



Final Report of
'TETRA Democracy in Wales'
22nd March 2005



Plaid Cymru
The Party of Wales



**TETRA DEMOCRACY IN WALES SEMINAR
22 MARCH 2005**

INTRODUCTION

“This the report of a seminar I organised following representations from several groups and individuals in Wales concerned about the siting of TETRA communication masts in their communities. The aim of the seminar was to raise awareness of the problems, hear expert evidence and discuss future campaigning.

02 were invited to participate in the seminar but declined. They also declined to provide me with a list of all TETRA mast sites in Wales.

The outcome of the seminar was to set up TETRA Cymru network to enable community groups in Wales to share information and keep in touch with one another. Attached is a list of the current contacts.

I am grateful to all the speakers and all those who attended this seminar to improve our understanding of this most important issue. I hope that this report will help in the campaign to ensure that our health and well-being are protected.”

Jill Evans

Jill Evans MEP
Plaid Cymru - The Party of Wales
www.jillevans.net

CONTENTS

Speakers	4
Summary of Audience Discussion.....	12
Conclusion.....	13
Initial Coordinators of TETRA Forum Cymru.....	13



Seated L-R: **Jill Evans**, MEP; **Ellen ap Gwynn**, Ceredigion County Councillor,
Standing L-R: **Grahame Blackwell**, TETRA expert; **Paul James**, Ceredigion County
Councillor; **Paul Lewis**, Secretary of the Health and Safety Committee of the Police
Federation of England and Wales

SPEAKERS

Dr Grahame Blackwell

An expert on all aspects of TETRA and telecommunications, he has published many research papers and provided research for MPs and AMs (Assembly Members) as well as local authorities - and residents groups. He has acted as an expert witness in a number of appeals - delaying implementation of TETRA in Devon & Cornwall for two years. He now works professionally providing support to people with TETRA and phone mast concerns and provides the latest information through his website www.starweave.com.

In Wales there seems to be a real determination to grasp the problem of TETRA by the throat.

TETRA signals are more of a concern than ordinary mobile phone signals, and therefore should be dealt with as a matter of urgency. But often it is very difficult to get to the facts about the science of TETRA because there is a marked reticence on the part of bodies that should be open and straightforward about information, to make that information available.

A good example of this is the experience of many people with OFFCOM which has shown that they are often unreliable when giving out information about masts – sometimes they change location on the sitefinder website, or their reference numbers change. It is difficult to believe that this is anything other than a deliberate attempt to stop people finding where masts are, because there is deep concern at government level about the whole issue of TETRA and the level of public disquiet.

The Stewart report¹ (about mobile phones) did contain a section on TETRA, the final sentence of which said that the emissions are pulsed at 17.6Hz. Emissions from TETRA handsets are definitely pulsed, but it is a matter of opinion whether emissions from masts are pulsed – it depends on your definition of pulsed. Airwave 02 and the NRPB (National Radiological Protection Board) choose a particular meaning to suit their purpose. This would seem to be irrelevant however, because the health warning issued elsewhere in the Stewart report referred to amplitude modulated signals. Signals from TETRA masts are amplitude modulated at 17.6 cycles per second – even Airwave 02 publicity material says that.

But in the NRPB report² on TETRA there is a question raised – they show that there is amplitude modulation at 17.6 cycles per second but they say it could be a 'statistical artifact' (coincidence). It is physically impossible to have a repeating pattern 17.6 times per second without having amplitude modulation in that signal at 17.6Hz, which is exactly what the Stewart report warned about.

Eleven reports were listed made by eminent scientists across the world, biophysicists looking at the business of bio-electromagnetics. Seven of these studies showed that there was something happening in brain cells at around 16 cycles per second, which of course is not far from 17.6 cycles per second. There were four studies that didn't demonstrate that effect – but failure to demonstrate an effect does not prove that the effect is not happening, it just means it isn't happening in those particular circumstances. The same person did three out of these four studies during almost exactly the same period of time.

