



INTERNATIONAL
COMMITTEE *on*
ELECTROMAGNETIC
SAFETY

Approved Minutes

IEEE Standards Coordinating Committee 28
Radisson Riverfront Hotel
St. Paul, Minnesota
June 10, 2001
8:00 AM – Noon

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Osepchuk at 0810 h. Each of the attendees introduced him/herself. The list of attendees is shown in Attachment 1.

2. Approval of Agenda

Following a motion by J. Cohen that was seconded by T. Tenforde, the agenda (Attachment 2) was unanimously approved without modification. Before proceeding to the next agenda item, M. Murphy paid his respects and presented a remembrance of David Erwin by reading excerpts from his obituary. He noted that the burial ceremony, held at Sam Houston National Cemetery, included full military honors. As many know, Dave was a long-time supporter of rational science-based standards and SCC-28 activities.

3. Approval of November 19, 2000 Minutes

Following a motion by L. Heynick that was seconded by C. Sutton, the minutes of the November 19, 2001 meeting were unanimously approved without modification.

4. IEEE Standards Activities Report

No report.

5. Executive Secretary's Report

Petersen reported that PAR extension requests for C95.1, C95.3 and P1472 would have to be submitted before the December meeting of the SA-Standards Board. He said that he would also submit a revised PAR for P1472 (electroexplosive devices) requesting a

project number change – from P1472 to PC95.4. He recommended submitting a revised PAR for P1555 (safety levels – 0-3 kHz) to have the project number changed from P1555 to PC95.6 and the title changed from *Standard for Maximum Levels of Human Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields, 0 to 3 kHz* back to the original *Standard for Safety Levels With Respect to Human Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields, 0 to 3 kHz* to be consistent with the title of the C95.1 standard. Petersen also reported that the SA-Standards Board's Audit Committee reviewed the SCC-28 Policies and Procedures and suggested only minor changes. He also noted that because of objections of a number of SA-Standards Board members, the SA Board of Governors is reviewing their earlier decision to require non-SA members to pay a fee to vote on standards at the sponsor level. Osepchuk briefly reviewed the history of ICES and its earlier incarnations pointing out how important the interdisciplinary approach to the C95 standards is and how important it is that invited experts who have no particular reason to belong to IEEE are permitted to vote at the sponsor level (main committee) without paying a fee. He pointed out that the standards are actually developed by the subcommittees whose membership is open to anyone. Petersen said that he suspects that the SA-Board of Governors would retract the fee requirement but the eligibility of each non-SA member to vote at the sponsor level would have to be approved by the Standards Board on a case-by-case basis – as it was in the past. J. Koepfinger re-emphasized the fact that the fee would only apply to those voting at the main committee level but not on subcommittee ballots – subcommittee ballots are not considered IEEE ballots.

6. Chairman's Report

Chairman Osepchuk reviewed the responsibilities of the chairman of ICES. He pointed out that the chairman is responsible for the activities of both the main committee and the subcommittees – of which there are five. He briefly reviewed the mailing from the Munich meeting pointing out that it was at that meeting that SCC-28 and ICNIRP began a dialog to effect harmonization of the RF/ELF safety standards. Two meetings have been held so far with participation of the leadership of both committees. It was agreed that the two committees would begin to exchange documents – ICES was included in the list of those selected to review the ICNIRP draft *General Approach to Protection against Non-Ionizing Radiation*. He noted that ICES and ICNIRP are also cooperating on the development of a joint-sponsored workshop on thermophysiology and he expects to see additional joint-sponsored workshops take place in the future. Osepchuk also reviewed the difference in philosophies between ICNIRP and ICES, e.g., representation and input from stakeholders on ICES but not on ICNIRP. He also reported that ICES members have been actively participating on the WHO EMF Standards Harmonization Project, which is developing a framework for the development of international standards.

Osepchuk also briefly reviewed the activities of IEC TC106 (exposure assessment) pointing out that the liaison relationship between ICES and IEC and common membership on the two committees, their subcommittees and project teams, should lead to harmonized exposure assessment standards. He reviewed the levels of authority of the types of IEEE standards, pointing out that the word “shall” is usually reserved for standards, the word “should” for recommended practices and the provision of a number of options is usually reserved for guides. He also explained the difference between

exposure standards and emission and product standards. He briefly discussed the letter drafted by members of the IEEE medical Technology Policy Committee that will be sent by IEEE-USA to try to encourage Congress to get support for standards activities from the federal agencies.

