

# **Health, Social Services and Housing Panel Telephone Mast Review**

**WEDNESDAY, 24th JANUARY 2007**

**Panel:**

Deputy A. Breckon of St. Saviour (Chairman)

Deputy C.H. Egré of St. Peter

Senator B.E. Shenton

Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade

**Witnesses:**

Mr. D. Watson (Chief Executive Officer, Jersey Airtel)

Mr. A. Clark (Electromagnetic Field Manager, Nokia Networks)

Mr. T. Barmuller (Director, Europe, Middle East and Africa, Mobile Manufacturers' Forum)

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Good morning, gentlemen. First of all, welcome. I will ask you to introduce yourselves in a moment or 2 but first of all I would like to give you the background to why we are here. Thank you for coming along today. My name is Alan Breckon, I am Chairman of the Health, Social Security and Housing Scrutiny Panel and under that panel a sub-panel that has been set up. The other members are the Deputy Chairman is Deputy Collin Egré, Constable Mike Jackson of St. Brelade and Senator Ben Shenton. Senator Shenton might have to slope off around 12.00 Noon so if he disappears it is nothing you have said, he has another commitment. The terms of reference of this Scrutiny review is we are looking telephone masts: "The sub-panel will consider the concerns of the public relating to perceived health implications as a result of the increase in applications for mobile phone mast installations following the recent expansion of the mobile telephony market. In undertaking this review the sub-panel will have regard to the advice provided by the Health Protection Department, international standards and best practice in respect of health precautions, health concerns raised by the public and reporting its findings and recommendations to the States." You should have before you a witness statement which covers the proceedings of these public hearings. I will ask Collin to cover that now.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Please excuse the formality of this particular stage but we have to read this to you for legal requirements. So I go on to say that: "It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement I am about to read to you on the table in front of you. The proceedings of the panel are covered by parliamentary privilege through Article 34 of the States of Jersey Law 2005 and the States of Jersey (Powers Privileges

and Immunities) (Scrutiny Panels, PAC and PCC) (Jersey) Regulations 2006 and witnesses are protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings unless they say something that they know to be untrue. This protection is given to a witness to ensure that they can speak freely and openly to the panel when giving evidence without fear of legal action although the immunity should obviously not be abused by making unsubstantiated statements about third parties who have no right of reply. The panel would ask you to bear this in mind when answering the questions. The proceedings, as you are aware, are being recorded and transcriptions will be made available on the Scrutiny website.” I understand you have already been asked to try and speak clearly into the microphones so we can have a clear recording. Thank you.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Thank you for that, Collin. I will ask you to introduce yourselves and give us a little bit about your background in the industry in a minute or 2. I understand that you were sent copies of questions, they are not sort of made in stone and I would expect you to share that with your colleagues but, as I say, they are not cast in stone. The other thing I would say is if there is anything at end that you would wish to say to us that we have perhaps missed or would like to say I will give you that opportunity again. It is not a case of if we do not ask we do not want to know. It is an open process and I hope you relax and enjoy it. You are not on trial for anything. It is a hearing and we do wish to have an exchange. Collin mentioned the transcripts. The formal process is that they whiz away across the world, they go to New Zealand and come back overnight, so hopefully within 48 hours you would have a copy of that. If there is something you say that you realise is factually incorrect you will be given the opportunity to change that, if you say 50 when it was 30. They will be sent to you, if we have the contact details. After 7 days they will become a matter of public record. It is a public hearing so that is the terms of engagement, if you like. The other thing with questions is if any of you feel comfortable with it then do answer, but if it is not directed at anyone in particular please feel free to interchange as you wish to answer. Because somebody has answered it does not mean that somebody else cannot answer. As I say, it is fairly relaxed and the idea is to have this exchange and there are no restrictions apart from shouting and swearing and throwing things and whatever else. So I would ask you know, in whichever order you please, if you would like to introduce yourselves, tell us a little about your involvement in --

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Before you do that, looking at our crib sheets here, I assume you are not going to introduce yourselves as members of Cable and Wireless?

**Mr. D. Watson (Chief Executive Officer of Jersey Airtel):**

No.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Please proceed.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I am David Watson, I am the Chief Executive Officer of Jersey Airtel Limited. I came over to Jersey to take up the position in February last year. The object of the company is a long-term investment in providing world-class mobile communication services to Jersey.

**Mr. A. Clark (Electromagnetic Field Manager, Nokia Networks):**

My name is Andrew Clark. I am the Electromagnetic Field Manager for Nokia Networks and also I have the responsibility of Chairman of the Communications Working Group of the Mobile Manufacturers' Forum, an industry association specifically interested itself in mobile communications health issues.

**Mr. T. Barmuller (Director, Europe, Middle East and Africa, Mobile Manufacturers' Forum):**

My name is Thomas Barmuller and I am the Director for Europe, Middle East and Africa within this already mentioned organisation, Mobile Manufacturers' Forum. Maybe it is of special interest for this panel that I have served as a managing director in Austria for Forum Mobile Communications, which is an interest group there and we had a lot to do with Salzburg and the measures which have been demanded there. So I also have prepared a very brief fact sheet about Austria and one about Switzerland, which I would like to hand over to you.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Thank you for that, gentlemen. Can I begin by perhaps asking about the development of your company in Jersey over the past few years? I know you have come to the table later than some of the others perhaps. Feel free to tell us, as you see it and as you found it.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

The licence was issued to Jersey Airtel Limited at the end of April 2006. The priority is to establish a network which is obviously fundamental to the whole operation. It is a project, not just a technical project, we have got to get our usual functions in place, sales, marketing, finance, IT (information technology) and everything else as you would expect to be put in place in any business.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Could I trouble you just to speak up just a little bit. I am getting a little nod from my man with the headset. Thank you.

