

De : Laurent.Bontoux@ec.europa.eu [mailto:Laurent.Bontoux@ec.europa.eu]

Envoyé : mardi 20 décembre 2011 09:49

À : jean-luc.guilmot@teslabel.be

Objet : RE: Results of a Long-Term Low-Level Microwaver Exposure of Rats : in fact, this study WAS INDEED published

Dear Mr Guilmot,

Thank you for your message. I will try to clarify.

1. The programme of the conference on EMF and health organized by the Commission in 2009 covered both policy and science and came after the adoption of the SCENIHR opinion. In contrast, the event this year was organized with a much narrower scope in view of a planned request by the Commission to update the SCENIHR opinion on EMF and Health. As a result, this conference was meant to be purely scientific to best serve the needs of the SCENIHR. As a result, the SCENIHR, in its independence, recruited a scientific steering committee for the conference according to classic criteria of academic quality, diversity of expertise, and international relevance and selected the speakers among an international pool of active scientists to ensure the highest possible level of academic credentials, coverage of all the relevant disciplines, and a plurality of views concerning the remaining scientific uncertainties.

2. The specific study that you are referring to was indeed not taken into account in the 2009 SCENIHR opinion as it was published after the adoption of the opinion. As I explained to you during our meeting, health risk assessment is performed by applying a weight of evidence approach. This methodology is described in section 3.8 of the 2009 SCENIHR opinion on "Health Effects of Exposure to EMF". Concretely, this means that this study will be assessed together with all the long-term rat studies on RF exposure, of which several were performed. Each study is then appraised according to quality criteria such as appropriateness of methodology for health risk assessment, the quality of the experimental work, etc. Its results are then considered in the pool of all the results of similar studies with a weight that depends on its quality. Only then are general conclusions drawn. This process goes beyond the standard peer review process vetting scientific papers before publication. The peer review process leading to publication in a scientific journal is also slightly different for each scientific journal as each journal has its own specificity. Therefore, the fact that a paper has been published in the peer-reviewed scientific literature is a necessary, but not sufficient quality criterion to determine relevance for health risk assessment. As you will have gathered from the presentations at the conference, many sources of experimental uncertainty affect research on EMF and health which have been precluding the scientific world, for several decades now, from providing the definite answers we are all longing for. The work performed by the EU scientific committees is very thorough to provide us with answers of the best possible scientific quality on which to base policy decisions.

3. I said that a proper answer on the EHS issue could only come from double blind studies, of which a number were performed. They should be assessed as explained under point 2 above. The presentation by Dr Rubin, at the conference, provided an excellent and very considerate overview of the issue.

4. Again, these cancer registry data were not available in 2008 and will be taken into account in the next update of the scientific evidence by the SCENIHR.

Best regards,

Laurent Bontoux

Laurent Bontoux, PhD
Principal Administrator - SCENIHR Management Officer
European Commission
Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO)
Unit D3- Risk Assessment
B-1049 Bruxelles
Phone +32.2.299.13.63

De : J-L Guilmot, TESLABEL [mailto:jean-luc.guilmot@teslabel.be]

Envoyé : vendredi 16 décembre 2011 12:49

À : 'Laurent.Bontoux@ec.europa.eu'

Objet : RE: Results of a Long-Term Low-Level Microwaver Exposure of Rats : in fact, this study WAS INDEED published

Dear Mr Bontoux

Thank you for your kind reply.

I apologize for having used the wording "very" in my phrase "limited attention" when truly a number of initiatives have indeed been taken by DG SANCO.

A better wording should have been "not receiving the full spectrum and open-minded attention the topic deserves given the escalating level of EMF exposure".

Could I kindly ask you to comment on these four specific issues:

(1) Biased selection of guest speakers at the 2011 EMF conference

As MEP Michelle Rivasi recalled in her opening speech, it is sad to see, contrary to the previous EMF conference in 2009, that the 2011 edition did not include scientists who have really voiced concern and published dissenting views with regard to the "consensus". <http://www.teslabel.be/sante-publique/209-conference-internationale-sur-les-cem-et-la-sante-l-dans-quel-monde-vivons-nous-r-le-discours-douverture-de-michele-rivasi>.

A perfect guest for example would indeed have been Prof. Vander Vorst, member of the board of European Microwave Association and co-author of such an important study challenging the status-quo.

<http://www.eumwa.org/en/euma/management-euma/board-of-directors-2011.html>

And many others come to mind including Henri Lai, Lennart Hardell, Mikael Kundi, Annie Sasco, Emilio Del Giudice, Leif Salford, de Franz Adlkofer, Andrew Marino, Vini Khurana, Livio Giuliani or Morando Soffritti.

(2) ICNIRP Standards

Given the existence of this high quality peer reviewed study on long term exposure of rats to microwaves which was not included in the present SCENIHR review – and given the level of uncertainty and challenge it casts on present guidelines – could you please briefly explain why you still feel personally quite safe with the present ICNIPR guidelines and, as you said during the meeting (correct me if I am wrong), you would feel comfortable to expose yourself (and your family) to a long term exposure of 900 Mhz microwaves at 41 V/m (the upper limit of ICNIPR guideline).