Osepchuk noted that it is almost a full time job for the chairman of ICES to respond to all of the requests from both within and outside of IEEE. For example, he recently commented on a draft Australian standard, coordinated comments on the ICNIRP paper mentioned above, drafted a letter to a contact in Peru encouraging participation on ICES to try to broaden non-US representation, and reviewed the ICES Interpretations Policy. He then described the ICES interpretations policy pointing out that interpretations working groups have been established for each subcommittee and explained how the working groups prepare responses to requests for interpretation. He noted that two requests have been expedited during the last year; one addressed a spatial averaging issue, the other an induced current issue. In response to a question from J. Koepfinger regarding archiving the requests for interpretation and their response, Petersen noted that both are included with the SCC-28 mailings.

Osepchuk mentioned some of the relationships of ICES members with other societies. He said that he is now trying to revive interest within MTT-S on RF bioeffects and noted that Om Gandhi received the MTT-S Pioneer Award. He also reported that Adair and Petersen were invited to submit a paper on RF bioeffects and standards for the 50th Anniversary Issue of the *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*. He noted that COMAR has published several technical information statements including one on wireless base station antennas and one on wireless handsets.

Koepfinger reported that an *ad hoc* IEEE group met to discuss environmental standards and to develop a policy addressing environmental and safety issues, which at some point will have to undergo legal review.

Osepchuk then announced that on August 31, 2001, he would be stepping down as Chairman of ICES and that Vice-chairman Adair would become chairman. He will remain on the EXCOM as Past Chairman, *ex officio*.

7. Treasurer's Report

A. Varanelli reported that the IEEE is in the process of auditing the ICES account and deferred presenting a report until the final audit is complete.

8. Membership Chairman's Report

T. McManus announced that the EXCOM approved the following four new members of ICES: Shiela Johnston from the UK, Sakari Lang from Finland, Ralf Bodemann from Germany and Peter Gajsek from Slovenia. He noted that Johnston continues to serve as consultant to a number of agencies and organizations, Lang, whose background is radiation physics and radiation biology, is a principal scientist at Nokia, Bodemann, whose background is radiation physics, has corporate-wide responsibility for radiation safety at Siemens, and Gajsek recently completed a number of projects at Brooks AFB before returning to Slovenia where he is with the Institute of Public Health in Ljubljana.

McManus discussed a number of international activities of interest to ICES, including two documents from Australia – one of which he said was a fair assessment of the Doll report (www.arpansa.gov.au/ceo_emf.htm). He also commented on the NIEHS and the Health Council of the Netherlands reports and read a few selected passages from the latter. He mentioned several Health Canada fact sheets, which can be downloaded from (www.hc-sc.gc.ca) (search for “it’s your health”). He described the new COST 281 program chaired by Ulf Berqvist and the CENELEC projects on wireless handsets, base stations and article surveillance systems. He noted that the EU DG on Health and Consumer Protection is in the process of trying to resolve the question of how to implement the July 1999 EU Recommendation. This Recommendation directs the EU member states to use the ICNIRP guidelines as the basis for their exposure limits. He noted that when the EU members voted on the Recommendation, Italy was the only member-state that voted against it – and then adopted more stringent limits. The Italian limits are 1/10 of the ICNIRP limits in areas where people reside.

McManus then announced an upcoming EU meeting in Luxembourg (see Attachment 3). He suggested that ICES should consider holding its next meeting in Luxembourg following the EU meeting to encourage attendance from the European countries. He then briefly reviewed the status of the Vatican Radio Study pointing out that one endpoint of concern was childhood leukemia. He noted that while there were no excess cases in a large circle surrounding the transmitter site – compared with any other large circle – there was what was reported as an excess in a smaller circle where 0.16 cases were expected and 1 was found – an odds ration of about 6.

McManus reported that the Netherlands government adopted a National Antenna Policy in December 2000 and that a number of other reports were published in the Netherlands including critiques of meta analyses and the Henshaw air-ion theory paper, and an assessment of the Muscat study. He also reported that booklets were published in the UK on mobile base-stations and health and mobile phones and health – both of which are available at (www.doh.gov.uk/mobilephones). He then reported that a number of WHO fact sheets are available or in progress, which include topics such as medical response to RF over-exposure, environmental impact of EMF (on flora and fauna), and EMF hypersensitivity and environmental illness. He noted that the WHO project to develop a fact sheet on intermediate frequencies, e.g., 300 Hz to 10 MHz, has been shelved.