**Mr. D. Watson**

Sorry. Yes, so we have made significant progress to date with the project as a whole. We have what we

call a main switching centre at Rue de Pres industrial estate which is, if you like, the heart of our network. That is where all the switching takes place. It is also the international gateway, it is also the link into the networks of the other operators on the Island. It also has the software platforms which drive the products and services that we will be delivering into the marketplace. To date we have one base station site operational. We have had 29 applications approved, some of which we are not at liberty - for one reason or another - to proceed with at this time. We currently have 19 applications awaiting determination with the Planning Department. The total number of sites that we are looking at is 57. They are made up of 35 ground base sites, 9 shared sites and 13 rooftop sites. So we are very much still in a pre launch business implementation phase. The launch date critically depends on having an appropriate quality network available across the Island.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

This rollout programme that you describe is that oriented to the 3G network?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

It is both 2G and 3G. Part of the obligation with the JCRA under the licence is to provide a world-class network with world-class services, the latest technology is 3G but we will be deploying what is affectionately known 3½G which is high-speed data protocol on top of the traditional network. The impact of 2 and 3G on the infrastructure is significant as is the quality of the network. It has got to have extensive seamless coverage. It has got to have significant indoor signal strength capability to meet requirements of the market. One of the differences between 2 and 3G technology that impacts on the structure of the network is that the range of the signal from 2G antenna at the frequencies that we will be using - is quite a lot more than the range of the 3G antenna and, therefore, to provide services of both 2G, 3G nature, it is really making sure that we have got the 3G network that is seamless. Obviously it is really the 3G that drives significantly the number of locations and sites and the locations of those sites themselves.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

So, just to confirm, the programme that you have in here will do - notwithstanding technological changes - for the launch for the foreseeable future?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Yes. The network itself is being sized for considerable expansion. It is not economically sensible to size it tightly so obviously you size it at a level for the future. Obviously that will mean that only when there is very, very significant additional consumer demand for existing services or for new services in the future, that is when the technologies can change and that is when you may need to revisit the network configuration that you have got.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

So, given that you do not really know what that is going to be until you officially launch, that is a successful business product that you could stimulate a need for further mast installations?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I do not see that at this point in time. As I said, the network is being sized significantly to accommodate many tens of thousands of customers and I do not see the need in the short term or over the next few years to significantly extend that in any way.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

It has been indicated to us that to ensure a seamless state within the network system and, as you rightly say, "in-build", how confident are you that you can achieve total coverage with the limited amount of masts? I think the total is 57 as we say. Is that inclusive of macro/micro pico-masts?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

This is the total number of masts that we are planning to put up. We do model them based on the geography, the topography and all sorts of factors specific to each site. We take into consideration the height that the antenna will be at, the angle - and I think it is a 7 degree angle at most that they are at - to try and make sure it covers seamlessly. It can vary. For example, we do not necessarily put indoor strength coverage over open field areas. There is no need. You can modify as best you can. The important thing is to make sure that you do have this seamless network that can cover the island.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

What sort of power output do you need to achieve from your output aerials to achieve this seamless coverage without going to pico-type base stations?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I need to ask my technical friend here.

**Mr. A. Clark:**

I think the important point here is not how much power but whether the emissions fall within the guidance from ICNIRP as endorsed by the World Health Organisation. I think that is the important thing but looking at surveys, for example, which have been conducted in the UK (United Kingdom) where surveys of mast emissions have been conducted to see typically what might be anticipated, generally there are found to be tens if not hundreds of thousands of times less than regulatory limits. My colleague Thomas here can probably confirm that similar surveys in other countries have revealed that generally functional networks have emissions which are many times below regulatory limits. But I think the important thing is we do have regulatory guidance, it is based on a very sound scientific

assessment and it is incumbent on people who operate networks to ensure that their networks operate within those science-based standards. I am absolutely sure that the sort of network we are talking about here would comfortably meet those criteria.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Again, sorry to push you on this point, but it has been indicated to us by other technical agencies that we have talked to, that Jersey has a particular topography which is a bit challenging for the technical people. The fact that there is a lot of granite and valleys and lots of buildings with block work which is constituted with cement and granite, and the consequence that possibly the number of masts has to be increased to achieve that penetration. What are your views on those comments?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

It is fair to say that the topography of Jersey is somewhat challenging technically as I said, and I explained about the range of 3G antennae. It follows also that the constructions that you describe are significant barriers to indoor coverage and, therefore, the location of the sites would naturally have to be closer to get the required signal indoors.

**Mr. A. Clark:**

It might help to say that there are a number of software planning tools to help people who are designing networks to determine how many sites would be needed, and these tools take into account a number of criteria that you can feed in. But, of course, that is a simulation and the reality of then operating the network can reveal black spots where maybe there is not adequate coverage, and then it is a business case decision by an operator as to whether they feel it necessary to provide infill into those black spots and whether it is an area which the public do not go and, as such, there is not a business case to provide infill. So, it is a little bit of guesswork, a little bit of science and a little bit of business planning to go together. I think it is probably true to say with pretty much all sophisticated systems, there is a certain evolutionary path and I am quite sure that will prove to be the case as this particular network would go live. There would be a reappraisal but, as you can imagine, as the industry develops, the tools become more robust and the amount of reappraisal is less and less. That is certainly the objective.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Given that your licence was issued by the Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority with certainly no doubt conditions attached, would you say that the need for blanket coverage has been dictated by that licence or has it been dictated by your business needs?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Neither. Primarily, I think it is driven by the consumer needs. Obviously if the consumer demands and expects a quality of service then you will stand a better chance of being successful in that market if you

meet that demand. The importance of the network is actually paramount because if you cannot provide the required level of service with the network, the actual products and services that the consumer enjoys - whether that is a simple voice call or a text message or whatever service - is degraded. For example, if you do not have indoor coverage of the strength required, you cannot sit comfortably in your armchair; you cannot have visitors coming here on business sitting in offices, sitting in hotels and restaurants, and not contactable on mobile telephones when they want to be in touch with people back home or wherever. They are not in communication and, therefore, it is the consumers of the various markets that will dictate exactly what we should be providing and how successful we will be. We believe that it is absolutely critical to have a first class network to be able to offer the first class services that are expected.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

It might be appropriate following on from that to hear your colleagues' comments on the full spoke(?) situation. It is my understanding from documentation that I have received that the emission levels are restricted in Salzburg to the effect that that world-class service that you anticipate providing over here, would not be available in Salzburg. Is that the case?

