



1919 S. Eads St.  
Arlington, VA 22202  
703-907-7600  
CTA.tech

*Via Electronic Filing*

October 22, 2026

Marlene H. Dortch, Esq.  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
45 L Street NE  
Washington, DC 20554

*Re: Reassessment of Federal Communications Commission Radiofrequency Exposure Limits and Policies, ET Docket No. 13-84*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The Consumer Technology Association (CTA®) urges the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to maintain its existing radiofrequency (RF) exposure limits and compliance procedures. These science-based rules protect public health while supporting wireless technologies that improve Americans' lives.

The Public Notice, which seeks comment on the issues subject to remand in *Environmental Health Trust v. FCC*<sup>1</sup>, correctly recognizes that the remand in this case was limited as the court did not vacate the Commission's RF exposure rules or hold that the rules are unsafe. Rather it directed the Commission to provide additional explanation concerning specified issues, including portable-device testing procedures, the health implications of long-term RF exposure, the ubiquity of wireless devices, and technological developments since the Commission last updated its guidelines.<sup>2</sup> CTA urges the Commission to retain existing RF exposure limits and compliance procedures, which provide strong public-health protections while allowing innovation to flourish.

### **Innovation While Preserving Public Health and Product Safety**

CTA is North America's largest technology trade association, representing more than 1200 companies, from startups to global brands. Eighty percent of our members are small businesses and startups. Together, CTA members support more than 17million American jobs. CTA also owns and produces CES® – the world's most powerful tech event.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Reassessment of Federal Communications Commission Radiofrequency Exposure Limits and Policies*, ET Docket No. 13-84, Public Notice (Sept. 17, 2026) ("Public Notice").

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 3.

CTA members produce cutting-edge wireless devices, including smartphones and wearables. These connected devices are used for telehealth, remote patient monitoring, chronic disease management, and everyday preventative wellness. CTA supports science-based, technology-neutral policy that protects public health while preserving access to the benefits of wireless technologies. The FCC should maintain existing radiofrequency (RF) exposure limits and compliance procedures to encourage continued innovation in products and services that improve consumers' lives.

## **The FCC Should Maintain Current RF Limits**

The Commission's current limits are based on consensus standards established by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP Report No. 86) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE C95.1-1991).<sup>3</sup> Expert health agencies, including the Food & Drug Administration (FDA), assess the established RF limits on a regular basis. The FDA's review of published literature from 2008 through 2018 evaluated approximately 125 peer-reviewed animal studies and 70 peer-reviewed epidemiological studies concerning RF exposure and cancer. The FDA found no quantifiable causal link between RF exposure and tumor formation. The FDA has further stated that the FCC's current RF limit remains acceptable for protecting public health and that there is no consistent or credible scientific evidence of health problems caused by exposure to RF energy from cell phones.<sup>4</sup>

The FCC should base any changes on sound, reproducible science rather than speculative or unverified claims. Scientific evidence should be transparent, peer-reviewed, and capable of distinguishing correlation from causation. For human-health claims, anecdotal reports and self-reported symptoms cannot substitute for reliable evidence of a causal health effect. According to the World Health Organization, electromagnetic hypersensitivity has no clear diagnostic criteria, is not a medical diagnosis, and has no established scientific basis linking reported symptoms to exposure to electromagnetic fields.<sup>5</sup>

CTA applauds the Commission for applying appropriate rigor in evaluating information about RF exposure and encourages the Commission to continue to maintain a high bar on the quality of studies it relies on to establish limits.

---

<sup>3</sup> Nat'l Council on Radiation Prot. & Measurements, NCRP Rep. No. 86, *Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields* (1986), available at <https://www.aapm.org/pubs/ncrp/detail.asp?docid=91>; and Inst. of Elec. & Elecs. Engrs., IEEE C95.1-1991, *IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz* (1991), available at <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/159488>.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Food & Drug Admin., Ctr for Devices & Radiological Health, *Review of Published Literature between 2008 and 2018 of Relevance to Radiofrequency Radiation and Cancer* (2020), <https://www.fda.gov/media/135043/download>; and *Scientific Evidence for Cell Phone Safety*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin., <https://www.fda.gov/radiation-emitting-products/home-business-and-entertainment-products/cell-phones> (last visited Oct. 21, 2026).

<sup>5</sup> World Health Organization, *Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity*, Radiation and Health (Dec. 2005), <https://www.who.int/teams/environment-climate-change-and-health/radiation-and-health/non-ionizing/hypersensitivity>.

## **Compliance Testing Should Rely on Real-World Scenarios**

The FCC's certification process tests wireless devices under conservative conditions designed to ensure compliance. Testing may use maximum rated output power, high duty factors, and direct-body-contact configurations that exceed typical consumer use. Those conditions are designed to establish compliance under circumstances that exceed typical consumer use.

In the real-world scenario of ordinary consumer use, devices commonly use dynamic transmit-power control to reduce output power to the minimum level needed to maintain connectivity. Devices also transmit intermittently, and many wearables use very low-power protocols. This means average real-world exposure is generally substantially below the maximum values reflected in certification testing. According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), wearable devices use low-powered transmitters and expose users to RF levels well below applicable limits.<sup>6</sup>

Compliance testing should distinguish between theoretical maximum exposure in a certification test and exposure that occurs during ordinary use. Mandates based solely on maximum theoretical conditions could mischaracterize the risk profile of modern devices and create unnecessary consumer confusion.

## **The FCC's Compliance Framework Evolves with Wireless Technology**

The technology industry recognizes the importance of user safety and public health throughout the product lifecycle from initial concept, planning, and design to production and sale. As new products and services continuously emerge, the FCC and standards organizations update measurement and evaluation methods. The Commission's RF exposure procedures are maintained through current Office of Engineering and Technology (OET) guidance and the Knowledge Database (KDB).<sup>7</sup> This system is working. It allows compliance evaluation methodologies to evolve alongside technological innovation.

## **Regulatory Harmonization**

Global regulatory harmonization is essential. Consumer technology products are developed, tested, manufactured, and sold across international markets. Unilateral U.S. requirements adopted without a demonstrated scientific need could create unnecessary trade barriers, restrict access to innovative products, and confuse consumers without producing a measurable public-health benefit. The Commission should continue to anchor its rules in internationally recognized standards developed by organizations.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Facts About Wearable Technology*, Ctrs. for Disease Control & Prevention (July 16, 2026), <https://www.cdc.gov/radiation-health/data-research/facts-stats/wearable-technology.html>.

<sup>7</sup> Public Notice at 6.

<sup>8</sup> See Consumer Electronics Association (now Consumer Technology Association), Comment on ET Docket No. 13-84 (filed Sept. 3, 2013), at 5.

## Conclusion

The FCC's existing RF exposure limits and compliance procedures protect public health while supporting American innovation. The rules rest on established scientific standards, and the FCC's testing framework has adapted as wireless technology has advanced.

The available scientific evidence does not establish that RF exposure within the FCC's limits causes adverse health effects. The FCC should retain its existing limits and compliance procedures and avoid new mandates that would raise costs without demonstrated safety benefits. Good regulation should address real risks, not create new barriers to technologies that improve Americans' lives.

Sincerely,

/s/ Rachel Nemeth

Rachel Nemeth  
VP, Regulatory & Government Affairs