Bushberg noted that the GAO report on cell phones is available at (www.gao.gov). D. Baron noted that Australian (ARPANSA) regulations, available at www.health.gov.au apply only to federal employees and that regulations that apply in the workplace can be obtained at www.whs.qld.gov.au. M. Swicord pointed out that a large number of similar URLs are listed on the Motorola website (www.Motorola.com/rfhealth) and R. Coghill noted that the Doll report represents a major update on the UK viewpoint on the EMF issue. S. Johnston noted that the B M Associates report came out within the past two weeks and she will send the URL to McManus – A. Varanelli noted that he would link the SCC-28 website (<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/scc28/>) to websites relevant to ICES activities.

9. International Liaison Chairman's Report

M. Murphy reported that K. Foster attended the WHO meeting in Peru but he has not yet had any feedback on the meeting. He noted that ICES is now formally invited to speak at the WHO harmonization meetings and added that there is a lot of interest in South America in the issue of RF safety. Murphy also reviewed the WHO Standards Harmonization Meeting in Bulgaria, where it was announced that the Republic of Czechoslovakia recently replaced its $1 \mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ RF exposure limits with the ICNIRP limits, China is proposing to adopt the IEEE spatial-peak average SAR limits for mobile phones and other limits are being reviewed for other exposures, and Korea adopted the IEEE SAR limits for mobile phones and the ICNIRP limits for everything else. He said it was not made clear what Italy intends to do. Murphy said that McManus represented ICES at the WHO IAC meeting in Geneva. He also reviewed the 3-day WHO meetings held at Brooks AFB in November 2000.

Murphy then reviewed meetings that are scheduled to be held throughout the world during the next year. These include the following: Asia-Pacific Radio Science Conference – Tokyo, Japan August 1-4, 2001; WHO EMF Biological Effects and Standards Harmonization – Seoul, South Korea, October 22-24, 2001; European Bioelectromagnetics Association Meeting – Helsinki, Finland, September 6-8, 2001; WHO EMF Standards and RF Bioeffects Update – South Africa, December 5-7, 2001; and the Asia Pacific EMF Conference (Organized by WHO and the USAF) – Phuket, Thailand, Winter of 2002. He noted that the WHO meeting planned to be held in Israel has been delayed because of political issues in the Middle East.

Murphy briefly discussed a number of International Standards Projects funded by the USAF and WHO. These included the “Basic Materials for EMF Standards Project” led by Yuri Grigoriev of Russia, the “Criteria for Standards in the Field of Radio Frequency Radiation in Some East European Countries Project” led by Michel Israel of Bulgaria (both funded by the USAF), and the “Database of World Standards Project,” led by Dina Simunic of Bulgaria and funded by WHO. He briefly discussed several NATO activities including the General Medical Working Group's 49th Meeting that was held in Brussels, Belgium, June 5-8, 2000 during which time revisions and new sections of the NATO RF Standardization Agreement (STANAG 2345) were discussed.

Chairman Osepchuk expressed appreciation noting that the increased ICES membership from outside the US and growing international interest and stature is in large part due to the efforts of Murphy and McManus.

10. Report on ICES and Fundraising

Osepchuk briefly reviewed the history of SCC-28, which began as an American Standards Association committee in 1960. He noted that the reason for becoming an IEEE committee in the late 1980's was to ensure that members of the committee and working groups were indemnified from liability – an important issue at the time because of litigation involving an ANSI standards committee (the Hydro-level case). He described how the committee finally became an IEEE committee after numerous meetings with members of the IEEE Standards Department and Standards Board during the late 1980's. At that time, ICES was ANSI Accredited Standards Committee C95. He

recalled the initial pushback by some members of the Standards Department and Standards Board that was eventually overcome thanks to support of some of the board members including J. Koepfinger and D. Zipse. During the 90's, the importance of international standards was recognized by many of the committee members and the IEEE, e.g., Judy Gorman – Director of the IEEE Standards Department, and it was felt that a name more suitable than “Standards Coordinating Committee 28” was needed to convey the scope of the committee, i.e., EMF/RF safety standards. A change to a more descriptive name was supported by the Standards Department and after several meetings with IEEE and other organizations, including TABD (Transatlantic Business Dialog), the name International Committee on Electromagnetic Safety was selected and approved by the IEEE SA-Standards Board in March 2001.