So the majority of studies showed that the sort of signals that are unquestionably coming out of TETRA masts at 17.6 cycles per second had an effect on brain cells.

¹ The Stewart report can be seen at www.iegmp.org.uk/report/text.htm

² The NRPB Report 'Possible Health Effects from Terrestrial Trunked Radio (TETRA)' can be seen at www.hpa.org.uk/radiation/publications/documents_of_nrp/dfs/doc_12_2.pdf

Then the NRPB report on TETRA (issued one year after the Stewart report) listed one further study, which also showed this, so there was an eight to four majority. It is commonplace to hear scientists and government representatives admitting that studies have shown these effects, but saying they were back in the 1970s and science has advanced since then. An example is Professor Colin Blakemore, who actually wrote the warning in the Stewart report “amplitude modulation at around 16Hz should be avoided in future developments in information technology if possible”. He is now saying openly that all the research about this is from the 1970s and therefore unreliable. Professor Laurie Challis, Head of the government’s Mobile Phone Communications Health Research Programme has said it is unreplicated research from the 1970s. And Hazel Blears, Minister for Policing said in a Common’s debate that there has been some concern about effects on brain cells, but the research saying that was done back in the 1970s. This is the official line.

The truth is, in the Stewart report, of all the studies mentioned which proved signals at around 16Hz affected brain cells:

- Two studies were conducted in the 1970s,
- Four were conducted in the 1980s (one in the late 1980s),
- One was conducted in 1996 and one in 1999.

By contrast, the four studies that failed to show the effect were conducted around 1981 – 1982.

The effect proved was the leakage of calcium from brain cells.

In the NRPB report it says that calcium is recognized as having an important role in the functioning of cells, particularly nerve cells (brain cells are nerve cells). But the official view is that this calcium leakage is not a problem – a complete contradiction.

The most disturbing thing about the NRPB report is that it goes to great lengths to discredit the research that has shown there is a problem, and to talk up the research saying the opposite. The authorities will use a particular study to back up what they say. This study was done by Dr John Tattersall at the DSTL Laboratories (otherwise known as Porton Down). His study used signals at 17.6Hz and failed to observe an effect.

There are problems with the Tattersall study³: Firstly, John Tattersall failed to record, and therefore failed to test three aspects of previous studies which are recognized by previous researchers as important:

- The prevailing temperature at the time of the effect
- Background static magnetic field at the time of the effect
- The power level windows at the time of the effect.

There are things happening at low levels of power which do not manifest at higher levels – Tattersall used higher levels of power than those at which this effect was observed by previous researchers. It is also possible to say that at a higher level of power there is some protective mechanism, which is not activated at a lower level. The general impression is that cells are responding in a way that suggests they have perceived some activity happening within the body, which isn’t actually happening, so they’re being given a false signal.

Secondly, although it is claimed he used much more modern research methods, this is untrue. Earlier research was criticized because it used studies conducted in vitro (clumps of cells in petri dishes) rather than in vivo (living tissues). Three of the six studies that were done after the 1970s used in vivo studies. However the Tattersall study was in vitro – the method that NRPB criticized about the other studies.

³ The Tattersall Study can be seen at www.policereform.gov.uk/implementation/tetra/tetra5.html

Thirdly, there are two ways of studying what is happening with calcium leakage. One method is used in some of the earlier studies – Radio Labelled Calcium. It uses a radioactive isotope of calcium, and what happens is similar to when a person has a 'barium meal' to track a growth within their body, because it can be traced and measured very objectively. This is what was used in some of the earlier studies. The other method, which the Tattersall study used, involves fluorescent dye. It is not ideal for many reasons. There is no way of knowing what the dye does to the actions of the cell – it can surround the calcium you are looking for, obscuring what is there. Also it has to be judged by eye. Tattersall's conclusions are that there are not enough changes in colour to constitute a significant effect. This is very subjective.