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

It is not the case. It is very often reported in the media but it is not the case because all over Austria only the ICNIRP limits count and are legally binding. So, we have the same limit as, for example, Germany has or Switzerland has because also this is a misunderstanding because the overall limits in Switzerland are also ICNIRP limits and they have a special regulation regarding installation steps.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

What is that special regulation?

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

It is to say that in Switzerland certain masts just contribute a little bit to the overall emission but the overall emission is only restricted by ICNIRP.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Can I ask is that because they are in a certain area where there are perhaps zones where there is a concentration of a school or a residential area? Is that a condition in Switzerland or anywhere else that you know?

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

Hopefully I got that right. There are no restrictions in Austria, for example, regarding schools or hospitals. Is that the question?

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Yes.

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

Yes. We do not have such restrictions in Austria. My feeling is from the development of the 3G networks in Austria that it was most important how traffic was loaded on the net. It is a question of what people demand. Then you have to optimise the net as an operator has to ensure that there is a first layer all over the area he wants to cover, and everything else is a question: where is capacity demanded by the customers?

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

In the UK - although Jersey is not English; we are fairly unique, or we like to feel that way - we still pay a lot of attention to the HPA. What agencies, in your experience in other parts of the world - and you have vast experience and we thank you for being here for bringing that alone - are there to monitor the health issues associated with mobile phone mast transmissions?

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

For example, in Austria and also in Switzerland, WHO (World Health Organisation) is very important and what they say is the real guideline, I guess, for all of us, or should be the guideline for all of us, because mobile communications is an industrialised business and it would not make sense to shape the equipment for each country in a different way. So, in Austria, for example, we have the Ministry of Telecommunication<sup>[TB1]</sup> which has to look at the emission levels and exposure levels which are applied in Austria. Additionally, because it is a public debate, a committee called Scientific Committee Radio has been established - and it is about radio and not just mobile communications. This decision was taken to make clear that a lot of radio applications in our daily life are already used. This committee evaluates those studies which are done over the year to see what is coming up new, and then they have to decide, if it is something new or not. All committee reports are available via internet - sorry, they are all published in German. Up to now they state all the same as also WHO does.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Can I just ask a supplementary to that: in your experience, the fact that the regulator would issue a licence based on a standard and then you would have to comply with that, normally is the self-policing way you would monitor levels of emissions and make a report, or in your experience would that be an independent agency that does that and report on you rather than yourself reporting?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

The licence does include compliance with the ICNIRP standards as I am sure you are aware. In terms



of the measurement, there is a requirement of planning approval that we estimate the emission levels from each of our. They will vary because of different factors as you have heard before. So, we have to install them and within a 12-month period after it is operational, we have to have it (the emission levels) measured. So far, as I said earlier, we have one site operational which we have already checked. It is incredibly low. It will be higher than it is now because once we are commercially operational, the traffic volumes will obviously increase the emission levels. So there is the requirement to check it. Once the equipment is checked - and I am told there should not really be any need for it - but I would be quite happy for our sites to be subject to a regular check as long as it is at a sensible interval. I have been very much involved in this issue over the last 6 months or more and I do appreciate the level of emotion that exists in people's minds. There are some people who I am sure are genuinely concerned about the health risk and I understand that. Myself and Jersey Airtel are quite happy to do what is sensible and necessary to help to address those concerns of the public and to help manage their perception.

**Senator B.E. Shenton:**

Can I just go on one step from that? May I just thank Jersey Airtel for funding Michael Repacholi's visit yesterday which was very interesting.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

It is a pleasure.

**Senator B.E. Shenton:**

One of the health protection unit's recommendations was that there should be improved consultation by the network operator with the community prior to the selection of a site for a base station. Now, as an observer, I would say that the consultation process has been a little bit lacking in the past. I am not picking out your company; I am just saying that just in general in Jersey. Is there any way that you think you could improve the consultation process before you put your planning applications in?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

There are a number of things that we have done. From July through to September last year I met with 10 of the 12 Constables, not just to introduce ourselves and our company and what we were doing, but also to share with them our plans for our network as it was at that point, because network design changes.. Some planned sites you cannot get access to, therefore you sometimes have to move other planned locations.. I shared this with the Constables that I met with. I also shared with them the plans that we had at that time for each of the parishes. I also shared with them some information that I had from the Mobile Manufacturers Forum; a document that Nokia put together for me which helped to understand a comparison of the emissions between base stations and sources of EMF emissions such as TVs and microwaves and that sort of thing. Subsequently one or two Constables who had, I have furnished one or two Constables with the report from the Ministry of Health that came out at the end of

April. Since then I have provided them access to the World Health Organisation paper; I think it is 304. The reasons I did that is because, and I am new to the Island so please forgive me, it occurred to me, and I was advised that in the parishes, the communities regard the figurehead of the Constable as a very key figure for parishioners. So, I wanted to get a relationship with them and give them the information that I could find so that they could at least be comfortable with first line questions from their parishioners. I also told them that I would be more than happy to meet with anybody, either individuals or groups or even attend Parish meetings, which I did at Grouville, as I am sure you are aware. I am quite happy to do that. The other things that I have done, includes when we have approached landowners to put up base station units and towers on their land, is to furnish them with similar information to that provided to the Constables, so that they are aware of what the implications are as regard to health such that they can make an informed decision, as they have done, They are in a position to try and inform their neighbours as well. We have been proactive in a few instances, I could have been perhaps accused of not being more proactive as you can always do more - with regard to Faldouet and Longueville (where our MSC Mobile Switching Centre is based at the perimeter of the industrial estate) We have taken on a warehouse which had not been used for 3 years and where suddenly there would be a hive of activity for many months to fit out the centre. I went with my Chief Technical Officer to meet with the immediate residents. We have kept in contact with them and told them of all we are doing. They have been to see what we are done with the site and we have offered whatever we can to improve the visual impact for them. Faldouet is a site that we had identified where I looked and thought: "I am not comfortable with it" so we proactively delivered a letter letter to the residents in that area which was from myself and included my direct office number - for people to call me personally on this matter. Which some did. I have been out and spoken to many people who have gone through the Constables or through Planning who wanted information about our sites. I have tried to make myself, and people within my organisation, as available as possible to try and help with the process of imparting information. I cannot say that people are always persuaded. There are people that I have met who have openly said to me that whatever I say there is no way that they will ever be convinced. I have found in a vast majority of cases that when you can discuss the facts with them, they are prepared to listen, and a number of people are quite happy. We have discussed on numerous occasions with residents close to proposed sites which have resulted in us moving or relocating the site from our original location where it was also convenient for us, in terms of maintaining the coverage and the standards that we would want, and they are happy. We try to reach compromise wherever we can. Even in Grouville we have been trying to reach a compromise there. I think we have done quite a lot. It is something that is very important to me which is why I did invite Mike Repacholi to speak to the Panel yesterday and these gentlemen who are with me today. I am happy to continue to continue to consult, and yes there is always more we can do and I will be happy to do so.