Osepchuk then discussed fundraising. He noted that a professional IEEE fund-raiser attended a meeting with the leadership of ICES and TABD and that further meetings will be held to develop a formal program. The ultimate goal is to form and generate financial support for an umbrella committee over SCC-28 and SCC-34 and any new committees that may be formed to address the topic of electromagnetic safety. He then asked for ideas on how to implement fund-raising. McManus asked if there was a target or objective regarding what is needed and what the funds will be used for. Osepchuk responded that he had prepared an annual budget a few years ago that had line items for travel, etc., and said that he would review that document and present a formal report during the next several months.

11. Subcommittee Reports:

a) SC1 (Techniques, Procedures, Instrumentation and Computation)

H. Bassen reported that the revision of the 1991 standard contains a number of significant changes and additional material on experimental and computational dosimetry. The draft revision was circulated to the subcommittee late last year for ballot. The one negative vote has been resolved and the revised draft recirculated for comment – comments are due June 30. The revision should then go to the IEEE for ballot by the main committee sometime within the next several months. In response to a question from Osepchuk, Bassen responded that the practical frequency range of the revision is 300 kHz to 300 GHz. Osepchuk then asked if there are plans to develop practices to cover the frequency ranges of 0-3 kHz and 3-300 kHz – Bassen replied that he intends to establish a working group to address the lower frequencies. He pointed out that the instruments and technology for measuring fields are considerably different at the lower frequencies than at RF. Koepfinger explained that it will be important to coordinate with the Power Engineering Society when the practices for the lower frequencies are being developed. Osepchuk then formally requested that SC-1 establish a working group to address frequencies below 300 kHz. In response to a question from A. Brecher, Bassen responded that there is little overlap between the revision of C95.3 and the work of SCC-34 – SCC-34 standards are narrowly focused and generally product specific.

b) SC2 (Terminology, Units of Measurements and Hazard Communication)

R. Tell reported that SC-2 is in the process of developing a practical guide that will provide guidance on establishing an RF safety program. He said that 12 members of SC-2, including representatives of FCC, OSHA and NIOSH, met in January at the OSHA Salt Lake City facility. A revised draft was produced that specifies exposure categories and defines elements of a safety program. He said that the subcommittee also met Friday (June 8th) and agreed on the concept of categories and that the document should be generic and not necessarily based on C95.1 standards. The next meeting will be in Washington DC in September where an attempt will be made to resolve several issues, e.g., one versus two tiers, whether the document should be a guide or a recommended practice, etc. He called for more participation – especially from non-US members.

c) SC3 (Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure, 0-3 kHz)

K. Jaffa reported that SC-3 met yesterday (June 9th) – there were 47 attendees. The draft standard was balloted in March. He said that he was pleased with the results – 91% approval, with and without comments. The comments have been reviewed and a revision is being prepared. He also reported that a small *ad hoc* group was established to work with SC-4 to ensure that there is continuity at the interface (3 kHz) between the two standards. The revised draft will be recirculated to the SC-3 balloting group and then sent to IEEE for ballot by the main committee. Jaffa also briefly discussed participation of SC-3 members at the Power Engineering Society (PES) Summer Meeting where a special session was organized to discuss the work of SC-3 and ELF standards. He felt that the session was very successful in that many PES members were unaware of or misinformed about these activities.

Jaffa also noted that a revised PAR would be submitted to the Standards Board. The revisions will include a title change to be consistent with C95.1 and a change in the project number – from P1555 to PC95.6. He said that he would like to have IEEE form the balloting group before the revision is finished to expedite the process.