Finally, the study that Tattersall did was not even about the problem highlighted by the Stewart report – calcium leakage from brain cells at this sort of frequency. Tattersall was measuring intracellular movement of calcium (movement of calcium within cells) which is completely different to what he should have measured – calcium influx (leakage of calcium from brain cells).

So there is no scientific evidence that the problem highlighted by early researchers is not a problem at all. We do have a concerted campaign on the part of officialdom, saying the earlier studies were unreliable and used outdated techniques. They're talking about world-class researchers who follow scientifically documented protocols and have their findings published in journals. The Tattersall study has never been published.

The International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) has issued guidelines as protection against any dangers of TETRA masts. If a TETRA mast has ICNIRP certification then a local authority has no right to further consider its health implications. But the guidelines actually admit they only cover short-term effects (to do with surface shocks, burns and heating) and there is not sufficient data to fix thresholds for long-term effects. They say they are not offering protection against cancer, Motor Neurone Disease (MND) and heart disease. The government thinks the guidelines are sufficient.

An important distinction must be made between thermal and non-thermal effects. The ICNIRP guidelines do not protect you from anything but thermal effects, apart from surface shocks if you happen to accidentally touch a mast. Quite a number of scientists are concerned about the health effects of TETRA, none of them about the thermal effects. All the official reports say that if this effect happens it must have a thermal component affecting it, even though there is no evidence of this.

In the latest report on TETRA (2004) it was stated that as emissions from a number of TETRA masts had been found to be within ICNIRP guidelines, there is no reason to treat them any differently to GSM emissions. There is no reasoning behind this – it is totally illogical. The paragraph in the Stewart report about TETRA says that health effects happen at levels too low to cause significant heating. In the latest report they have checked the signals they have used are within thermal based guidelines, and are therefore not prepared to consider any other possibility.

There has been a recent report about Radio Frequency EMFs, not specifically about TETRA called the Reflex Study. It was a four-year study by a consortium of twelve organizations from seven different nations across Europe, and said clearly that it is no longer possible to say that we do not know of any biological mechanisms by which ill health could be caused by this type of radiation. Not only is it damaging DNA (damage to double strand DNA which the body cannot repair) but it is also limiting the capacity of the body to deal with the damage.

There have been a number of symptoms reported from around the country - a number reported when people didn't actually know there was a TETRA mast near them until they experienced the symptoms. The classic case is the primary school in Littlehampton, Sussex. One day in January 2004 eleven children went home from school ill with serious headaches and nosebleeds. Afterwards it was discovered that the nearby TETRA mast, which had been there for a while, had been switched on that morning.

The short term effects of TETRA masts are the same across the country; people getting serious headaches, being shocked awake numerous times at night, nausea and nosebleeds. Also people being completely disorientated and doing things like driving in the opposite direction to the place they are trying to get to.

In the long term, one of the earliest masts, at Drumcarrow Hill in Scotland is a good example. It is like a war zone, there are so many different sorts of illnesses, in animals as well as humans. All the sparrows disappeared from the area when the mast was switched on. More specifically there have been five cases of Motor Neurone Disease in a community of a couple of hundred people – normally it affects 1/50 – 100,000 people per year. It is so rare that this should be ringing alarm bells very seriously, particularly because MND has been linked specifically to levels of calcium around brain cells, as have TETRA emissions.

The cynical view about why the UK government has chosen TETRA instead of TETRAPOL, is that someone from BT gave a large donation to Labour just before the last election. But it is worth noting that there is a connection with the USA – TETRA is more US based, whereas TETRAPOL (an alternative) is more European based. Motorola (a US based company) is the big name in TETRA and has a significant interest in the Airwave system in this country. It is a requirement of law that any chips with encryption keys them produced by a manufacturer in the USA must be 'lodged' with the US government. This means it is quite possible for them to decrypt any encrypted communications happening among UK police forces. There is a strong concern that the US government may be able to 'listen in' to everything happening in this country.