(3) Double blind study on EHS

Could you please comment on you saying that there was no double blind study with positive results for the EHS issue, given this paper published by Dr Havas in 2010.

http://www.teslabel.be/PDF/Provocation_Study_Using_Heart_Rate_Variability_Shows_Microwave_Radiation_From_Cordless_Phone_Affects_Autonomic_Nervous_System_M_Havas_2010.pdf

(4) Documented increase in brain tumors between 2001-2010

You also mentioned that no increase of brain tumors statistics had been documented so far. I am afraid this is no longer the case. According to the latest report from Danish Cancer Registry, brain tumours have increased by 40% between 2001-2010 in Denmark.

<http://newsvoice.se/2011/12/15/brain-tumour-increase-in-denmark-by-40-between-2001-2010/>

Thank you very much for your your time and efforts in adressing these issues and helping improve the health and protection of people with respect to EMF exposure, including sensitive and vulnerable very young *non*-consumers.

Yours sincerely,

Jean-Luc Guilmot

TESLABEL ASBL

Jean-Luc Guilmot

President

Mail: jean-luc.guilmot@teslabel.be

Web: www.teslabel.be

Tel : 010 680 260

De : Laurent.Bontoux@ec.europa.eu [<mailto:Laurent.Bontoux@ec.europa.eu>]

Envoyé : vendredi 16 décembre 2011 09:32

À : jean-luc.guilmot@teslabel.be

Cc : Willem.Penning@ec.europa.eu; steven@petitie-elektrosmog.be

Objet : RE: Results of a Long-Term Low-Level Microwaver Exposure of Rats : in fact, this study WAS INDEED published

Dear Mr Guilmot,

Thank you for the information about the UCL rat study. I am glad to hear that this study was published. It will be taken up in the next review by the SCENIHR and considered along with the several other studies of that type already performed. A new very large scale long-term rat study considered by the experts to be very promising in terms of methodological and experimental quality is ongoing at the University of Chicago.

For the rest, please let me set the record straight. We had a very open discussion and I am very disappointed that you are distorting what we said and that you are disregarding the evidence. As testified by all the actions undertaken this year (stakeholder dialogue, EMF conference, SCENIHR update, participation in numerous events...), DG SANCO is giving a lot of attention to the issue of EMF. In addition, thanks to our steadfast dedication over the last few years, three important research projects on EMF are being funded under FP7, with a total EU contribution of almost 10 M€. What we said is that in these troubled times, the EMF issue has to compete for scarce resources with other issues of high societal interest such as the potential health effects of climate change. Therefore, decision makers have to weigh numerous elements beyond EMF before setting funding priorities.

Be assured that we are taking our role in the protection of public health at EU level very seriously and that we will continue to work towards establishing the best possible scientific basis for policy making in this domain, including EMF.

Best regards,

Laurent Bontoux

Laurent Bontoux, PhD
Principal Administrator - SCENIHR Management Officer
European Commission
Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO)
Unit D3- Risk Assessment
B-1049 Bruxelles
Phone +32.2.299.13.63

http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/policy/index_en.htm

From: J-L Guilmot, TESLABEL [<mailto:jean-luc.guilmot@teslabel.be>]

Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 4:18 PM

To: BONTOUX Laurent (SANCO)

Cc: PENNING Willem (SANCO); 'Steven Boone'

Subject: Results of a Long-Term Low-Level Microwave Exposure of Rats : in fact, this study WAS INDEED published

Dear Dr Bontoux

Contrary to what I expressed during our meeting in Brussels yesterday, the study was in fact published in a well respected scientific magazine two years ago :

Results of a Long-Term Low-Level Microwave Exposure of Rats

IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON MICROWAVE THEORY AND TECHNIQUES, VOL. 57, NO. 10,
OCTOBER 2009, Dirk Adang, Claude Remacle, and André Vander Vorst.

Given the dramatic results of this particular study – symbolically carried out a mere 20 miles away from the EC in Brussels – I am concerned to hear the lack of attention EMF exposure is receiving within DG SANCO, where as your mentioned, most of the attention is now being directed towards things like the health consequences of climate change, among other things, and clearly EMF and Health is receiving only very limited attention, while at the same time EMF exposure keeps increasing every single year.

As a public service, given the importance of the results of this particular study and the current state of thought with respect with the validity of the ICNIRP standards, I believe DG SANCO is in a better position than most to help this sort of study being replicated rapidly.

If you think this study deserves more attention for the common good, please comment on how DG SANCO can help.

Please realize I am personally doing all this without any sort funding nor any kind of conflict of interest.

Thank you for your kind attention and your help in this matter.

Best regards

Jean-Luc Guilmot

TESLABEL ASBL

Jean-Luc Guilmot

President

Mail: jean-luc.guilmot@teslabel.be

Web: www.teslabel.be

Tel : 010 680 260