K. Gibney noted that NIEHS is revising its ELF booklet – the revision should be available around November 2001. Jaffa concluded by noting that a motion was passed at the SC-3 meeting to create a 1-2 page document on long-term effects – the drafting group is chaired by R. Bodemann.

d) SC4 (Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure, 3 kHz-300 GHz)

J. D'Andrea reported that SC-4 met during the past two days (June 8-9th). The Revision Working Group is preparing a revision of the latest version of C95.1 – progress is slow but the group is steadily moving forward. He said that the pace of the literature evaluation process is still a problem. To help move things along, important papers have been identified for immediate review. The cutoff date for

new papers will be sometime before the next meeting. Topic reports are being prepared on various sections of the revision and 10 “white papers” are being prepared to help guide the process. The intent is to send the white papers to a peer-reviewed journal for publication. Weekly updates on the progress of the various sections are required to keep progress on track. The Revision Working Group will meet in Washington DC in September. The normative sections of the revision should be available sometime in August and a working draft of the entire document should be available in November.

Osepchuk noted an action item in the minutes of the last meeting¹. He recalled that the intent was to prepare a document targeting the hi-lights of the revision, similar to the rationale document being prepared by ICNIRP, and asked whether this has been addressed. D’Andrea responded that it has not.

Vijayalaxmi raised the general issue of the quality of published RF bioeffect papers noting that many are not useful for standard setting. She said that many do not even mention SAR and asked if there was some way to alert others as to how important it is to include this information. Osepchuk pointed out that an SAR tutorial was published a few years ago in the BEMS journal that he hoped would alert others. He added that the consistently low engineering evaluation scores should also raise a flag. C. K. Chou said that this is an important issue and that the BEMS journal tries to scrutinize each submitted paper to ensure that the engineering/dosimetry information is complete. He also said that SC-4 is writing to the editors of relevant journals to alert the editors of the importance of this issue.

e) SC5 (Safety Levels with Respect to Electro-Explosive Devices)

J. DeFrank reported that the revised draft of P1472 (*Recommended Practice for Determining Safe Distances From Radio Frequency Transmitting Antennas When Using Electric Blasting Caps During Explosive Operations*) was recirculated – there were no negative votes. There were, however, a number of editorial comments that would have to be incorporated to bring the document into conformance with the new *IEEE Style Manual*. In addition, as pointed out by a representative of the Institute of Manufacturers of Explosives (IME), the entries in an entire column of one of the tables were off by a factor of 10. The editorial changes and substantive changes to the table will require another recirculation – which should take place sometime this summer. DeFrank noted that much of the material in P1472 is taken from a similar IME document but the IEEE document is more international in character is also based on probabilities of the occurrence of an explosion.

DeFrank noted that the other task of the subcommittee – addressing the use of cellular phones in explosive atmospheres – has not been forgotten. He said that some fact sheets and news reports of gasoline-station explosions seem to be based

¹ M. Meltz will formulate a proposal for the preparation and publication in the refereed literature of a document that describes the rationale and basis of the revision of IEEE C95.1-1991.

more on legend and mythology than on fact and called for factual information on the issue – especially from Europe.

In response to a question from Osepchuk, Petersen responded that as far as he knew all new standards would be published with black and white covers – not with covers in the traditional colors.

12. New Business

McManus pointed out the importance of openness and the interpretations process. He suggested posting a booklet of interpretations or posting the interpretations on the ICES web page so members and others who use the standards would be aware of issues that have been raised and addressed. Varanelli agreed and said that he would set up a page on the ICES website for interpretations. Osepchuk asked Adair to look into some mechanism for compiling the interpretations.

Adair said that she was being overwhelmed by the amount of paperwork generated by ICES and its subcommittees, e.g., mailings, minutes, etc., and suggested placing the information on the web instead. S. Maurer agreed and suggested sending everyone CDs instead of hard-copy. J. Daly noted that SC-3 does most of its work by e-mail and Chou noted that SCC-34/SC-2 does everything by e-mail through its website and reflector. Petersen agreed – there would be no more hard-copy mailings.

13. Plans for Future Meetings

There was some discussion about the venue of the next meeting. It was agreed that if ICES meets in the fall, it would meet in Luxembourg immediately after the EU meeting, i.e., December 1-2, 2001. This should be confirmed by the end of July. If ICES does not meet in Luxembourg in December, it will meet in San Antonio, TX in January 2002 – or, possibly, in both places. Osepchuk noted that in the future, more meetings would be held outside of the US because of the international character of ICES. R. Coghill suggested holding the fall meeting in Helsinki, FI in Sept.-Oct.– it was agreed that that would be too close to this meeting.