Also TETRAPOL is Proprietary Standard whereas TETRA is Open Standard, which means anyone can use TETRA without paying licensing fees. However the number of TETRAPOL masts that had to go up across France is a fraction of the number of TETRA masts that are going up here. It is thought that the UK could have been covered by one tenth of the number of masts if they were TETRAPOL, and at a tiny fraction of the £2.9 billion paid out so far for TETRA. And there are ongoing costs that will have to be covered by the taxpayer in a few years time, which are not mentioned much in official circles.

Paul Lewis

Secretary of the Health and Safety Committee of the Police Federation of England and Wales

The Police Federation of England and Wales is a representative body of the police force, which is the equivalent of a union. The organization have called for an effective and secure communication system that allows police to carry out their job – to protect the public and their property from crime.

In 1987 the Home Office recommended a review of the communication system in place because it was out of date and a danger. This review, published in 1993, recommended that a new system should be put in place that should be centrally directed to the core of infrastructure. The UK government decided it would be TETRA and the police forces would only get involved in the hardware/equipment side of it – issues surrounding radios, coverage etc. In 1996 the contract (in excess of £2.8 billion) of the Police Secure Radio Communication Programme (PSRCP), now commonly known as the Airwave Project, was awarded to BT. At this time the organization was consulted on the hardware side of it, how the police would actually be using the equipment. The first force to use TETRA was in Lancashire in 2001, and now over thirty forces in the UK are fully operational. The government wants all forces to be fully operational by the end of 2006.

The stance of the Police Federation is that we understand the huge potential benefits of the TETRA communications system but there are conflicting reports of its safety. The police have no choice but to use it because the analogue system that was there before is becoming obsolete. The government is putting £5 million into a health monitoring programme, being carried out by Imperial College London over 15 years.

A number of people have asked ‘why doesn’t a police officer refuse to use the TETRA system?’ The police are a disciplined body, governed by rules and regulations, and with the duty to protect life and property. For this there has to be an effective communications system. The Discipline Code refers to failure to comply with a lawful order – if a police officer refused to use equipment they could be disciplined and eventually sacked.

The Health and Safety Executive believes that the use of Airwave TETRA by police officers does comply with the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act, provided it is used in accordance with manufacturing instructions. The police are caught between a rock and a hard place – they can’t refuse to use it. They have to leave it to the experts to discuss whether there is a problem or not.

The Barry Trower report, in 2001, claimed there were health risks associated with the use of TETRA, but his research was not commissioned by the Police Federation of England and Wales. They invited him to put his views to them but stressed that what he wrote should be kept private and confidential so they could discuss the points he raised. But it was given to the Police Federation one day, and then appeared on websites around the country the next day. The report examined research already carried out on TETRA and concluded that long-term exposure to such levels of radiation is harmful. The Home Office agreed that some questions the report raised were relevant, but questioned how Mr Trower came to his conclusions.

The media describe the report as the work of the Police Federation – it is not. It was mentioned in The Ecologist magazine in October 2004, which accused the police of covering up and ignoring the findings of the report. The Police Federation does not ignore any findings, they look at them and decide on a suitable approach.

Since using TETRA, some police officers have stated that they have experienced ill health effects caused by its use. A number of officers have passed away, and relatives have blamed TETRA. The police are also aware of the benefits of using this system, particularly in mountainous areas such as many parts of Wales. This system means that an officer can contact any police officer anywhere in England and Wales.

The Police Federation is conducting a study into the health effects of TETRA, independent from the government study, in conjunction with the Breast Cancer Research Trust. There are so many contrasting views on the health effects; the police can only push for more health surveillance and research, until there is categorical evidence. That is the position of the Police Federation, from an operational perspective.

Paul James

Plaid Cymru councillor on Ceredigion County Council representing Llanbadarn Fawr. The first councillor in Wales to campaign for delegated powers to be taken from the planning officers for masts under 15 metres so that every application is placed before the full council for decision.