**Senator B.E. Shenton:**

Have you been surprised by the level of concern or is it a case of whenever you enter a new market that

there is this level of concern?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

It depends. I have not been involved with mobile phones in too many places around the world. In the UK I never worked for a mobile phone company but I worked for a company that had one, and yes, there is always concern.

**Mr. A. Clark:**

Maybe I can just add a few comments. Different countries and different cultures do react to the imposition of technology in different ways and even neighbouring countries, it can be quite surprising the difference you will see. For example, in Finland there is very little active coverage and interest in the deployment of mobile communications networks and yet surprisingly the land neighbour of Sweden, there is an extensive debate. Similarly you can find these contradictions or differences in neighbouring countries all around the world. There are many things, I think, bringing this about: political considerations, financial considerations, cultural considerations and I do not think there is any one, shall we say, defining characteristic you can really look forward to. But I do believe that the sort of activities which have just been explained about openly talking to people, making available information about networks, pre-deployment, is a constructive way to go forward. I see that as a healthy thing to do and in most cases I feel that would be the most successful thing to do in terms of enabling people to understand the technology which is being discussed and is planned to implement into their environment. So, best practice is almost something difficult to quantify exactly, but I think what we are talking about in terms of the level of consultation is a very constructive way forward.

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

I would like to add regarding my experiences that to talk to people is really necessary. You cannot do it without talking. Industry cannot hide. But on the other hand, a solution in Salzburg was only developed jointly with the responsible politicians there. If politics does not have a firm standpoint then it is not possible to solve this issue.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

May I pick up your point on dealing with landowners? One concern that has been expressed to us is over indemnity of possible claims of landowners in the event in future years that health claims were to arise. Would you have any comment or observation on that?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I am no expert . I would not like to give you a comment because I am not confident of my knowledge on the subject. We obviously take out indemnity insurances against our masts and base stations.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Would you be able to confirm to the panel, with research, the sort of indemnity that your company is able to provide in these situations?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Yes, I can certainly give you access to that.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

As you said, you are new to Jersey. We are 45 square miles with a population of 86,000 or 96,000 depending on who you speak to. That, by UK terms and European terms, is a very, very small area. What are your views on the level of competition that is being put in this area. Bearing in mind you are the third operator, with a possible fourth.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Yes. Obviously, before my investors sought the licence here and decided to invest, they did the usual assessments and business plans. We believe the size and scale of the market – and there is not just a static population here, if I can call residents that, but also a number of visitors coming into Jersey, both business and tourist. This makes for a market that is of a size and value which should be capable, in our view, of supporting 3 operators profitably, and sufficiently profitable for them to continue to invest to provide services for the future. Certainly, I cannot speak for the other 2 - I can only speak for our company. Forgive me for not sharing commercially confidential aspects at this stage with you. I believe firmly that what we will bring to Jersey will be a step forward, a significant step forward, not just initially, but we will be able to provide for the future, which will mean truly comparable services with the rest of the developed world. We have done a lot of market research and talked to a lot of different segmented groups to understand what they want? They want the benefits of competition and asked “why can we not have what they have in the UK?” Indeed, that is what we are looking to provide.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

What other advantages, if any, do you see for a company coming to operate in Jersey?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

A mobile phone company coming to operate in Jersey?

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Yes. Other advantages over and above?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

A further one, or just the 3? I am sorry.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

No. What other advantages, if any, do you feel an individual company has if operating in this Jersey environment? Extra advantages over and above the operation of a telephone network?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I am not sure I understand your question.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Do you feel there are any other advantages for a company coming to operate in the Channel Island environment? Commercial?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Commercial? Yes, as you know we are moving into Guernsey; we have obtained a licence to operate there. Advantages also going offshore from India in a number of other jurisdictions that have yet to be announced. Obviously Bharti are currently operating in the Seychelles. In terms of operating here commercially, this is viable. It is in some ways a unique challenge that we face here, given the reported high level of market penetration to date. It is a unique challenge in that way. I think what we can bring are the benefits to support the development of Jersey. As I understand it, the States are looking to attract further investment into Jersey which is currently very heavily dependent on the Finance sector, and I think diversity is an important thing. From my own experience, I have been aware of a number of companies going into new jurisdictions over the years. It has always been that there are a number of key criteria that investors will look at before they will invest. There is the political situation: stability, consistency and that sort of thing. Also infrastructure, and the quality of telecoms, the availability of telecoms and the linkage to the rest of the world is right up there as an important criterion. Not the most important criterion, but a very important criterion for companies investing, particularly in island communities.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Can I go into electromagnetic fields, which I am sure is your speciality? There is a body of opinion that a certain proportion of the population are affected by the influences of electromagnetic fields. Would you have any comment on that?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

