

**CENELEC/ETSI JOINT WORKING GROUP ON
EMC OF CONDUCTED TRANSMISSION NETWORKS**

**CONFIRMED MINUTES OF 10th MEETING OF THE JWG ON
17 AND 18 MARCH 2004 AT ETSI, SOPHIA ANTIPOLIS**

Present:-

Mr Ronald Storrs	Chairman
Mr John Ryan	Secretary

CENELEC/TC46X -

CENELEC TC65 -

CENELEC/TC205
Mr Per Wigren SE

CENELEC/SC 205A
Dr Paul Brown GB
Mr Michel Goldberg FR
Dr John Newbury GB
Mr Bernd Wirth DE

CENELEC /TC 209
Mr Carston Engelke DE
Mr Eberhard Gauger DE

CENELEC /TC210
Mr Bernard Després FR
Mr Jacques Delaballe FR
Dr Bernd Sisolefsky DE
Mr Christian Verholt DK
Mr Wiel Zuidinga NL

CENELEC /TC 215
Mr Bjorn Fossum NO

ETSI

Mr Jean-Paul v Assche	NL
Mr Jaakko Annanpalo	FI
Mr Björn Baumann	DE
Mr Vincent Buchoux	FR
Mr Robert Buszkiewicz	NL
Mr David Court	IE
Mr Alan Dearlove	FR
Mr Jean-Luc Detrez	BE
Mr Ingobert Dittrich	DE
Mr Victor Dominguez Richards	ES
Mr Koos Fockens	NL

Mr Rainer Gehrmann	DE
Mr Mariano Giunta	IT
Mr Beniamino Gorini	IT
Mr Joe Groeger	DE
Mr Yrjö Hämäläinen	FI
Mr Ari Honkala	FI
Mr Peter Jackson	GB
Mr Pierre Kasser	FR
Mr Peter Kerry	GB
Mr Pascal Krähenbühl	CH
Mr Jürgen Lehmann	DE
Mr John Long	GB
Mr André Malitte	DE
Mr Ian Marshall	GB
Mr Claude Monney	CH
Mr Trevor Morsman	GB
Mr Yves Ollivier	FR
Mr Edmund Palkovich	AT
Mr Henry Price	GB
Mr Jens Rahbek	DK
Mr Klaus Verschuere	BE
Mr Camille Veyres	FR
Mr Helmut Werner	DE

ETSI Secretariat

Mr Bernt Mattsson

EU Commission

Mr Thierry Brefort

Guests/Observers

Mr Reinhard Gorol	DE
Mr Remy Jentgès	FR
Mr Kwie-Sing Kho	BE
Ms Annette Nielsen	DK
Mr Wendelin Reuter	DE
Mr Dale Stacey	
Mr C. J. Wansbeek	NL
Mr Mike Zwingl	AT

Apologies

Mr Robert De Vré

1. To agree the Agenda (04)10_01r10

Mr Storrs welcomed members to the 10th meeting of the Joint Working Group. He explained that his role as Chairman was to seek consensus amongst the JWG members, but if consensus was not possible then he was at liberty to seek the views of National Committees if in his opinion there would be a reasonable probability of a positive outcome to the further circulation of a draft document.

The Secretary explained that the editing group had met on 2/3 March in order to analyse the collations of CENELEC and ETSI comments and to propose solutions. The collations of comments (10_13r2, 10_14r3, 10_15r1, 10_16r3, 10_17r1, 10_18r2) had therefore been updated after this meeting with the completed observations from the editing committee. Subsequently a proposal for the draft standard had been agreed by email and edited in line with these observations and this (10_03r1) was uploaded on 13 March together with revision 10 of the agenda. The JWG agreed to proceed with this agenda.

2. Matters Arising from Meeting 9 not covered by this agenda

The Secretary said that comments on the minutes of JWG Meeting 9 had been taken into account until 5 September when (03)10_02r1, the confirmed minutes were issued.

Mr Zwingl requested that reference be made to the video-clip that was shown at the JWG of interference to radio from PLC at a trial in Austria. This was agreed.

Action items (03)10_02r1

The actions were to be completed soon after the previous meeting and therefore were not reviewed by the JWG. For completeness these are recorded below:-

The editing group checked that as far as possible the wording of the draft standard followed the CENELEC and ETSI drafting rules.

Mr Kasser supplied more technical detail for paper 09_24, which was added to the documents circulated for enquiry.

The editing group met on 16/17 July and prepared the documents for the enquiry.

The editing group considered the wording in Clause 8.

Mr Court held a meeting of the ad-hoc group after the JWG meeting and produced a list of potential safety-related frequencies appropriate for inclusion in the draft standard. These were circulated as part of the enquiry.

