Appendix 1

BCP Council Overview and Scrutiny Board
Call for Evidence on 5G Connectivity - Methodology and Summary of Responses

---

Methodology

1. The Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Board held a call for evidence on 5G connectivity over September and October 2019. A media strategy accompanied the call for evidence in order to publicise it to potential respondents. The below timetable was followed:

Stage	Date	Activity
Opening date for call for evidence (written submissions)	10 September 2019	Written submissions provided in response to the call for evidence.
Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting.	23 September 2019	Opportunity for verbal submissions to the call for evidence. Speakers attended a meeting of the O&S Board and addressed Board members to highlight their views.
Closing date for call for evidence (written submissions)	7 October 2019	After the close of the call for evidence all submissions were provided to Overview and Scrutiny Board members for review and consideration.
Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting	11 November 2019	Submissions received through the call for evidence will be discussed by the O&S Board. Further action will be determined by the O&S Board at this stage.

Key Lines of Inquiry

2. The following broad questions were posed to respondents:

- What are the perceived benefits to the area as a result of the implementation of 5G?

- What are the perceived concerns relating to the implementation of 5G?

Although answers to these questions were invited, all responses were welcomed.

Verbal Submissions

3. Opportunity for verbal submissions was provided at a meeting of the O&S Board on 23 September 2019. Eight people registered a wish to speak, and a large number of other people attended the meeting to hear the views expressed. All members of the Council were invited to attend the meeting, in particular members of the Health & Adult Social Care O&S Committee owing to health concerns that had been expressed in relation to 5G. Speakers were provided with five minutes to provide their views, with some flexibility provided in timings and the opportunity for further questions of clarity to be raised by the O&S Board. The verbal submissions were filmed and are available to view here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xm0D7KvMSV4

   A summary of those who attended and the views provided is outlined in the below table. Some of these people also responded with written submissions.

Name	Organisation represented	Summary of views
John Hunt speaking as proxy for Susan Lennon	None - own views expressed	Expressed variety of concerns relating to 5G
Nick Greenwood	None - own views expressed	Expressed variety of concerns relating to 5G
Charles Ross Illingworth	None - own views expressed	Expressed variety of concerns relating to 5G

David Merefield	None - own views expressed	Expressed variety of concerns relating to 5G
Anthony Story	Silicon South	Expressed variety of benefits relating to 5G
Marios Angelopoulos	Bournemouth University (Principal Academic in Computing)	Outlined detail in relation to the meaning of '5G' and how the technology functions, from his capacity as an academic in the field. Also expressed variety of benefits relating to 5G.
Adrian Dwyer	None - own views expressed	Expressed variety of benefits relating to 5G.
Sam Crowe	Public Health Dorset – Director.	Outlined the role and position of Public Health England (PHE) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) in relation to 5G connectivity, highlighting that as long as exposures to radiation levels for 5G stay within related guidelines, PHE says there is no cause for concern to human health. No concerns or benefits were expressed.

Summary of issues and comments raised by all speakers:

- The apparent lack of accountability regarding the instillation of fibre optics in Bournemouth;
- The development of 5G through weapons technology;
- Secrecy concerning 5G;
- Omissions and inaccuracies in various official reports on 5G;
- Studies evidencing health impacts and concerns in relation to 5G technology;
- Consideration of alternative technologies to 5G;
- Insurance unable to cover illnesses in relation to 5G technology;
- Impact of 5G technology on the environment and wildlife;
- International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines;
- Concern of a rise in cancer and other illnesses, a link to brain and heart tumours, radiation through 5G high frequencies and infertility;
- Out of date and inaccurate health reports being used;
- Request for 5G moratorium from leading scientists and doctors;
- Towns in the UK having adopted 5G moratoria, high profile cities across Europe had also adopted moratoria on 5G;
- Geneva reversed its 5G rollout after people falling ill;

- BCP area was well served in alternatives to 5G such as fibre optics;
- Decision making driven by machines rather than humans;
- Concern that councils were responding to publicity material and promoting technology above people;
- Public Health England were falling behind in their advice and effects would only become apparent afterwards;
- People should be allowed to consent and take precautionary measures;
- 5G trials were already taking place in cities around the country and BCP Council needed to keep up;
- There were economic and development opportunities through 5G;
- 5G would improve social outcomes and quality of life;
- The divide between the digital and tech sectors would merge together
- The various sectors within BCP were well placed to support 5G technology;
- 5G will change how we share and consume information;
- There were a number of different technologies which will make up 5G;
- New technology would be commissioned and deployed for 5G;
- Technology needed for 5G;
- The amount of information able to be handled by a 5G network;
- Ability to do things not previously possible and tackle new problems;
- Job creation opportunities due to 5G;
- Improvements to the local economy with 5G developments and the need to attract high tech industries to the area;
- The frequency of 5G in the Lansdowne area should be no concern to public health according to the World Health Organisation;

Overview of Written Submissions

4. A total of 220 written responses were received in email and hard copy. Some respondents indicated that they were replying on behalf of others. For the purposes of summarising the data received, each written response has been considered as a one response.

5. A wide variety of views were provided in the call for evidence. For the purposes of this summary, views have been grouped into themes, with the number of respondents who referred to each theme indicated. Where three or more respondents indicated a similar view, these have been outlined below. It must be noted that many of the respondents referred to more than one theme and many of the themes overlap so the numbers will not add up to the total of 220.