There has been a lot of debate in this area, and opinions will doubtless rage backwards and forwards, but I think maybe the more interesting area is to look at what the World Health Organisation had to say about this. It is very much my understanding they have yet to be convinced that electrosensitivity as

such is something that can be determined to exist. There are a number of studies which have been commissioned where people who say that they are electrosensitive are invited to participate in the studies, and they are constructed in a so-called double blind format, so that neither the people operating the equipment nor the person being subjected to the emissions are aware when the signals are off and on. To the best of my knowledge, none of these studies have proved positive, that is to say shown an association between signals being turned on and people being able to determine that those signals have been turned on. I do not know, Thomas, whether you ... That is my understanding at the moment, but obviously we are aware, all of us here, that there are people who have these concerns. But science at the moment does not seem to support the opinions that they are expressing.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Does your scientific research or do your decisions rely principally on the knowledge coming from the World Health Organisation, perhaps both in Jersey Airtel terms and Nokia terms?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Personally, I look for credibility. I think anything to do with health is extremely sensitive and emotive and important to people, and rightly so. I tend to look for who I think are credible and why. I have looked at different organisations. The World Health Organisation - and I am not putting myself forward as an expert - but my understanding and knowledge of the World Health Organisation is that it has a degree of independence that is largely unmatched by anybody else. I think it is a body that has a reputation for credibility that is accepted widely throughout the world, and therefore I believe it is worth listening to. Governments around the world look to it to provide information, and obviously you received a lot more background on that from Mike Repacholi yesterday. In terms of other documents that have come to my notice, include some through the Internet. I have asked others for input, and I have been told that the documents I have highlighted have not been subjected to appropriate scientific scrutiny and evaluation in many cases. Therefore, because there is this uncertainty about information that is freely available on the Internet - and I guess that is one of the flaws of the Internet that anybody can put anything on a website without it being substantiated in any way - is why I have tended to look to the World Health Organisation for sort of comfort and support on this subject. The information that I have had seems to make sense, so that is really my reference point.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Are you aware whether Bharti funds any technological research into the electromagnetic effects of the population?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Not to my knowledge, no.

**Mr. A. Clark:**

Maybe I could just say a couple of words about science and the quality of science. It may be helpful. There is, I think, a general misunderstanding of the scientific process by many people. We can pick up the newspaper almost any day of the week and see a study that says one thing or the other, and if you had asked me maybe 10 years ago, I would say: "This looks very interesting", whatever it was. But now I ask myself a question. Were the scientists that were involved in that study expert in the field in which they were researching? Has the study which they have published been published in major scientific journals? Has it been reviewed by expert peers? Has the work been validated by another team of scientists in a different environment to add strength to the conclusions? If you cannot answer yes to those points, then you have to put a question mark over that science. Now, when looking at the science which I trust in, the science which forms part of the reports and the guidance that comes from the World Health Organisation, they can say yes, the science that we are taking into account has passed those tests for scrutiny. I think that is an important point for all of us, whatever we are looking at, to validate the quality of the information. That is something. As for is it just the World Health Organisation. Well, there are a number of scientific reviews. There is the Royal Society of Canada, et cetera, et cetera. In fact we can furnish you with a list of major international reviews where expert scientists have looked at the weight of scientific evidence, pros and cons, and eventually published, based on that extensive review of available science. It is those expert reviews which then together form part of the assessment which the World Health Organisation and the International Commission on Non-ionising Radiation Protection use when they put forward the guidance and recommendations that we use in our day-to-day work. So I feel that we are operating from a very strong scientific base and not something that is, shall we say, born out of the last study. You must always consider the weight of evidence, whatever the subject. That is the rational thing to do. It is on that approach that I personally consider the science which we use in the industry. You asked the question do Bharti contribute to science. That is often asked of industry, and there are a few points here. If industry solely funds research, then there will be a question over the independence of that research. If industry does not pay for any research, people will say, well, you are just interested in making a dollar and you did not give a damn. So there is a balance. The balance is that industry, through its trade associations pays as minority shareholder in a number of the international research programmes identified by the World Health Organisation and other major groups as appropriate. But by being a minor shareholder, the independence of the work can still be assured, and I think that is the important thing. For example, the Mobile Manufacturers' Forum contributes to research programmes identified by the World Health Organisation, along with national governments and other NGOs (non-government organisations) and interested stakeholders. But the independence of the science is assured, and that is an important point, because we have to be able to trust the science which we use.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Thank you, Mr. Clark.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

I wonder if I could just come back in some general terms, and maybe you would like to express an opinion about any frustrations that you may have about the situation you found with perhaps the regulator or the incumbent operator or the authorities, whether they be planning or on staffing issues. Have we been, in general terms, welcoming and accommodating from your point of view or made life difficult for you? Would you like to express an opinion?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No, I would not say that anybody has made life deliberately excessively difficult for us. There are situations that arise when you get into a market opening up to competition for the first time, and I have been on both sides. We have developed very good relationships with the incumbent operator. We have developed very good relationships with the regulator. I am a believer that you achieve things more quickly through reasoned discussion and debate rather than confrontation. We have worked closely with the planning department, and obviously certain criteria have been introduced over the last 10 months. I think Stephen Smith mentioned this morning That most of these recommendations have been implemented and applied, and I think they are all sensible things to do. We made it very clear when we first met with Planning people way back in March last year that we are more than happy to comply with their requirements. We just wish to know what they are. The process is one where each application is viewed on its merits. That is the requirement. We put our applications in, and we sit down and discuss things openly and clearly with Planning people and try and make sure that what is required in terms of visual impact, what is appropriate for a location and environment, we try and reach the best compromise that we can. As I said, we have had 3 site applications turned down. Naturally disappointing, of course and I am sure that you would expect me to say nothing else, I am sure. But no, I have not experienced anything that I would say is totally unacceptable in the circumstances that we find ourselves in. It is pretty normal for a process to be put in place for issues like network interconnection. I think I can share with you that we have cleared and signed up with the incumbent operator last week for network interconnection., so that issue will not stop us from launching.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Part of the reason I asked that, really, was to explore a number of other areas. You mentioned Guernsey, for example. Well, in here, that is a sort of G-word that you do not use.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I apologise if I have caused any offence. I do not mean to.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Having said that, they do have a different situation where the Office of the Utility Regulation



independently monitors the operators, and it is a recommendation that has come from another report - I want to mention that, too - that could be perhaps done here. Would you have any problem with that? With a regulator monitoring your emissions?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No, not at all. We do not have the in-house capability to monitor it. I mentioned earlier that we have measured the one site that is operational, and this was carried out by a company from the UK. There are very few companies around the UK that have the capability to do it. Andrew advised me there were 2, I think.

