Dear Janet Finch-Saunders and the Petitions committee.

Thank you for your letter received on the 22nd of October regarding the petition I ran on taking preventative measures on wireless devices in nurseries and primary schools.

I would like to consider some key points in response.

The attached document explains that essentially The Welsh Government are guided by Public Health Wales (PHW) who in turn advised by Public Health England (PHE) on matters relating to health effects from wireless networks.

The document states that PHE concluded that there are no special steps required to reduce exposure to these waves and there are no current reasons why it should not continue to be used in schools.

I would like to ask whether PHE, PHW and the Education Ministers are aware of guidelines set out in resolution 1815 Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly from 2011?


It clearly states in 8.3.2. concerning the protection of children that, I quote:

For children in general and particularly in schools and classrooms give preference to wired internet connection

I general terms 8.1.4. quote;

to pay particular attention to electrosensitive people who suffer from a syndrome of intolerance to electromagnetic fields and introduce special measures to protect them, including the creation of wave free areas not covered by the wireless network.

Therefore you must put in place an alternative with special measures to protect children and provide options for parents/carers who do not consent to their children being involuntary exposed.

With this there needs to be a national curriculum that doesn’t revolve around equipment at such a young age, when children and even parents and teachers are not even aware of the exposure.

The document from Kirsty Williams explains the results of the research supporting PHEs view that exposures from wifi are low in relation to The international Commission on Non-
ironising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guideline and when compared to similar exposure from mobile phones.

So you are clearly aware that there is exposure upon the children, teachers and parents within the schools, therefor it doesn’t seem unreasonable to have a risk assessment for each school using a full range spectrometer.

I would like to stress all wireless devices that transmit and receive these signals consist of intermittent bursts of radio frequency energy that will exceed the average. Remember, ICNIRP levels are only set to protect direct effects such as electric shock and body tissue heating.

These frequencies appear to have more or less potentially harmful biological effects on plants, insects and animals as well as the human body even when exposed to levels that are below the official threshold values. The levels are not very precautionary.

Experts in the field provide concrete examples of simple and practical means of reducing the exposure to these indoor fields and eliminating certain health problems such as headaches, insomnia, coughs, dizziness and depression etc.

If Kirsty Williams is so committed to continuous improvements in Education Technology across Wales, then a risk assessment would be in her interest, as this would make her liable if the dangers of these exposures were not tested with the appropriate equipment.

We are not satisfied that you have provided sufficient guidance to local authorities and schools, rushing this equipment whilst ignoring European guidelines. Parents/carers and teachers who have responsibilities to protect children are not receiving this information what so ever about exposure from short term and long term health effects. There has not been any information handed out anywhere since this equipment has gone in place.

Does the Education Digital Standards that assist the schools under the connectivity options advise European Guidelines?