# CORA-Description of the ICNIRP Report

## 1. About

**Source**

Guideline for limiting exposure to time varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields (up to 300 GHz).

Health Physics 74 (4): 494-522; 1998

**Link**


**Supporting information**

[http://www.icnirp.de](http://www.icnirp.de)

## 2. Content and Mandate

### Objectives

To provide advice on health hazards of non-ionizing radiation exposure

### EMF spectrum covered

0-300GHz

### Status of report and authorship

ICNIRP is a non-governmental organisation, formally recognized by WHO, ILO and EU as the international independent advisory body for non-ionizing radiation protection. It carries out its work in collaboration with and on demand of a number of national and international organisations.

### Funding

Non profit organisation, funded by IRPA, national governments, publication sales some other sources, except industry.

### Accountability

For this report no special mandate was given: ICNIRP gives advice as a scientific organisation

### Summary

ICNIRP evaluates peer reviewed research on EMF effects and deduces recommendations for limit values. Only in the years after this recommendation details about the organisation and the evaluation scheme became available on the internet.

## 3. Authorship

### Selection of Members

ICNIRP has 14 main members and 4 standing committees with about 8 members each, the selection criteria are given on the internet page.

### Institutional background of members

Institutional background of the members of the expert group are given on the internet site [http://www.icnirp.de/sc.htm](http://www.icnirp.de/sc.htm)

### Expertise

Expertise required to fulfil the mandate and expertise available in the team of authors are given in the selection criteria on the internet page [http://www.icnirp.de/commission.htm](http://www.icnirp.de/commission.htm)

### Impartiality

According to ICNIRP the ICNIRP members work free of vested commercial interest, they are not paid for their work. Only travel and necessary costs for attendance at meetings are reimbursed to them

### Disclosure

Names of the authors are on the publication, affiliations on the ICNIRP site. Members formally declare any activity that might imply a conflict of interests detrimental to ICNIRP's status as an independent advisory body. The absence of conflicts is evaluated and guaranteed by the Chairperson.

### Summary

For the 1998 report not all details listed above were known publicly, nowadays these details are on the internet.
### 4. Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature search</strong></th>
<th>As a general rule, only peer reviewed original papers or technical reports are used, however selection process is not described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality assurance</strong></td>
<td>Criteria published by Repacholi and Stolwijk 1992 and Repacholi and Cardis 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighing of evidence</strong></td>
<td>Criteria published by Repacholi and Stolwijk 1992 and Repacholi and Cardis 1997 are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation activities</strong></td>
<td>Internal consultation plus (nowadays also) external consultation as given on internet site and on paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consensus finding</strong></td>
<td>Information about formal procedures/rules for consensus finding are not published. The report does not contain a minority opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Except for the consensus finding process all other assessment processes are described.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Differentiation between biological and health effects</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unbiased descriptions</strong></td>
<td>The report does provide a balanced discussion of the pros and cons. The strengths and weaknesses of the evidence is indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence-based conclusions</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plain language summary</strong></td>
<td>No, the whole report is in scientific language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unbiased summary</strong></td>
<td>Yes, the summary is balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The paper contains a balanced evaluation of the scientific evidence, the text is in scientific language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>