14. Adjournment

Before adjourning, the committee expressed a debt of gratitude to retiring Chairman Osepchuk for the years of hard work that elevated the committee to its present internationally recognized stature.

There being no further business, upon a motion by D'Andrea that was seconded by Petersen, the meeting adjourned at 1205 h.

Attendance List

Radisson Riverfront Hotel
St. Paul, Minnesota
June 10, 2001
8:00 AM – Noon

	Last Name	First Name	Country	Status	E-mail Address
1.	Adair	Eleanor	US	M	eleanor.adair@ieee.org
2.	Adlkofer	Franz	DE	O	prof.aflkofer@verum-fiundation.de
3.	Anderson	Vitas	AU	M	Vitas@ieee.org
4.	Aslan	Ed	US	M	Edward.aslan@nardaeast.L-3COM.com
5.	Baron	David	US	O	baron006@tc.umn.edu
6.	Bassen	Howard	US	M	hib@cdrh.fda.gov
7.	Black	David	NZ	M	drblack@itmedical.com
8.	Blick	Dennis	US	O	dennis.blick@brooks.af.mil
9.	Bodemann	Ralf	DE	O	ralf.bodemann@mchp.siemens.de
10.	Brecher	Aviva	US	M	brecher@volpe.dot.gov
11.	Bushberg	Jerrold	US	M	jbushberg@ucdavis.edu
12.	Chou	C.K.	US	M	ck.chou@motorola.com
13.	Cleveland	Robert	US	M	rclevela@fcc.gov
14.	Cohen	Jules	US	M	jcohen@denny.com
15.	Coghill	Roger	UK	M	roger@cogreslab.co.uk
16.	D'Andrea	John	US	M	john.daandrea@brooks.ak.mil
17.	Daly	James	US	M	jim.daly@ieee.org
18.	DeFrank	John	US	M	john.defrank@amedd.army.mil
19.	Gandhi	Om	US	M	gandhi@ee.utah.org
20.	Gettman	Ken	US	O	ken_getman@nema.org
21.	Gibney	Kelly	CA	O	kgibne6276@home.com
22.	Gluck	Melissa	US	O	
23.	Gorsuch	Gregory	US	M	gmgorsuch@us.med.navy.mil
24.	Haes	Donald	US	M	haes@mit.edu
25.	Hammer	Wayne	US	O	hammerw@spawar.navy.mil
26.	Hatfield	James	US	M	hatfield@hatdaw.com
27.	Heynick	Louis	US	M	louhey@mindspring.com
28.	Hubbard	Roy	ZA	O	roy.hubbard@eskom.co.za
29.	Ivans	Veronica	US	M	veronica.ivans@medtronic.com

	Last Name	First Name	Country	Status	E-mail Address
30.	Jaffa	Kent	US	M	kent.jaffa@pacificorp.com
31.	Johnston	Shiela	UK	M	sajohnston@btinternet.com
32.	Joyner	Ken	AU	M	C20471@email.mot.com
33.	Koepfinger	Joseph	US	M	joseph_1_koepfinger@msn.com
34.	Lang	Sakari	FI	O	sakari.lang@nokia.com
35.	Lathrop	Janet	US	O	jclathrop@fignetworks.net
36.	Mantiply	Ed	US	O	emantiply@fcc.gov
37.	Mason	Patrick	US	O	patrick.mason@brooks.af.mil
38.	Maurer	Stewart	US	M	maureremf.juno.com
39.	McManus	Tom	IE	M	tommcmamus@dpe.ie
40.	Mercer	Christopher	ZA	O	mercerc@vodacom.co.za
41.	Morrissey	Joe	US	O	ejm037@email.mot.com
42.	Murphy	Michael	US	M	michael.murphy@brooks.af.mil
43.	Needy	Robert	US	O	needyri@nswc.navy.mil
44.	Osepchuk	John	US	M	jmosepchuk@cs.com
45.	Petersen	Ron	US	M	r.c.petersen@ieee.org
46.	Quan	Gregory	CA	O	gregory.quan@bchydro.com
47.	Reilly	J. Patrick	US	M	jpatrickreilly@erols.com
48.	Roberts	Brad	US	M	brad.roberts@apg.amedd.army.mil
49.	Root	Ervin	US	M	avroot@alliant-energy.com
50.	Scanlon	William	IE	M	w.scanlon@ulst.ac.uk
51.	Smith	Matthew	US	O	matthew.smith@pnl.gov
52.	Sutton	Carl	US	M	doctorchs@aol.com
53.	Tattersall	John	UK	M	jtattersall@dera.gov.uk
54.	Tell	Richard	US	M	rtell@radhaz.com
55.	Tenforde	Thomas	US	M	Thomas.tenforde@pnl.gov
56.	Toropainen	Anssi	FI	O	Anssi.toropainen@nokia.com
57.	van Rongen	Eric	NL	O	e.van.rongen@gr.nl
58.	Varanelli	Arthur	US	M	a.g.varanelli@ieee.org
59.	Vijayalaxmi		US	O	vijay@uthscsa.edu
60.	Watkins	Cleveland	US	O	
61.	Ziriaux	John	US	O	john.ziriaux@navy.brooks.af.mil
62.	Zollman	Peter	UK	O	peter.zollman@vodafone.com



