

Stakeholder Roundtable
“Mobile Phones, Base Stations and Health -
the current state of the issue”

T. Greulich and R. Kemp

23 December 2004

Galson
SCIENCES LTD

5 Grosvenor House, Melton Road, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6AX, UK
Tel: +44 (1572) 770649 Fax: +44 (1572) 770650 www.galson-sciences.co.uk

Stakeholder Roundtable

“Mobile Phones, Base Stations and Health - the current state of the issue”

Report History

This document has been prepared by Galson Sciences Limited for the Mobile Operators Association under the terms of a Call-off Contract, Galson Sciences reference number 0303c.

Stakeholder Roundtable: “Mobile Phones, Base Stations and Health - the current state of the issue”				
Version:	Date:	Principal Author:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
0303c_2v1.0	23 December 2004	T. Greulich	R. Kemp	D. A. Galson
		Sign Date	Sign Date	Sign Date

Executive Summary

This report summarises the presentations and discussions held at a Mobile Operators Association (MOA) National Stakeholder Roundtable that was held on Thursday 9th December 2004 at One Whitehall Place, Westminster, London. The focus of the Stakeholder Roundtable was to examine the current status of issues surrounding mobile phones, base stations and health, allowing an exchange of information and understanding between key organisations and interest groups. Stakeholder representation included industry bodies and operators, central and local government officials, academics and scientists, and special interest campaign groups.

Presentations were provided by the key stakeholder representatives, outlining their perspective on recent developments and providing an update of key activities. Each presentation was followed by an opportunity for questions and group discussion. In addition, Professor Challis, Chair of the Mobile Telecommunications and Health Research Programme (MTHR) Management Committee, presented the current thinking on the research undertaken into possible health effects associated with mobile telecommunications, as well as an indication of future research needs.

Prof. Challis explained that there is currently no convincing evidence of a health effect from mobile technology for the general population, but that a risk to health cannot be entirely excluded, hence the need for further research.

Several constructive observations and suggestions were made during general discussions and these are contained in the main report. Some of the key issues addressed during group discussions related to how best to address community feelings of disempowerment, improving communication with stakeholders, building confidence and trust to encourage continuing dialogue between the industry, key stakeholders, and the community, supporting research needs, and addressing practical planning considerations.

Contents

Executive Summary	i
1 Introduction	1
2 Stakeholder Presentations	1
2.1 Mast Action UK.....	1
2.1.1 Group Discussion.....	1
2.2 Office of the Deputy Prime Minister	3
2.2.1 Group Discussion.....	3
2.3 National Radiological Protection Board	5
2.3.1 Group Discussion.....	5
2.4 Mobile Manufacturers Forum.....	6
2.4.1 Group Discussion.....	6
2.5 Mobile Operators Association	7
2.5.1 Group Discussion.....	7
3 Keynote Presentation	7
3.1 Group Discussion.....	7
4 Concluding Comments.....	10
5 Summary of Suggestions.....	11
5.1 Concluding remarks.....	12
Appendix 1: Attendees	A-1
Appendix 2: Agenda.....	A-3
Appendix 3: Professor Challis' Presentation.....	A-4
Appendix 4: MAUK Presentation.....	A-5
Appendix 5: ODPM Presentation	A-8
Appendix 6: NRPB Presentation	A-9
Appendix 7: MOA Presentation.....	A-10
Appendix 8: MMF Presentation	A-11

Stakeholder Roundtable

1 Introduction

The Mobile Operators Association (MOA) held a national roundtable for key stakeholders with an interest in mobile telecommunications and health, on Thursday 9th December 2004 at One Whitehall Place, Westminster, London. The focus of the Stakeholder Roundtable was to examine the current status of issues surrounding mobile phones, base stations and health, allowing an exchange of information between key organisations and interest groups. Stakeholder representation included industry bodies and operators, central and local government officials, academics and scientists, and special interest campaign groups.

The Stakeholder Roundtable involved presentations by key stakeholder representatives on different perspectives of the current status of the health issue, followed by facilitated group discussions. This report outlines the key discussion points arising.

The meeting was held under Chatham House Rules to encourage free exchange of views and it was agreed that a report of the meeting would ensure that any comments would not be attributable to particular individuals. The meeting was chaired, and the discussions facilitated by Dr. Ray Kemp of Galson Sciences.