3. Response to Questionnaire

The Chairman said that the intention at the last JWG had been had been to circulate the questionnaire (10_04) together with the draft Harmonised Standard (10_03) and the draft annex (10_05: *Provisions for protection of safety and emergency services*) to both CENELEC NCs and ETSI NSOs with a request to co-ordinate responses so as to provide one response per country. However, whereas this could be done as an informal Secretariat Enquiry by CENELEC, under ETSI rules it had to be approved by ETSI TC ERM before a Public

Enquiry could be launched. Following the JWG meeting the approval of ERM members to go ahead was sought by email, but two members, the UK DTI and the Austrian Administration objected, which meant that any further decision would have been delayed until the next ERM meeting. It was therefore decided by the ETSI Secretariat to circulate the enquiry instead directly to ETSI members together with a collective letter. This was done at the beginning of September at the same time as the CENELEC circulation. The result was that comments were received from CENELEC National Committees and from individual ETSI members. Some responses from ETSI NSOs were also received.

One objective of the circulation had been to seek the views of individual countries so that an opinion could be formed as to how they might vote at some time in the future, which for both ETSI and CENELEC would be by an equivalent voting procedure weighted by country. It was much easier to interpret the comments received from CENELEC NCs on a country basis than those from individual ETSI members.

The Chairman referred the JWG to the summary paper by Mr De Vré (*10_20 Short analysis of the CENELEC and ETSI answers and comments to the JWG draft for telecom networks*). He asked members in turn whether the analysis was correct in respect of which options had been selected by their respective countries and members indicated that they were in correct.

He said that on this basis there was a weighted majority from CENELEC NCs in favour of Option 2 (see 10_21 Key points from JWG editing group), with the following weightings: Option 1 (59), Option 2 (78), and Option 3 (26). There was little support for Option 3 alone, but there was a majority in favour of a field limit (Options 2 and 3). Some responses for both ETSI and CENELEC in favour of Option 1 had also indicated that there had to be a field limit then Option 2 was preferable. The ETSI responses were much more difficult to interpret on a country basis part from the fact that national administrations tended to prefer Option 3.

The Chairman therefore proposed that the JWG should proceed with the harmonised standard to the next stage of public enquiry on the basis of Option 2, because in his opinion, based on the returns, this would most likely result in a positive response. He added that he was responding to the result of the enquiry despite the fact that Option 2 was not his own preferred choice, nor was it the choice of the Swedish committee. He understood that Radio contingent would not necessarily agree with this choice, but as there would clearly be no consensus in the JWG, he had to interpret the views of national committees.

Mr Dittrich said that to the contrary the conclusion should be that none of the proposed limits were acceptable. Mr Jackson said that there should have been an option of not approving any option. The Chairman replied that the questionnaire had been approved by the JWG. These comments would be noted, but the JWG had to accept the majority decision of the NCs.

It was noted that Germany and France did not choose any option and the UK only did so by majority. Mr Price said that the likely reasons for a committee not choosing any option was either because the committee was split or it did not want in-situ tests at all and wanted only product tests. Mr Kasser said that this could also be because some do not agree with CISPR limits, which should be changed. Mr Ollivier confirmed that the French administration wanted more work in CISPR first.

Mr Long agreed that the UK comment was by majority, but the administration did not agree with any option and therefore commented separately via ETSI. Also the comments as recorded were not strictly correct in saying that only one organisation objected to Option 1. The UK administration does not agree with conformance via the product limits and expressed that in the ETSI comments. The field limit must take precedence. Emissions from networks

are more complicated than what is on the table. It has to be what really happens in a real environment and a single line on a graph cannot represent this. He was also worried that the CENELEC returns were given precedence.

The Chairman said that CENELEC comments were not given precedence, but it was easier to deduce the national views than with ETSI. In a formal ETSI enquiry only the NSO views would be relevant, influenced by ETSI members

The JWG re-entered previous discussions at some length on the merits of Option 1 and Option 2 and whether the latter could be taken as the field equivalent to CISPR 22 or whether it would lead to a large number of interference cases. It was noted that at lower frequency ADSL is just below the CISPR 22 limits and has not resulted in many interference cases, but the same may not be true for VDSL and PLT, which are at higher frequency and use different networks. Mr Després felt that any network would be susceptible to exceeding an in-situ compliance limit at one point, unlike a product standard. Mr Fockens drew the attention of the JWG to paper 10_19, which showed a non-equivalence to the common-mode current limits. Although it is clear a majority of national committees prefer a field limit some JWG members still favour Option 1.

The Chairman referred to document 10_21r1 *Key points from JWG editing group (2/3 March 2004)*. The editing group had revised provisional meeting dates in this document that morning.