INTERNATIONAL
COMMITTEE *on*
ELECTROMAGNETIC
SAFETY

ATTACHMENT 2

IEEE Standards Coordinating Committee 28
Radisson Riverfront Hotel
St. Paul, Minnesota
June 10, 2001
8:00 AM – Noon
Kellogg Rooms-I & II

Preliminary Agenda

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Call to Order: | <i>Osepchuk</i> |
| 2. Approval of Agenda: | <i>Osepchuk</i> |
| 3. Approval of November 19, 2000 Minutes: | <i>Petersen</i> |
| 4. IEEE Standards Activities Report: | <i>Vogel</i> |
| 5. Executive Secretary's Report: | <i>Petersen</i> |
| 6. Chairman's Report: | <i>Osepchuk</i> |
| 7. Treasurer's Report: | <i>Varanelli</i> |
| 8. Membership Chairman's Report: | <i>McManus</i> |
| 9. International Liaison Chairman's Report: | <i>Murphy</i> |
| 10. Report on ICES and Fundraising: | <i>Osepchuk</i> |
| 11. Subcommittee Reports: | |
| a) SC1: | <i>Bassen</i> |
| b) SC2: | <i>Tell</i> |
| c) SC3: | <i>Jaffa</i> |
| d) SC4: | <i>Chou/D'Andrea</i> |
| e) SC5: | <i>DeFrank/Koban</i> |
| 12. New Business: | <i>Osepchuk</i> |
| 13. Plans for Future Meetings: | <i>Osepchuk</i> |
| 14. Adjournment: | |



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH & CONSUMER PROTECTION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
Directorate G – Public Health, Luxembourg
G2 – Cancer, drug dependence and pollution related diseases

ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS AND HEALTH WHICH REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY?

*LUXEMBOURG, JEAN MONNET BUILDING, PLATEAU DE KIRCHBERG, M6
30 NOVEMBER 2001*

AGENDA

9.15 Welcome Address and Introductory Remarks

Fernand Sauer

I. - WHICH KNOWLEDGE?

Chairperson: Matti Rajala

9:30 The Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment: 2001 Activities and new recommendations

Jorge Costa-David

10:00 The WHO International EMF Project: Presentation and Results

Michael Repacholi

10:20 Discussions

10:50 Coffee Break

11:15 New Technologies and New Risks: Current Survey and Perspectives for Future

Research

Ulf Bergqvist

11:40 Science and development of exposure Standards: the ICNIRP Approach

Bernard Veyret

12:00 Discussions

12:30 Lunch

II. WHICH RULES

Chairperson: Wolfgang Hensel

14:30 Presentation and Follow-up of the Community Initiatives

Mark Seguinot

ATTACHMENT 3

15:00 Product Liability and Electromagnetic Fields

Marc Mildred

15:30 Discussions

16:00 Coffee break

16:20 Precaution, Safety and Standardisation

Christoph Schieble

16:40 Free Movement, Product Safety and Protection of Health in the Community

Nial Fennelly ()*

17:00 Legal Basis Aspects for Community Actions in the Area of Electromagnetic Fields

Philippe-Emmanuel Partsch

17:20 Discussions

18:20 Closing Remarks

Wolfgang Heusel

18:30 Cocktail offered by the Academy of European Law

(*) Subject to confirmation