2 Stakeholder Presentations

Presentations were provided by the key stakeholder representatives. Each presentation was followed by an opportunity for questions and group discussion. The key discussion points and questions or issues raised are outlined below.

2.1 Mast Action UK

Mast Action UK (MAUK) outlined their current position and perception of how the industry is implementing the Ten Commitments and Code of Best Practice. MAUK expressed concern that the necessary level of consultation over base station siting does not appear to be taking place at all times. It was acknowledged that MAUK are generally only contacted by people who object to base station proposals and/or who have not been consulted. MAUK cannot judge how often consultation is taking place across the board, but it was emphasised that they are notified of many instances where the industry is accused of failing to meet community expectations across the country.

2.1.1 Group Discussion

Operator dialogue: Active dialogue had been taking place between operators and MAUK to address site specific issues, and it was agreed that there had been some

benefit from this. However, this has subsided. It was suggested that it might be in everyone's best interests to re-establish this dialogue.

Concern was expressed that industry representatives often refuse to attend public meetings, and that this leaves communities feeling angry and disempowered. It was also suggested that the industry needs to improve people's access to improved information on base stations, including for example, predicted power density calculations. If the industry has nothing to hide, then this would improve transparency and help people to feel more involved in the process.

Licence Notification: Concern was voiced regarding *de minimis*, and licence notification developments, that under current planning arrangements do not require planning consent or consultation. It was advised that operators do undertake voluntary Traffic Light Model (TLM) ratings of all developments, including licence notifications, and that if a *de minimis* site is rated Red the same type of community consultation would be undertaken as for other Red-rated developments. However, it was felt that some communities feel angered by this planning 'loophole'. The current planning arrangements are seen by some as a way to get base stations installed 'through the back door'.

Concern was expressed that under the TLM rating system, the perception of what a Red-rated site should be is very different from operator and community perspectives. It was also suggested that the information on the TLM rating for *de minimis* developments should be made publicly available. *De minimis* developments are listed on the Sitefinder database, but the quality of information on Sitefinder was also brought into question, and it was suggested that an external review of Sitefinder should be undertaken.

There was some frustration that licence notification details are not held by most local planning authorities (LPAs), although it was pointed out that operators do provide this information to LPAs with annual roll out plans.

PPG 8: It was felt by some that Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Note 8 - telecommunications - is not sufficiently clear, and this makes it difficult to uniformly interpret. Some considered that the guidance in PPG 8 was not being fully observed by operators. It was suggested that PPG 8 needs reviewing and clarifying. It was further suggested by some stakeholders that the recent All Party Mobile report should be acted upon by Central Government.

Community Empowerment: It was expressed that even when communities are consulted over a base station proposal, they feel disempowered if nothing is acted on following consultation activity. It was felt by some that operators' deployment teams have improved their relationships with communities, but that there are difficulties when there is no scope for discussion because some communities make it clear that they don't want a base station anywhere, and hence discussion over possible solutions is not possible. Counter to that view, it was explained that sometimes communities put forward suggestions for alternative options but that operators simply say they can't pursue them, even where they would seem, from a community perspective, to meet technical requirements.

2.2 Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Progress made since publication of the Stewart Report in 2000 was outlined, including changes to planning arrangements. It was explained that the past 12 months have seen an increase in correspondence to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) from the public regarding mobile telecommunications, with concerns about health being the main subject matter. It was explained that future developments include a planned review of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order Part 24 so that definitions could be clarified.

It was also announced that the Minister for Housing and Planning, Keith Hill, would be releasing a ministerial statement later that day, with the aims of:

- reasserting the importance of community consultation and the TLM
- recommending that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) think about how communities should be consulted over annual roll out plans
- encouraging Local Planning Strategies to specifically address the issue of telecommunications developments.

2.2.1 Group Discussion

Planning Arrangements: Disappointment was expressed that no reference to licence notification developments was made when discussing planning arrangements. This was argued by one stakeholder to be a significant oversight of the fact that such installations represent possibly the greatest source of exposure to radio frequency (RF) emissions for the public, yet these are not controlled at all under existing planning arrangements. It was explained that as licence notifications are not defined as developments under planning legislation, they could not be addressed under planning arrangements but rather that this was addressed by the TLM. It was felt by some that allowing operators to rate sites themselves under the TLM introduced inherent bias to the system. This was suggested to contribute to communities' sense of disempowerment. The Deloitte and Touche implementation review was suggested as being part of the process to ensure that use of the TLM was as intended.