6. Many respondents provided additional information, links to other papers, videos and attachments to their responses. After the closing date of the call for evidence, all O&S Board members were provided with access to responses in full to enable review of these responses.

7. 15 respondents indicated disinterest in 5G or sent an unrelated response. Some of these also sent other advisories or comments.

8. Other respondents indicated concerns and benefits, and/or provided other comments and advisories to the Council on the matter of 5G connectivity. Many respondents did not indicate a clear 'for' or 'against' view in relation to 5G connectivity but rather a collection of views in relation to it, including some respondents who referenced both concerns and benefits within their responses.

9. The number of respondents that highlighted only concerns were 96. The number of respondents that highlighted only benefits were 50. The number of respondents that referenced both concerns and benefits were 29. The number of respondents that did not indicate any concerns or benefits but made other comments on 5G connectivity were 30.

10. 17 respondents were representing an organisation. The list of organisation who responded to the call for evidence (verbal and written submission) is shown below.

    Silicon South
    Bournemouth University
    Public Health Dorset
    Future Cities Team (BCP Council)
    Facebook Group – 'Stop 5G UK'
    UKIP - Mid-Dorset and North- Poole
    Xpertnest
    Dorset Engineering and Manufacturing Cluster
    Cyber Professionals Forum
    Redweb
    The Society for Poole
    Greenwood Campbell
    International Push to Talk Ltd
    Devon, Cornwall and Dorset Police
    Siemens
    Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership
    Guide Dogs

General comments and advisory views

11. 38 people indicated that 5G was unrequired – by either the BCP area or the individual respondent.

12. Four people suggested that wired solutions should be found instead of 5G.

13. 35 people made reference to general coverage issues and speeds needing improvement – such as 4G and broadband speeds.

14. Three people referenced future-proofing of 5G as a potential issue – highlighting that speed gains from 5G may be negated by more people using it and diluting the benefit.

15. Three people indicated that BCP should do a full consultation with residents before introducing 5G

16. Five people indicated that work on 5G is not a priority or that other Council priorities should come higher.

17. Three people suggested that BCP should allow other areas to test and understand potential mistakes relating to 5G prior to implementation.

18. Three people indicated that 5G was not dangerous/ no more dangerous than other domestic appliances already in use.

General concerns

19. Ten people indicated concern at links between 5G and warfare or the potential to weaponise 5G technology.

20. 11 people were concerned about compatibility issues with non-5G devices, phone applications not working without 5G, or the need to buy a new phone to access 5G technology.

21. Eight people were concerned about potential security and privacy issues.

22. 11 people referenced the potential financial cost or drain on budgets to implement 5G, or questioned whether the cost would be worth the benefits.

Environmental and ecological concerns

23. 30 people highlighted general environmental and ecological concerns including sensitivity of 5G radiation for insects, and the possibility of 5G contributing to climate change.

24. 14 people were concerned that trees would need to be felled to prevent signal blocking.

25. 33 people raised queries and concerns that 5G would give rise to taller or more masts or transmitters or referenced the cost that would be associated with maintenance of these as a concern.

Health concerns

26. 54 people said that more research was required into the health impact of 5G, or that evidence of proof that 5G was not harmful was required, rather than an absence of proof that it was.

27. 54 people were concerned about the potential for increased radio frequency radiation as a result of 5G – referencing potential harm to humans, animals and plants / lack of choice to avoid radiation if 5G is implemented.

28. 28 people were concerned about the potential for 5G to negatively affect children's health.

29. 12 people were concerned that those people who were sensitive to radiation (electromagnetic hypersensitivity) would be adversely affected or those affected would not be able to avoid 5G radiation.

30. 23 people requested a delay or no roll out (moratorium) of 5G in the BCP area.

31. Six people commented that companies would not insure against 5G owing to health concerns.

32. Seven people suggested that the implementation of 5G in the area may give rise to legal challenge from residents opposed to it.

33. 30 people referenced general health concerns in their submission/ did not give further specific detail regarding health concerns.

General support

34. Three people expressed support for 5G provided it was proven safe.

35. 23 people expressed general support for 5G without providing specific detail.

Socio-Economic Benefits

36. 37 people said that a benefit of 5G would be better communications – phone connectivity, capacity and speed; and a more varied market that would benefit the consumer as a result.

37. 19 people said that a benefit of 5G was that it is an important technological advance which would lead to progression such as the internet of things/ other, yet unknown, possibilities would be unlocked.

38. 32 people said that 5G would be a benefit to the BCP area/ BCP should grab the opportunity of 5G and not be left behind other areas.

39. 34 people referenced benefits to business, service delivery and the economy in their response –tourism, engineering, manufacturing, communications industries, healthcare and transport were the main areas highlighted by respondents that would benefit as a result of 5G.

40. Ten people said that 5G would improve the quality of life for residents – including social life, wellbeing, public safety and a reduction in social isolation.

Environmental benefits

41. Five people stated that the environment would benefit from 5G as increasingly electrified and self- drive cars could be introduced to the BCP area leading to lowered congestion/ lowered carbon emissions resulting from less travel because of better connectivity.