**Mr. A. Clark:**

There are 2 companies, certainly, which we know to be of a good professional standard, and I think, again, it is important to remember that if you are going to make measurements on which decisions are based, those measurements have to be robust. They be to certain pre-defined standards, using equipment which is calibrated to traceable national standards, so that the subsequent results can be believed in and used in a constructive way. It is too easy to just bring out the little pocket monitor for whatever. "Oh yes, it is in the blue zone" or the yellow zone. "This is very significant." Well, this is far more important and the complexity of the measurements is far more significant. So it is absolutely essential that whoever is commissioned to undertake measurements has the capability in terms of the equipment and the trained resource, and also the knowledge of the correct measurement practices.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Would you agree, and could you give an example perhaps from your experience of where that is translatable, so that the public understand that, so any fears they have are translated into consumable information as opposed to being too scientific or technical?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

I think possibly one example which I use is Australia. It is particularly interesting what has happened there. Going back maybe 10 years or so ago, there was a debate not so dissimilar to the one which we are engaged in now, and both government and the industry realised there had to be a way forward. So a decision was clearly made that some best practice criteria needed to be generated. The underlying principle would be that it would be an open and transparent process. So now members of the community can go to a website; they can see the location of base stations in their environment; they can see the extent of the emissions from those base stations; who owns them, et cetera, et cetera. It is a matter of public review. One simply just has to go through Google and look for the mobile carriers forum of Australia, and it is not long before you find yourself accessing this information. So that sort of open, transparent approach and making the measurements clearly visible has done a lot to mean that there is a more reasoned approach towards mobile communication and other infrastructure deployment

in Australia. I think we can all learn something from that. We are all essentially the same. We want the information on which to base decisions which are important to us in our lives. So I think that is what I would term as one of the best of practices around the world in how to approach this issue.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Could you say if that was industry funded, or was it government, or was it a joint initiative?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

It was a joint initiative in terms of how to proceed. Certainly the operator company Telstra shall we say were highly instrumental in wanting to drive this forward, but they are not alone in doing this. They work in very close co-operation with their head-to-head competitors in making this information available.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

The reason I say that is that leads on to this report - I do not know if you are aware of it. It is something that was produced by Steve Smith's department, who was in this morning, which is the Public Health Services report on mobile phones and health, mobile phone base stations. In there there are a certain number, 6 recommendations at the end, and this is exactly the process that he talked about. It is about giving the public information, and I am interested to know, in your experience elsewhere would this be a common practice?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

It does vary region to region. I am trying to think whether there are any contradictions to what I am about to say. In most cases, industry tends to move forward towards more consultation and more transparency. It is the best way to go forward. It helps to have informed stakeholders. Decisions conducted behind closed doors, very generally, are rarely robust, though in a number of countries there are, shall we say, codes of conduct which are entered into by industry and also by the regulator as a way forward to bring that level of information to the public.

**Senator B. Shenton:**

As you may know, we are undertaking a survey to find out what the level of concern among the people is, because when you hold a public meeting ultimately the people that are concerned turn up and the people that could not care less sit at home watching TV or making phone calls. During the application process, did you have a lot of objections to the masts as they were going up, or was it just a small proportion of masts that tended to have vocal objections?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

It varied. The shared sites, of course there was no comment. The rooftop sites there was very little.

There has been one instance where we have gained planning approval for a rooftop site and the property owner subsequently asked us not to proceed because of inputs from the tenants. We complied with that. It is mainly the ground-based sites that have attracted objections, as you would expect. Some have had none; I cannot give you the numbers, I am afraid. Some of them have had a few letters. There have been a few petitions. So it is varied. We have responded to the letters. The themes, as I am sure you would expect, are similar. health, visual impact, and property values being the main areas of concern. I have spoken to quite a number of people. Health is the most emotive and sensitive issue. The expression “nimby” (not in my back yard) has been used on more than one occasion. I understand the principles of that. We have had landowners who have agreed to go forward with us only to withdraw following discussions with neighbours and other people, and for other reasons. We have always respected that; we have not tried to co-erce anybody. We have responded to every letter that has come in via Planning, and we have, as I said earlier, made ourselves available to meet with anybody that has expressed a wish to discuss the issue further.

**Senator B. Shenton:**

Have you been surprised at the amount of media attention that the issue has stimulated, particularly in the *Jersey Evening Post*?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No, not really, because I think it is a very sensitive and emotive issue. I welcome the inquiry, because I think it can only add value through providing greater understanding to people. So yes, I really do not have a problem with the coverage. Would I have rewritten anything? I do not know. I think it is important that the media do express views. I think it is important also that they present the most balanced view, and I think this ( the Scrutiny Panel hearing) has been for me the most appropriate forum within which to state clearly the industry’s position and rationale for taking that position.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Can I ask you a related question? You may or may not know, but we had the managing director of the Jersey Electricity Company yesterday, and one of the questions we asked of him was about the access of electricity supply to base stations. I just wondered if you could relate your experience to us of how that has been for you - I mean, the access to the electricity supply, not just to a nearby point, but how you then translated that to the station - whether you needed way leaves across land or you have been digging up roads. How generally that has worked and if it has been a costly experience?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

There is a process that the electricity company operates, which I have to say in my experience has been pretty efficient and very helpful. There are some sites where there is not any other power supply to be shared. Obviously if you are going on a rooftop, there tends to be a supply there already. Even at the

airports and the ports and places like that, where there is existing facility, where there is existing power, our process is to ask the owners or the people who have that power whether it is possible for us to share. In most cases, that has been fine, and Jersey Electric have been very accommodating to make it happen. There is only one site that we have in place, as I told you and there are a further 19 currently in Planning. The applications for power have been made to the JEC. We have arrangements with Jersey Electric to go forward, and I have absolutely no problem with the facilities that are being offered.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Another thing that has been suggested to us is about the landowners and leasing arrangements. In general terms, do you have a standard lease that you would do sort of up to 9 years, or are you looking at a longer term?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

It is typically 9 years, yes.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Would you like to express an opinion if there has been any tension on negotiation of price?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Not overly. I can only think of one or 2 instances where we have been asked for, quite frankly outrageous sums, which we have declined.