It was argued that most LPAs would find it impossible to manage a database of *de minimis* installations. There were also concerns that LPAs in cities would find it difficult to consult on roll out plans. The fact that so many different people may undertake consultation was also thought to be confusing. It was suggested that a calibration system could be introduced to set out who has responsibility for consulting over different types of development.

Health Concerns in Planning: It was stated by some that the planning system is not the place to consider health issues, and caution was recommended in bringing the health issue into planning matters as this can't be addressed during community consultation. This was challenged by others who felt that as peoples' concerns are fundamentally about health, they should be able to raise this issue in response to base

station consultation. It was felt by some that the health issue should be left to scientists to address, and that communities should raise the issue outside the planning forum.

It was suggested that operators have a responsibility to consult on the health issue, ensuring that sufficient information is provided to people to enable them to make informed decisions. If people remain convinced that they do not accept the health implications, there needs to be clarity on how to deal with this in the planning system.

It was felt by some that the public get very frustrated that operators appear to be 'judge and jury' on the health issue, and the suggestion was made that health information would be more credible if it came from an independent body.

LPAs: In line with the statement by Keith Hill, that there should be more emphasis on LPAs taking a greater role in consultation, and becoming more involved in TLM ratings, concern was expressed that historically it has proved difficult for operators to engage LPAs in discussion. It was acknowledged that telecoms proposals were just one of many issues facing LPAs, but that it was hoped that Central Government emphasis on this matter should help to encourage LPAs to make this more of a priority.

Concern was expressed by some that the ministerial statement would do little to change the perceived reality by communities that even when consultation is undertaken nothing is done as a result of the feedback submitted. It was suggested that the current review of the Code of Best Practice should help to address this, and should bring a better understanding of how it operates in practice. The need for a clearer definition of consultation was highlighted.

Certification: A suggestion was made that all base stations should be subject to certification, based on their emissions, in order to provide some reassurance to people concerned about the health issue. The Ofcom audit was considered by some to address this issue, demonstrating that all base stations are ICNIRP compliant, and furthermore the resource implications of implementing such a certification scheme were seen to be out of scale with the benefits.

It was put forward that there already exists an industry standard that dictates the maximum power output from base stations, the CELNEC standard, and it was suggested that this is flouted by all operators. However, it was explained that the CELNEC standard is an equipment standard not an emissions standard, and that the maximum licensable power and ICNIRP public exposure guidelines are the only standards that apply. The question was raised regarding whether or not this actually represents the safest situation, and it was suggested that rather than focussing efforts and funds on auditing all base stations (which are known to be ICNIRP compliant) attention should be paid to finding out more about the science, especially possible health effects below ICNIRP public exposure guidelines.

2.3 National Radiological Protection Board

The National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) provided a background presentation on the Stewart Report 2000, in anticipation of the follow-up report due to be released in January 2005, as well as a brief overview of other key review reports and scientific assessments published since 2000. It was explained that the forthcoming Report will include a number of annexes, for convenient reference. The NRPB also intends to publish information on new research findings, through the NRPB website. It was explained that the NRPB will continue to function, but that it is due to become part of the Health Protection Agency after 1 April 2005.

2.3.1 Group Discussion

Health Concerns: A query was raised about evidence reviewed by the Stewart Group which suggested that neurological effects might be associated with exposure to RF from mobile telecommunications, and the implications of such evidence for children with base stations on site at school. It was questioned whether any monitoring is taking place to look for health effects among children with base stations near their school.

It was explained that the Mobile Telecommunications and Health Research (MTHR) programme is addressing the issue of RF exposure for children through a specific study, but that there was no ongoing monitoring of children with base stations near to their school. It was explained that monitoring children for health effects is not straight forward, due to the enormous variety of things to which they are exposed every day, including a wide range of RF sources. It is not easy therefore to determine the likely causes of measured health effects in children of school age.

Reference was made to the TNO report, which provided some evidence to suggest health possible effects linked with exposure to RF emissions. It was explained that while the TNO study had raised questions, and suggested that further research is required in that area, it could not be used as robust evidence of a health effect, due to the nature of the study.

