

---

**From:** [John-F.Ryan@ec.europa.eu](mailto:John-F.Ryan@ec.europa.eu) [mailto:John-F.Ryan@ec.europa.eu]  
**Sent:** 22 April 2014 14:06  
**To:** [Eileen@radiationresearch.org](mailto:Eileen@radiationresearch.org)  
**Cc:** [Stefan.Schreck@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Stefan.Schreck@ec.europa.eu); [Donata.MERONI@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Donata.MERONI@ec.europa.eu); [Giulio.Gallo@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Giulio.Gallo@ec.europa.eu); [Severine.BERNARD@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Severine.BERNARD@ec.europa.eu); [brian.stein61@gmail.com](mailto:brian.stein61@gmail.com); [erica.malleryblythe@gmail.com](mailto:erica.malleryblythe@gmail.com); [subatomicuk@btinternet.com](mailto:subatomicuk@btinternet.com); [Jill.evans@europarl.europa.eu](mailto:Jill.evans@europarl.europa.eu); [bentonj@parliament.uk](mailto:bentonj@parliament.uk); [iangibsoncontact@googlemail.com](mailto:iangibsoncontact@googlemail.com); [caroline.lucas.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:caroline.lucas.mp@parliament.uk)  
**Subject:** RE: BioInitiative Working Group's SCENIHR letter and exhibits also

*Dear Eileen,*

*Thank you for your emails on the Bio Initiative Working Group's SCENIHR letter and exhibits. As already stated in my previous correspondence, the Scientific Committees are independent, and it will be up to the Committee to decide the weight which needs to be given to Dr Hardell's papers or to the Bio Initiative comments as well as to other evidence which will be collected as result of the public consultation. The whole process will be transparent and all comments/studies received in the public consultation will be publicly available together with the feedback from the Committee.*

*As is described in the methodology chapter of the preliminary opinion, information has primarily been obtained from studies published in international peer-reviewed scientific journals, which were selected according to precise criteria established in the SCENIHR "Memorandum on the use of the scientific literature for human health risk assessment purposes – weighing of evidence and expression of uncertainty". The final judgment of the Committee is based on the studies collected for three lines of evidence (epidemiological studies, in vivo and in vitro studies) and which include human, animal and mechanistic studies along with exposure. The weighting also considers if causality is shown or not in the relevant studies.*

*Let me also stress that Dr Kjell Hansson Mild is a member of the EMF Working Group and also actively working with Prof. Lennart Hardell's group. He is co-author in 4 of the 5 studies of Professor Hardell, which you have brought to my attention. Likewise, Dr Joachim Schüz is a member of the EMF working group and Head of Environment and Radiation Section at IARC. He was involved in the IARC classification of EMF RF you mentioned in your email.*

*Finally I would like to stress that members of the SCENIHR are experts in many disciplines (not only on EMF) and the majority of them have no publications in the EMF area. We are therefore confident that the SCENIHR will adopt an unbiased opinion, as it did on many other scientific subjects.*

*I trust you understand that public hearings are open events; we have no administrative rules for inviting individual participants. Everybody was*

*able to join the hearing. Professor Hardell was personally informed by my staff.*

*With regard to Ms Meroni, I trust you received her email and I hope that the situation is now clarified.*

*Finally, although respecting your personal judgment, I would like to stress that the scientific reviews by the SCENIHR are appreciated worldwide, and all scientists are independent and their declarations of interest are publicly available.*

*Best regards*

**John F. Ryan**  
**Acting Director**  
**Public Health Directorate**  
**Health and Consumers Directorate General**  
**European Commission**  
**L-2920 Luxembourg**  
**+352 4301 32719**