So you have not felt that you have been hung out to dry by some of this process?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I will be very careful on this one. There is one instance that we are still negotiating.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

I should say we have a form - if there is any commercial information that you would like to share with us, we do have a private way that is done where it would not be disclosed. That is a cast-iron guarantee. So if there is anything ... we might come back, because there are some stories doing the rounds as usual, and we might want to test that with you in future.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I would be happy to meet in private with you.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Going back to our terms of reference, if I may. One of the terms of reference, as has been mentioned

earlier, is that we have to comment on the advice provided by the Health Protection Department. Are you content that the communications you have had with Health Protection have been adequate, or do you think there is room for more communication or advice coming from that department?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I have spoken with Steve Smith on a couple of occasions with regard to the document (Health Report). In some instances just seeking clarification following meetings with concerned people. I think the document - and I am probably not qualified to say just how good it is - seems sensible to me. The conclusions seem sensible. I think most of them, if not all of them in some shape or form, have been implemented and are effective. I think it is important that the Ministry of Health take a role in this, because that is the nature of the issue that is concerning the public. But from my company's point of view, we are more than happy to work as closely as we possibly can with the Ministry to share information that may from time to time become available to us. In fact, we have already sent some documents to them.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Just checking with the record - it would appear you have a copy of that document in front of you?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Yes.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

Looking at the conclusions and the recommendations, are there any there that you feel the company would not be happy to comply with?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No. In principle, no.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

For example, you have no problem in disclosing where base stations are? That would not be any problem?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Not at all. We have made available to JCRA and to Planning all the locations of all the sites that we have been looking for. Obviously some of them have changed, but Planning see them. so that as we put applications in, This should enable Planning to check each application against what we have already provided. . We are in the process of developing our website, and information about our network including the location of sites, will be available through the website.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Do you think that for the public comfort, for the information being in the public domain about siting and emissions and monitoring, do you think it is a legitimate charge on the operator? A legitimate charge for the operators to pay for the setting and maintaining of a public accessible information system that cites regular monitoring and generally breaks that information down?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I think it has to be a shared cost, not just among the operators but with Planning and others that wish to go in it. Obviously it needs to be designed; it has to be effective, and if it were a separate website maybe under the Department of Planning that had triggers from each of our websites to connect into it and vice versa, that would be helpful. Yes, in principle I would have no objection to making an appropriate contribution to that.

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

I would like to add something, because we have such an internet site<sup>[TB2]</sup> also in Austria, and it turned out that at the very beginning everybody was interested in this site, but after a few weeks nobody cared about it. Now we have to maintain it, but it is not really an issue any more.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

You were at our meeting at St. Brelade, I understand? Is that right? The public meeting?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

You were not. Have you attended a public meeting?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

You have not, okay. Well, at the public meetings, we have met people who are very upset, very emotionally upset, to the extent that they could be determined as being ill. They have genuine concerns. Regretfully, they are not over-happy with science, but they do not really see that as a problem. They see that there is a possibility, no matter how remote, that something could affect their children, and as a consequence they become stressed, and stress can lead to a downturn in health and can lead to illness. A lot of it would appear to be a lack of education before it gets to the stage where it

becomes at that level. What do you think we could do to try and stem these fears earlier on, to try and avoid them?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

I think maybe the answer lies in public education and communication, for sure. The way we treat different issues and the way we have anxieties about different issues is quite interesting. Some people, for example, are concerned about air travel but will think nothing about getting in their car and driving without a seat belt. It makes no sense, but nonetheless it is very difficult to take away that anxiety about flying. So that is one issue; there is an educational issue, and I think it is not something you can solve today or tomorrow. It is progressive activity. Secondly, there is this maybe perception unless you can be given an absolute guarantee that something is safe, you should not do it. Well, you cannot give absolute guarantees about anything. How many studies would you do? One; 10; 100; 100,000; 200,000? When do you have a big enough weight of evidence? The important thing here is that people take a more rational look at this. You cannot determine that a cup of water that I might have is 100 per cent safe. But the weight of evidence suggests that it is not going to do me any harm.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

In effect, what we are talking about is risk. One of the things is that is not taught through the educational system at an early level is an understanding of risk and yet it hits the paper every day, it hits the media every day, because a lot of the things that are being talked about are about risk. At what level do you think we should start discussing risk with people?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

A conversation I had, I cannot remember who it was with, a few months ago we talked about this subject and why should representatives from our industry not get together with people from Health or Planning, or wherever it is appropriate from the public sector, and talk to the kids in schools? I would be happy to do it, whether the Minister of Education would welcome me to do that, I would hope he would, and I would be happy to do it. But with education, people tend to say that it can never be early enough and there are youngsters using mobile phones at all sorts of young ages. They are growing up with it and I think the greater their understanding of the technology and how it works can be no bad thing at all.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Given the size of your company internationally, are you aware of any case law with regard to legal challenges, which have been made with regard to the perception of risk to health, rather than health risks themselves?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

The only one that I am aware of, and it was highlighted to me as an answer to a specific situation I was not expecting, was a court case in Birmingham, in the UK, in 2005. I think the court found for the mobile operator. The case of the complainant was unproven. Obviously, they had an expert witness for the complainant, and I seem to recall that the evidence given by that expert was seriously questioned, if not rejected, it is the only one I have any sort of knowledge of. I have a copy of the briefing here if you would like a copy.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

That would be very useful.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Given that in the US (United States) they tend to be more litigious about these things, have Bharti got a presence in the States at all?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