An additional comment was made relating to school playground monitoring that has been undertaken. This indicated that RF exposure levels may be elevated as a result of children using their mobile phones at school, rather than base stations operating in vicinity of the school.

Ofcom Base Station Audit: It was explained that public feedback about the base station audit has been very positive, and that site measurements often help to allay peoples' concerns. The number of requests for monitoring has fallen, and it was acknowledged that more should be done to publicise the fact that the public can request free monitoring, through Ofcom.

Concern was expressed that monitoring of the base stations can only be undertaken once a base station has been installed, and that this does not help to address public concerns prior to development. There was disappointment that some people find it

very difficult to gain any indication from operators about likely power levels from proposed base stations. It was suggested that all operators should be obliged to provide power density calculation maps with all proposal details, and follow this up with actual monitoring once a base station is installed. It was felt that even by supplying such data, some people are unwilling to accept that compliance with recognised safety standards represents actual safe practice. Nevertheless, operators recognised the importance of providing increased transparency and were working towards improved provision of such information.

2.4 Mobile Manufacturers Forum

An update on activities by the Mobile Manufacturers Forum (MMF) was provided, including details on the updated Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) information for handsets available at the MMF website. It was explained that the SAR reporting phase II is underway, to improve the way that SAR information is presented to consumers, with the overall aim of global consistency. It was also explained that the user manual text has been revised to include internationally harmonised advice relating to issues such as use of handsets on aeroplanes, in hospitals, and on petrol station forecourts.

2.4.1 Group Discussion

Marketing to Children: Concern was expressed that not all mobile phone retail outlets provide the Department of Health leaflets for customers. A query was raised regarding how manufacturers are addressing the matter, in order to actively encourage parents to keep their children's mobile phone usage to a minimum, in line with precautionary advice.

It was explained that the MMF doesn't have the retail presence to provide brochures to all outlets. The position is that the health of children is paramount. Children themselves are not able to buy mobile phones – generally parents have to do this on their behalf. Other countries have assessed the evidence and decided not to impose any restrictions on the use of mobile phones by children, for example, the Health Council of the Netherlands.

In the UK, general health advice is available to parents. All companies undertake extensive market research and this indicates that many people carry out thorough web-based research before deciding which phone to buy. The retail point is actually the end of the process. It is recognised that people need information at the research stage, when deciding which phone to buy, and this is being done through the provision of comprehensive web-based information.

A comment was made that most children and young people use their phones for texting rather than making calls, and hence personal exposure levels are much less than predicted by SAR calculations.

Mobile Phone Use on Planes: A query was made regarding the current position on using mobile phones on planes. It was explained that different airlines and different countries have implemented widely ranging policies on the matter, hence international

advice is simply to follow the specific airline advice provided on every trip regarding when to switch off handsets.

It was further explained that a good deal of research is currently underway and new developments are taking place, albeit inconsistently, across the industry. Lufthansa is currently trialling the use of on-board base stations. Some of the new handset models are also offering a non-transmitting mode, so that phones can safely be used on all flights to access other services available through the handset. However, due to the difficulty in monitoring this, most airlines will still request that all phones are switched off during flights.

2.5 Mobile Operators Association

The Mobile Operators Association (MOA) thanked all stakeholders for attending the roundtable, and provided an update of recent MOA initiatives. This included an overview of recently released publications, and an explanation of how the findings from the Deloitte and Touche 10 Commitments review were being addressed by industry.

2.5.1 Group Discussion

Ofcom Base Station Audit: It was suggested that more publicity should be provided to the Ofcom audit of base stations. The MOA supports the audit, and suggests that the audit should demonstrate that operating guidelines were being adhered to, and this could help to reassure the public.

A suggestion was made that monitoring should be undertaken with a broadband meter to help to determine RF hotspots, as opposed to fixed measurements in specific locations, which might miss hotspots. It was explained that the audit had never been intended to look at hotspots, but had rather been a service to people who wanted to know RF levels at particular locations, such as in their child's classroom, for reassurance. However, the use of a broadband meter is currently being considered.

3 Keynote Presentation

Professor Lawrie Challis, Chair of the Mobile Telecommunications and Health Research Programme (MTHR) Management Committee, presented the current thinking on research undertaken into possible health effects associated with mobile telecommunications, as well as an indication of future research needs. Copies of his presentation were disseminated at the roundtable.