The village of Llanbadarn Fawr, near Aberystwyth in Ceredigion had its first experience of TETRA and the company Airwave 02 approximately three years ago, when there was an application for a 25m TETRA mast. There was a meeting of some of the residents of Cefnllan (a residential area) and considerable concern was expressed because the mast was to be so close to a residential area. The height of the mast and equipment is 23.6m, and it replaced an Orange mast that had been put there by default. That was because in the old days the authorities had 28 days to deal with any application, then if not dealt with it went through automatically – Ceredigion Planning Department did not reply within 28 days. Now there are 56 days to deal with applications.

Government guidelines state that sites should be shared, so once any mast is erected in your village it is possible MM02 will be coming to share it. At present the police force are using TETRA but the fire and ambulance services are having reservations. One fire authority, in the South of England was looking into using TETRAPOL, which is more advanced and does not have adverse health effects. But the government interfered due to their potential financial gain through the use of TETRA.

Local residents were concerned that the TETRA mast could emit up to twice the amount of radiation as the previous mast had done. Now there is also a third operator's mast attached – from 02, a subsidiary of MM02. Residents felt the TETRA mast should not be erected near a residential area until there was solid proof there was no danger. Planning authorities across the UK have denied permission for masts on health grounds, and on grounds of reasonable public concern on health, visual amenity and appearance.

TETRA is a controversial issue nationally.

In oral evidence given to the DTI Select Committee by William Stewart, he advised the 'area' (mast signals pulsing near to 16HZ) should be avoided if at all possible.

Dr Hyland, of Warwick University has made striking observations about Extremely Low Frequencies and how they influence brain function, and is extremely anxious about the imposition of TETRA on people across the country.

Dr Roger Coghill, a member of the Department for Health's UK Mobile Communications Health Research Programme has said that criminals could not create a better frequency to disarm and incapacitate the very forces they are trying to secure.

Alistair Philips, director of Powerwatch (a national campaign group) believes TETRA has the potential to be the next asbestos.

The proposed site in Llanbadarn is only 90m from the nearest dwelling and in close proximity to a large residential development. The largest school in Ceredigion, Penglais Comprehensive School is 153m away - there has been a lot of concern from school governors and parents. University halls of residence are close, as is a well-used public footpath. The mast is visually obtrusive from anywhere in Aberystwyth, and it may influence whether prospective university students choose to study in the town due to uncertain health implications.

02 submitted another planning application in July 2003 to place another 6-prong antenna on the mast situated at Cefnllan. Guidelines issued by the office of the Deputy Prime Minister recommended companies make every effort to consult local communities and bodies within communities such as town and county councils and educational establishments, before submitting an application.

02 did the opposite; they submitted their application before any consultation. Letters should have been sent to households and schools in the area – the 02 Public relations Officer, Angela Johnson said that the school was closed at the time, because it was half term. This was untrue. Letters had been sent to residents a few days before the proposed meeting, but had all been redirected to the Post Office because they had no stamps, and would cost each person £1.20 to retrieve. This is unacceptable behaviour.

02 refused a request that they withdraw the application and resubmit it after consultation, but they did organize another meeting with the public. Comments from experts raised further concerns including from Professor Alan Preece of Bristol University. He said that the decision to allow a mast so close to Penglais School was insensitive and should have been subject to more consideration. Before the application came for the mast to be sited at Cefnllan, applications were refused for it to be attached to the side of the university, and Aberystwyth Town Council also rejected it being in the town, on health grounds. Llanbadarn Community Council asked for deferral until after the public meeting.

There are plenty of examples of the devious and dishonest tactics deployed by companies. In many places in Ceredigion, including Llanrhystud and Gilfachrada masts that turn out to be TETRA masts are originally submitted as ordinary telecommunications masts. An application was submitted for a 2m high mast, a 'booster station' in the Llangrannog area. It had not been through the planning application procedure because it was under 15m high. But no application notices were put up, so people had no idea of what was happening – it is certain that residents would have opposed this mast.