No.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

Can you give us the benefit of your experience in negotiations over sharing masts? Has there been any tension there?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Sharing masts, we have been very open to sharing masts, in most cases it is quite a process involving lawyers etc in getting agreed conditions. There are not that many facilities that are capable of being shared. There is also a case that says, if everybody shared the same sites and there was some sort of disaster, then all the networks would go out. So, there is a diversity argument to this as well. There are 2 offshore companies, Arqiva and National Grid who have sites here, one is in St. Brelade and one is Les Platons, up north. We have concluded negotiations with them, one has been approved by Planning and the other one is in that process at the moment. We have had negotiations with Jersey Telecom and they had 3 sites that were possible to utilise, one was found to be unsuitable, we could not have a commercially available slot, obviously when other people use their towers, they have got tower locations booked into the future, so it depends what you get allocated. Others have been fine, but it is not only availability; it is also whether the structure is capable of taking the extra weight. There are a few instances where we are paying to have the structures strengthened to take the extra antenna. So we are quite happy to share where it is sensible to do so, and we will continue to do that. There is one instance where Planning have requested that all 3 operators get together, I think it is St. Catherine's Pier, we are trying to work that out. I think the other 2 operators are already there and we are having problems trying to locate our antenna on the structure, for various reasons. Sharing is not an issue for



us.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Would you have any comment on the technical side of that in terms of emission? Additional aerials on one mast will obviously cause additional emissions. Could you comment on that?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

That is absolutely true, but I think again the important thing to bear in mind here is the emissions come from the antennas themselves. The antennas, generally, are mounted at a point well above the ground, out of the immediate proximity of the public. So, even when you have multiple antennas on a single mast it is highly improbable that the public will be able to position themselves in such a way as to be exposed to an extent greater than the regulatory guidance allows for. And, should there be such a circumstance where that could be a possibility, it would be incumbent on the operator to put in boundary markings or fencing around the installation so as to prevent risk to human health. I think that is generally accepted good practice. But, for the most part, when we are talking about a direct single mast pole, without being flippant, short of flying through the air, you are not going to put yourself in a position where you would be exposed in excess of regulatory guidance.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

Is there any way of controlling directional emissions from these masts, or does it tend to be 360?

**Mr. A. Clark:**

That is an interesting question you ask. If you could consider radio energy to be something you could put inside a balloon, one like you may have at Christmas, and you can squeeze it and maybe make it into sort of a long sort of sausage balloon or you can have little bubbles sticking out, antennas, it does not increase the overall amount of radio energy, it just determines where it goes, and the design of the antenna can do exactly that. So, depending on the installation and where you want the radio energy to go, you choose an appropriate antenna. So it may be to project longer term for distance or it may be that you want a very immediate coverage for a small area, so your antenna choice is absolutely critical and then when you do your compliance boundary calculation for that site you take into account, not only the amount of radio energy, but the design of the antenna, and you can therefore conclude what the compliance boundary would be in terms of retro-fitting access.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

So, in practice, if you get an installation, shall we say on a hillside in one of our many bays we have here in Jersey, you could direct it towards the populated areas and away from, shall we say, the less populated areas, to comply with your consumer needs?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

There are a number of instances where we have 360-degree coverage through 3 sets of antenna.

**The Deputy of St. Peter:**

So the lobes overlap, in effect.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Yes, so it goes around 360 degrees . There are other cases where we will put 2 antennae, if we just need it going a certain direction and we do not need any coverage g at the back. You get a bit of drift at the back of the antennas, you get a little bit of coverage, but if we do not need to go 360, we would only put up the antenna that we need for the coverage area that we want.

**Mr. T. Barmuller:**

May I just add, I guess it is very important to mention that mobile communication is a 2-way system and it does not have just to locate an antenna somewhere, because you always have to phone back to the antenna and to send the signal back, and that is very often forgotten when we discuss that, because people think just go out of the village with the antenna, we have coverage then anyway, but you have to phone back and especially the mobile phone becomes more and more the limiting factor in network planning.

**The Connétable of St. Brelade:**

So, just to perhaps conclude on that, in a situation where perhaps someone finds themselves with a property with a phone mast by their back door, which seems to be the case in some situations over here, given that the phone operators could direct the emissions away from their property, do you think that would be an acceptable course of action?

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Indeed, in fact there is one specific location where I suggested exactly that, to reduce the height and number of antenna and the angle of it, but unfortunately that was still not acceptable.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

As I did say at the start, and we have no other questions of you at the moment, but there could be some follow-up that we will get back, you mentioned a document, and so this is part of a process, not the end of the process, and you did have a certain confidence and you said you welcome the inquiry and we would inform, I hope we can carry some of that confidence through to our conclusions, but what I would say now, for a moment or 2, if there is something you would like to say of us, please feel free to do so, say as much as you want. It is an opportunity for something we might have missed or something that you wish to say and do not feel restricted, I mean, either one of you or indeed all of you have that

opportunity now should you so wish.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

I think we have covered everything that we wanted. I would stress the importance of a conclusion to your investigations as soon as possible, not just for commercial reasons of my own company, but also I think for the concern of the public. I think it is very important that that starts getting addressed as soon as possible. From comments that I have had from people who are making sites available to us, and some of them have said: “we are awaiting the outcome of the Scrutiny Panel investigations.” it does have an impact on my Company, it does have an impact on the public, and I think it is in everybody’s interests to reach a conclusion as soon as possible. I do not know how quickly that is possible for you to do, but it is just a statement of wish, if you like.

**Deputy A. Breckon:**

I think we appreciate that comment, I am just finishing a review of the dairy and I was told, as well: “Hurry up, we need to inform the industry.” So, in most of these we get involved with there is a sense of urgency, but we appreciate that and we are not here to frustrate anybody, we have come to this inquiry fairly late and we are trying to do it fairly quickly, but treat it with the respect it deserves, both from the industry’s point of view and the concerns that the public have expressed. Any of your colleagues would like to say anything before we close? Okay. Again, can I thank you for attending and for the information that you have supplied on request and hopefully will do in the future, and now we adjourn until 1.30 p.m. Thank you very much indeed.

**Mr. D. Watson:**

Can I just clarify, I will let you have visibility of our indemnity insurance, which you requested, and also I will make available the Birmingham case documentation that I have with me. You mentioned that you might wish to speak with me on anything that is of a confidential nature, if you wish to do that then can I assume that you will contact me?