3.1 Group Discussion

Electro hypersensitivity: Reference was made to the Stewart Report suggestion that some people may be more susceptible to health effects from exposure to RF than others, despite the balance of evidence to the contrary for the general population.

It was explained that the MTHR programme includes four projects that specifically address people who report symptoms. There is also a Home Office investigation into Tetra reported symptoms. It was explained that there are provisos attached to all general statements, and furthermore that people reporting electro hypersensitivity symptoms indicate a wide range of different symptoms, which makes it difficult to get to the crux of the issue. Whilst sufferers may believe a particular cause to be responsible for their symptoms, actually proving this scientifically is not so straight forward.

Funding Further Research: A suggestion was made that as the Government received such a great deal of money for 3G licences, the Government should contribute more than it currently does to the research fund. Mention was made of the Italian public information system for mobile technology, which was funded with some of the 3G licence money.

It was explained that there are several other sponsors who may wish to contribute to the research fund if Government funding is not allocated for the next phase of the MTHR programme. This issue is currently under discussion with potential sponsors.

It was also explained that the income from the 3G licence auction went straight to the Treasury, and none of it has been allocated for anything specific. It was decided that if the research programme was too large it would be difficult to manage the quality control of the programme, hence the programme was restricted in order to ensure as robust, good quality outcomes as possible. The programme is well regarded internationally due to the high standards of quality control. It was emphasised that if the research is of poor quality, the findings are meaningless.

The TNO Study: It was noted that two studies (in Sweden and in Denmark) are being undertaken to replicate the TNO study. A study of the effects of exposure to 3G base station signals is also underway in the UK although this is not a strict replication. The sample size will be larger and it is hoped that the design is an improvement on that of the TNO study. It was explained that the findings of the TNO study that have appeared to date have not been peer reviewed but that a peer reviewed publication is expected in the near future. It was suggested that the TNO findings deserve further investigation but should not at this stage be taken as firm evidence.

Communicating the Science: It was suggested that it is important to get scientific information into the public domain, but that the messenger is often more important than the message in risk communication terms. A trusted source is required, and the MTHR programme was suggested as possibly representing a credible source. A suggestion was made that the MTHR should provide a Q&A facility on their website, which industry could refer members of the public to. There was general discussion about how user friendly the MTHR website is, and whether or not they would be the most relevant site for the public. Concerns were also voiced that if the Q&A facility proved to be controversial it might damage the credibility of MTHR if they were responsible for it. It was clear that this was an important issue and it was suggested that the matter should be tested in some way before a final decision was taken.

There was general discussion about the public's ability and willingness to accept scientific uncertainty. It was suggested that a sterile, web based Q&A function would not address the issue as it prevents dialogue, which would enable concerns to be explored and the science to be explained.

It was suggested that general public knowledge about the technology is minimal, and a query was raised regarding how much of the MTHR funding is allocated to projects addressing this. It was explained that during the first phase of the MTHR programme only one study was addressing this issue, but it was hoped that more projects could focus on communicating the issue in the second phase. There had been specific research requirements to address during phase I.

It was suggested that as an industry, concerted efforts are being made to give information at the pre-application stage, to promote openness and transparency. It was felt that a standardised set of cross-industry information would be helpful to be sent out with planning information, to counter any concerns that the industry is trying to conceal certain information, and to attempt to build trust. It was suggested that monitoring of communications should take place to make sure that the right information is going to the most appropriate people, and to monitor how the information is received in terms of supporting balanced decision making.

Research into Children's Health: A query was raised regarding research the MTHR programme was funding, into less serious health effects in children living near base stations, in terms of which types of illness might possibly be linked to RF exposure. It was explained that anecdotal evidence on the subject needed to be tested, and that although it would be more robust if notifiable diseases were looked at, it is also helpful to look at less severe diseases with much greater incidence and lower latency periods.

Another query was raised regarding any monitoring on children's health that has been undertaken, based on the fact that base stations have been in place around schools for more than 10 years. No-one was aware of any specific monitoring.

A further query was made about any epidemiological studies proposed to look at the possible effects on children who are exposed to base station emissions for more than 6 hours a day, 5 days a week. It was explained that a pilot study is being funded by the MTHR programme, looking at diseases in pre-school children, who are easier to monitor, and who don't generally use mobile phones. A personal exposure meter was currently been tested in the hope that it would provide a clearer individual exposure picture.