The Director of Environmental Services and Housing in each local authority has the right to approve all applications for masts under 15m as long as there are no objections received. Due to the public concern about TETRA, all masts, not just those 15m and higher should have to go through this process. Once one mast is erected, others come on top, and the original can be removed. In Cefnllan, Orange removed their 15m mast, and the 23.6m TETRA mast replaced it.

All residents in Ceredigion have the right to know of a TETRA mast in their area regardless of its size and location. Now in Ceredigion there are approximately 35 TETRA sites.

The following motion was presented by Paul to Ceredigion County Council – they passed it, as did Caerffili County Council and many more are looking at it:

The motion means:

1. Full consultation and full disclosure of information by telecommunication companies, developers and planning officers to local communities should precede any planning application for telecommunication equipment.
2. In the interests of transparency, consultations should extend to local education establishments such as schools, further education colleges and universities within (800m) of the proposed site as well as Town and Community Councils.
3. All applications submitted to the local authority seeking determination of the authority as to whether prior approval is required as to the siting and appearance of the development in accordance with part 22, schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (i.e. masts under 15m) shall be referred to the Development Control and Licensing Committee. This should apply to developments of particular interest to the public, such as planning applications for the new police telecommunications system TETRA network.
This removes the power of the Director of Environmental Services and Housing to exercise delegated powers in respect of the permitted development rights of telecommunications operators without prior consultation with the Development Control Committee.
4. All planning notices for telecommunications equipment should contain information on their actual purpose so that all residents of the local authority have the full facts and a chance to object within the 21-day period.
5. Local authorities should note that the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) allow for the emergency site moveable apparatus purely where required for the replacement of unserviceable apparatus and that this does not extend to Greenfield sites.

It means things are done more democratically and people have more time. The last paragraph is particularly important. Often a mobile mast or apparatus is brought onto a site for work on an existing mast – this is allowed under emergency powers. But in Ceredigion mobile masts have been taken on to a site and erected, but there was no mast originally there. This flouts the emergency powers.

Councils throughout Wales should be working with people in their local communities and targeting these companies wherever they try to do business. An effective tactic is to challenge those who have allowed their land to be used for a TETRA mast.

POINTS RAISED IN AUDIENCE DISCUSSION

Levels of Community Consultation

In Haverfordwest, a TETRA mast is within 400m of eight primary schools – the people were not consulted about its location. It seems a common tendency of Airwave 02 to claim to have written to people when they have not. In this situation it is crucial that the head teacher or head of governors of a school contacts the local authorities and the local politicians, as there needs to be a record. The Stewart Report recommends that educational establishments and communities within a certain area of the proposed mast should be consulted, but it is a recommendation rather than a statutory requirement. Many cases have shown that 02 will not communicate with the public more than they have to, but will always claim to have done so.

The difference between masts and base stations

One way companies get around planning laws is to say that masts are base stations, which confuses people. A mast is not a base station. If an operator has no antenna on a mast then adds an antenna, they are setting up a base station. If there is an 02 mast which already has a TETRA antenna, and they add a 3G antenna – they are setting up a base station that was not there before. Every TETRA mast is a base station.

Although Airwave 02 information differentiates between base stations and non-base stations, the only distinctions are little things like repeaters, which serve as relays between base stations.

Possible lines of action for groups

A petition with 500 signatures has been submitted to the House of Commons, from the group fighting the TETRA mast in Caersws. The reply the local MP got from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister was patronizing and unsatisfactory. TETRA should be a big issue in the forthcoming general election. The group from Llanidloes had planned to hold a meeting with Airwave 02 in Westminster, hosted by the local MP. Groups have also asked people to sign pledges to change their mobile phone company, if it is currently 02, and people living near TETRA masts are keeping 'health diaries'.

