levels of pulsed electromagnetic radiation from smart meters and you as a department are encouraging and incentivising the energy companies to install them across the country.

You and the minister for Energy Security and Net Zero, Claire Coutinho, will be directly liable, accountable, and responsible for the harms caused to the British people by disregarding the

science that points to genuine harm caused to families, and especially children, who are much more susceptible to irradiated harms as they develop, than adults.

Please see below this paragraph from the Environmental Health

Trust: <https://ehtrust.org/educate-yourself/health-risks-posed-by-smartmeters/>

**Research consistently finds that radiofrequency radiation penetrates deeper into children's bodies and brains and the American Academy of Pediatrics considers children more vulnerable to radiofrequency radiation- whatever the source.** Research that has looked specifically at smart meters has found that the radiation is absorbed at a faster rate and more intensely into their bodies. Read this 2018 published paper ([Qureshi 2018](#)) which concludes that the highest observed whole body specific energy absorption rate value was in the child model when radiation from a smart meter was simulated.

Please rethink your policy of encouraging the installation of smart meters into homes as you will ultimately be damaging the health of future generations of the British public whom you have been employed to serve.

The EM Radiation Research Trust looks forward to your reply to questions above and to your response to the dangers of smart meters pointed out to you above.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen O'Connor

Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust

Website address: <https://www.radiationresearch.org/>

Email: [eileen@radiationresearch.org](mailto:eileen@radiationresearch.org)

The EM Radiation Research Trust is an educational organisation funded by donations. An independent Charity Registered No. 1106304 © The EM Radiation Research Trust 2003-2004