Other Electrical Appliances: A query was raised regarding research into exposure to RF from baby monitors, which are close to babies for long periods of time. No-one was aware of specific research into this, although there had been consideration of monitoring classroom environments for all RF sources, both within the class and externally.

Concern was expressed that when people are interviewed about their own exposure to RF, they are actively focussed on mobile phone usage, which potentially introduces a respondent bias into the studies.

Other Stakeholders: A query was raised about acquisition agents, and whether they had been invited to attend the stakeholder roundtable. It was explained that due to limitations on the number of attendees it had not proved possible to extend the roundtable to include agents, although it was generally felt that a wider discussion of the issues, including the acquisition agent perspective, would be helpful. It was felt that LPAs would benefit from specific dialogue with agents, as they are the front line of the industry as far as local authority planners are concerned.

A query was raised regarding the level of dialogue between agents and operators. It was reported that there is evidence that applications received by planners do not always appear to comply with the Code of Best Practice. It was explained that during the MOA presentations to LPAs, operators had offered to meet and discuss such issues, and it was emphasised that if agents do not appear to be applying the Code, operators must be informed so that they can deal with it. It was suggested that a specific planning roundtable be held to address such issues and, to help with the day-to-day matters, central contact points for each operator should be provided to all LPAs.

Planners felt that they need some kind of support in how to deal with concerned residents. It was acknowledged that the information from operators to LPAs is now far better and more user friendly, however, improved consultation and concerns about health remain the key issues for LPAs to address. While health issues can be deferred to Central Government to address strategically, consultation remains confusing. It was suggested that LPAs would find it helpful to receive improved information from operators regarding what consultation had been undertaken prior to an application, and what the outcome of the consultation had been.

4 Concluding Comments

Individual stakeholders provided their own key comments and conclusions from the roundtable discussions, which can be summarised as follows:

Microcells: Microcells provide proportionally more RF exposure to the public than macrocells, yet *de minimis* microcell installations do not require consultation or planning permission, and this should be addressed by the ODPM. It was emphasised that all base stations fall well within ICNIRP exposure guidelines.

Pre-Application Consultation: Clarity and cross-stakeholder agreement should be sought on how to address the health issue during public consultation. Health concerns are at the heart of most public objections and this should be dealt with. There should be an industry agreed methodology, so that all stakeholders know exactly what to expect.

Feedback Gaps: It is clear that feedback is not always being provided to communities about progress and decisions on proposals, which increases the sense of community disempowerment. This feedback gap needs to be addressed.

Communication: Further thought needs to be given to how best to communicate health information to the public and who the most appropriate messenger would be. Efforts should be made to understand peoples' communication needs. Also, thought should be given to how to counter the scare stories that gain high media profiles, with science-based stories to help to allay fears.

Transparency: It is clear that people want facts, and that sometimes they find it difficult to obtain the information they seek. There should be greater disclosure from operators, for example, over emission levels from base stations, in order to build greater trust.

Research: Future funding for the MTHR research programme should be provided by Central Government, given the extent of public interest in the issue. More social science research should be undertaken into issues of how best to respond to community concerns.

Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement: The MOA are encouraged to continue to develop meetings between stakeholders, including acquisition agents, for ongoing improvement to the consultation and deployment process. The roundtable has been helpful in enabling joint understanding of the on-going issues and the need for improved information sharing

5 Summary of Suggestions

In conclusion, the following list summarises the various suggestions made during the roundtable discussions, without detailing the discussion that took place around each suggestion. The list is presented for reference purposes only and issues are listed in no particular order of priority. These issues did not receive formal support from all those present at the roundtable, but they reflect the main issues raised by one or more of the key stakeholders present.