Evidence of Health Effects

There have been many studies into the effects of telecommunications masts on human health, which all show ill health consequences. There hasn't been one specifically on TETRA but there has been one on 3G antennas. 3G is actually more advanced than TETRA (which is the equivalent of 2.5G)

The Barry Trower Report

Grahame Blackwell, who knows Barry Trower personally, said that the Police Federation of England and Wales commissioned the Trower Report. Mr Trower is a highly able and honest man and if he had agreed not to release information to the public, then he would not have done so. Many people believe that it was a member of the police force who released the report on to the Internet.

Paul Lewis replied that Barry Trower certainly met executive people within the Police Federation of England and Wales, but whether they commissioned the report is up to interpretation. They asked him to put his views to them, and before they had any opportunity to use it, it was leaked on to the Internet. Any possibility of using it was lost.

The group GRAMM (Gower Residents Against the insensitive siting of Mobile Masts), based in Swansea, have had a lot of experience of working with the police. Officers are not allowed to attend public enquiries about the siting of TETRA masts, and the Police Federation have tried to bury a particular report about TETRA from 2002 because it didn't say what they wanted to hear.

Masts going through due to mal-administration

'Mal-administration' can mean an application for a mast was not looked at by a planning department, or it was never posted. Most common is when a letter of refusal has not been received within the designated 56 day period. If a large number of people take their local council to court to claim damages, because a mast has gone through on mal-administration; it must be cheaper for the council to remove the mast than to pay all the damages.

The future of TETRA campaigning in Wales

Jill Evans MEP suggested the formation of some sort of network, and that the European Parliament could potentially fund a similar meeting in the future. This report will be sent to local councils and politicians, as well as all attendees. For her the most shocking thing to discover has been the complete lack of consultancy and local democracy. There needs to be a national group to lobby the National Assembly, and the Ambulance and Fire Services at the national level. There are some differences between local campaign groups, but there are two issues that are common to all – Health and Planning.

It was agreed that this network will be called 'TETRA Forum Cymru' and that an email group will be one of the means of communication. Initially the Forum will be coordinated by GRAMM from Swansea, with help from the Haverfordwest and Llanidloes groups. It should be non party political, and the focus will be TETRA masts rather than all mobile phone masts, so as not to dilute the campaign too much.

Conclusion

- to set up TETRA Forum Cymru with the aim of enabling groups to keep in touch and share information
- to publish a report of the seminar to be sent to all AMs, MPs, MEPs and council leaders
- to arrange another seminar in late 2005

Initial Coordinators of TETRA Forum Cymru:

Lis Davies, Swansea

List of Delegates

Lis Davies, Swansea
A. Eickhoff, Welshpool
Genny Bove, Wreccsam
Rachel Gaster, Llanidloes
Steph Butler, Llanidloes
Sue Prince, Llanidloes
Issidy Hafner, Llanfechain
Eva Roberts, Llanfyllin
Garmon Roberts, Mold
Andy Warren, Llanidloes
Rod Attrill, Llanarth
Moiria Attrill, Llanarth
Karin Reiter, Llanidloes
David Cooper, Swansea
Lucy McIlroy, New Quay
Shirley Hooson, Llanidloes
Alyson Donovan, Haverfordwest
Judith Davies, Llandovery
Cllr. Paul James, Aberystwyth
Alan Blood, Caersws

Mark Strong, Aberystwyth
Joan Thomas, Haverfordwest
Eryl Thomas, Haverfordwest
P. Richter, Staylitttle
D.M.Thomas, Gilfachreda
E. Matthewson, Gilfachreda
J. Ayling, Llawr-y-Glyn
P.Hughes, Prestigne
S. Boulenger, New Radnor
Ellen ap Gwyn, Talybont
Michelle Crowther, Wreccsam
Alan Selkiale, Llanidloes
Simon Flemming, Cwmbran
Harry Love, Staylitttle

With thanks to **Cathy Madge** for organising the seminar and compiling this report.