- Re-establish community representative / activist and industry dialogue
- Predicted power density calculations to be made publicly available
- TLM ratings for *de minimis* developments should be made publicly available
- Sitefinder database should be externally audited
- PPG8 should be reviewed and clarified
- The All Party Mobile report should be acted upon by Central Government
- A clear definition of consultation should be established, and a calibration system, outlining responsibilities for consultation, should be introduced

- Operators should ‘consult on health’, by providing balanced information
- The planning system should clarify how to address the health issue
- Health information should be provided through a credible, independent body
- All base stations should be certified, based on their emissions
- There should be improved publicity for the Ofcom RF monitoring service
- Use of a broadband meter in RF monitoring should be considered
- Treasury money from the 3G auction should be used to fund further research or a public information system
- A MTHR web-based Q&A facility may offer a credible, trusted information source – but this should be tested first
- MTHR should allocate research funds into effective communication of the science
- A standardised set of cross-industry information should be developed and sent out with all planning information
- A communications audit should be undertaken
- A planning roundtable should be held
- Central contact points for each operator should be provided to all LPAs
- LPAs should advise operators if agents are not applying the Code of Best Practice
- The outcome of pre-application consultation should be forwarded to the LPA

5.1 Concluding remarks

The chairman closed the National Stakeholder Roundtable by thanking all those present for taking the time and trouble to attend and to participate in a spirit of seeking to find a way forward on such difficult issues. Dr. Kemp thanked Professor Challis for his presentation and the MOA for supporting and organising the meeting. Mike Dolan, Executive Director of the MOA, added his thanks to all participants for contributing to a successful roundtable discussion.

Appendix 1: Attendees

Stakeholder Roundtable “Mobile Phones, Base Stations and Health - the current state of the issue”

Thursday 9th December 2004 at One Whitehall Place, Westminster, London.

Alphabetical list of attendees:

ALDEN, ALEC, MOA
ANDERSON, ROLAND, NETWORK RAIL
BARKER, PROFESSOR ANTHONY, ROYAL HALLAMSHIRE HOSPITAL
BARNETT, DR JULIE, UNIVERSITY OF SURREY
BELL, MIKE, EM RADIATION RESEARCH TRUST
CATTERALL, STEVE, HSE
CHALLIS, PROFESSOR LAWRIE, MTHR
COLLINS, KATY, ODPM
DAVIES, NICOLA, MOA
DOLAN, MIKE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MOA
EVANS, JANE, 3
FREEMAN, ALAN, O2
GREULICH, TAMSIN, GALSON SCIENCE
HARRIS, STEPHEN, CHICHESTER DC
HOOKER, GEORGE, DEPT OF HEALTH
JUDE, CHRISTINE, MOA
KELLETT, GERRY, WREXHAM CC
KEMP, DR RAY, GALSON SCIENCE
KERR, GILL, T-MOBILE
KINDER, PAULINE, PUBLIC HEALTH PROTECTION, WELSH ASSEMBLY
GOVT
MANGAT, CHRISTINE, MAUK
MATTHEW, JULIE, MAUK
MATTHEWS, ROB, VODAFONE
MILLIGAN, MICHAEL, MMF
PHILIPS, ALASDAIR, POWERWATCH
RANDALL, ERIC, CABLE & WIRELESS
READ, ADRIAN, ORANGE
ROBERTS, PETER, WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVT
ROBINSON, DAVID, AIRWAVE

RUTT, AILITH, BASINGSTOKE AND DEAN DC
SIMPSON, JESSICA, CARPHONE WAREHOUSE
STATHER, DR JOHN, NRPB
TAILBY, LLOYD, OFCOM
TIMOTIJEVIC, LADA, UNIVERSITY OF SURREY
WALKER, JOHN, WESTMINSTER CC
WORSLEY, GRAHAM, DTI

Appendix 2: Agenda

Stakeholder Roundtable “Mobile Phones, Base Stations and Health - the current state of the issue”

Thursday 9th December 2004 at One Whitehall Place, Westminster, London.

AGENDA

DATE: Thursday, 9th December 2004
VENUE: River Room & Meston Suite, One Whitehall Place, London SW1
Timing: 9.15am - coffee and registration (River Room)
9.45am - Chairman's introduction (Meston Suite) Dr Ray Kemp
10.00am - 10 min presentations from key representatives and
facilitated discussions

- Mast Action UK
- ODPM
- NRPB
- MMF
- MOA

11.40am - Coffee
12.10pm - Facilitated discussion
1.00pm - Lunch

2.15pm - Presentation on current state of
science and MTHR by Prof Lawrie Challis
2.45pm - Q and A and discussion
3.15pm - Plenary session and conclusions
4.00pm – Finish

- Chatham House Rule
- Approximately 35 attendees
- Summary meeting note, prepared by Chairman, will be provided

Appendix 3: Professor Challis' Presentation

[The Mobile Telecommunications and Health Research Programme \(MTHR\) \(pdf 261KB\)](#)

Appendix 4: MAUK Presentation

MAUK was formed 4 yrs ago by Christine and myself in response to the overwhelming public demand for help with mast problems.

We have, however, been involved with this issue for the last 10yrs.

When we were asked to give a presentation at this Roundtable my first thought was WHY?

Why take part in an MOA risk management exercise, that's designed to allow the MOA to say that they did allow key stakeholders to share their views and opinions in an open forum and very unlikely to change the approach of the network operators as expected under the ODPM's Code of Best Practice.

Despite believing that this is in fact purely an MOA risk management exercise, I came upon this quote and decided we should participate

SLIDE 1

I also found the English Dictionary very helpful in formulating what I have to say today.

The definition of Round Table for example- 'so that none should have precedence'

We believe the key issue here is 'consultation'.

PPG8 states..discussions should be carried out by the operators with residential groups. and where the site is near a school..it is important to discuss it with the relevant school body.

Code of Best Practice states that operators have a commitment to carry out consultation.. and where the site is near a school they should carry out specific pre application consultation exercises with the school.

Soho Parish Church of England Primary has 27 masts within 200yds. Head teacher Rachel Earnshaw was not aware of a single one!!

We were actively involved in the consultation that led to the introduction of the 10 commitments...consultations which were as misleading as the 2nd commitment itself.

Perhaps you too should have consulted the dictionary before the word 'consultation' was used in the 2nd commitment.

Consultation..... seek permission or approval from a person for a proposed action.

We had faith that the industry and representatives, perhaps persuaded by our government, were actually prepared to proceed on a level playing field, where the public were consulted and a compromise achieved.... I think they call that democracy...

Incidentally the dictionary had these definitions of democracy.

1. Majority rule.
2. The principles of social equality and respect for the individual within a community

The situation we actually have is rather different. There are 2 options currently being used by the industry and I will illustrate these.

OPTION 1

Lets not consult at all

A site in Woking, close to homes was applied for by O2. Our member has a 5yr old child with Tuberous Sclerosis, a disease where tumours grow inside the body, making her predisposed to cancer and therefore not a general case.

They live opposite the site and like other residents and a nearby school, were not informed of the application. Woking Borough Council, backed by Surrey County Council, however, sensibly turned down the application. O2 took the case to appeal. The residents were not informed of the appeal or its outcome. The Inspector approved the mast.

In the letter written by our member to planning inspectorate she states...

Quote from letter..

O2 did not install this mast at the time. They went on to apply for a larger mast, which was again turned down by the council and is still waiting an appeal verdict. So the residents thought they were safe. That is until 2 weeks ago when contractors appeared on the site and began digging footings for the mast, using the controversial original planning application. Those of us with consciences can imagine how that family are now feeling.

OPTION 2

Consult but ignore the wishes of those we consult.

TMobile, Orange and 3 applied for this mast in Harrogate. This mast is close to residents and 2 local schools. After consultation, the council with the backing of residents and the schools, turned down the application. The operators took the case to appeal. The Inspector upheld the council's decision.

Wishing to quash the decision of the local residents, school bodies, local council and planning inspectorate... the operators went to the Court of Appeal, because unlike the previous case, they were informed of the decision and they had the money to do so.

The appeal judges overturned the decision, because they decided.... the operators stated they had given sufficient reassurances that there would be no harm in terms of health concerns to the living conditions of the children in the nearby schools....

It is obvious that self regulation of this industry is not working. MAUK and the public have been used and misused and I wonder how much longer this situation can continue.

We are all aware that by the time the ODPM's steering group reports its findings, most 3G masts will already be up.

Appendix 5: ODPM Presentation

[ODPM presentation \(pdf 66KB\)](#)

Appendix 6: NRPB Presentation

[Mobile Phones and Health 2004 - Statement from Board of NRPB \(pdf 233KB\)](#)

Appendix 7: MOA Presentation

[MOA presentation \(pdf 131KB\)](#)

Appendix 8: MMF Presentation

[Overview of recent MMF actions \(pdf 1.5MB\)](#)