Applying the latest country weightings for the CENELEC returns the results are Option 1 (59), Option 2 (78), Option 3 (26). On this basis the Editing Group proposed that Option 2 should be used in the next stage for the harmonised standard. If there were to be a vote on the harmonised standard the same weightings would also apply to ETSI NSOs. The Chairman also pointed out that there was overwhelming support for a field limit. Mr Zwingl commented that these limits do not protect radio and therefore the JWG should not proceed on this basis.

The remaining points in relation to the new draft are:-

- The European Commission and Member States will deal with regulatory, legal and political issues. Standardisation bodies will only deal with technical issues.
- Applications of the standard to the network can apply to all or part of the network in cases where the overall network has multiple owners.
- Safety services section proposed for removal – many administrations maintained that Art 6 (89/336/EEC) covered this and they could act unilaterally. Therefore a harmonised standard is not the appropriate place.
- Aircraft measurement process should be deleted.

Mr Reuter said that he had problems with this procedure. If ETSI was making a standard relevant to ECC, then ECC should be consulted according to the co-ordination agreement. Mr Marshall said that he disagreed because ETSI and CENELEC have the responsibility for harmonised standards and ECC have been involved. Dr Siolefsky said that ECC should receive the document and it was up to ECC to influence national committees via their normal paths. The Chairman said that if the JWG went to a public enquiry with the draft HS, then it was not possible to wait until the next ECC meeting in November, but the JWG could agree to send them the document.

There was insufficient time in the meeting to refer in detail JWG(03)10_13r2 *Collation of responses from National Committees of CENELEC on JWG(03)10_04 (questionnaire)* and

JWG(03)10_14r3 *Collation of responses from ETSI Members on JWG(03)10_04 (questionnaire).*

4. Product family emission standard for telecommunication networks

10_03r1 *Product family emission standard for electronic communication networks*

The Chairman said that following the editing group meeting on 2/3 March this draft of the HS had been produced by the editing committee in line with their observations on the collations of comments (10_13r2, 10_14r3, 10_15r1, 10_16r3, 10_17r1, 10_18r2). Bearing in mind the time pressure in the meeting he proposed to focus discussions on this draft and only to refer to the collations of comments where necessary.

The Chairman proceeded to go through the document clause by clause. The first change had been to the title. The proposal was in fact to change “telecommunication network” to “electronic communication network”, both in the title and globally throughout the document. Several comments had asked for this change to be in line with the terminology in the new EMC Directive. JWG members opposed this change and preferred to revert to the wording in Mandate M313. The decision is therefore:-

Title:

Change “electronic communication” back to “telecommunication” in title and globally throughout document.

The JWG discussed the scope of the standard, and agreed that the mandate excludes equipment, but covers wired networks, including the wired component of radio network. It was agreed that the standard was not intended to cover fault conditions. Also the mandate refers to “powerlines” and not specifically the LV network. The agreed changes are :-

Scope and object

First sentence: **Add** “fixed” before “wire-line telecommunication networks” ;
Add “installed and operated as intended” before telecommunication networks ;
2nd bullet: **Change** “Low Voltage (LV) AC mains” to “electricity supply”.

The following changes to definitions were agreed:-

Definitions

Telecommunication network, second bracket: **Delete** “and 2”

Electronic communication network: **Add** “of” to last sentence before “the network”.

There were several comments requesting modification of the diagrams, including some confusion because some of the terms are used differently in other contexts such as ownership or regulatory. Mr Long requested that the diagrams be re-instated. After a long discussion it was agreed to re-instate figure 1, because this was the more generic of the two diagrams, but to make the following changes:-

Figure 1

Reduce length of arrows for “Telecom Network” to be the same as for “Network Cable”.

Remove “NTE” and combine the two boxes and call it “TTE”.

Remove the note from the diagram.

The abbreviations should be brought in line with the text:-

Abbreviations

Restore definition for NTE

Check that remaining abbreviations are used in text (editorial)

The JWG moved on to discuss Clause 4, “Assessment procedure for telecommunications networks”. The main discussion was on the first bullet point, which stated that networks were deemed to comply with this network standard if the applicable EMC product standard was met. Mr Dominguez felt that this was an “escape clause” for networks that already had product standards and that it discriminated against PLC. Dr Sisolefsky said that the German administration would also like this first bullet deleted. Some members felt that this was a regulatory statement and therefore should not be included in a harmonised standard. The Chairman said that there was a danger in unpicking the results of national comments because individual members had different views to their national committees and the bullet point should remain. National committees would have another opportunity to comment at the next stage.

The Chairman said that subclause 4.1 had been deleted because as national committees had asked for it.

The discussion moved on to the second paragraph of subclause 4.1.1 Applicability (new numbering). Dr Sisolefsky said that measurements inside industrial buildings should be excluded as in comment DE09. Mr Marshall said that a network could stretch across several industrial locations and parts cannot be excluded. Mr Verholt felt that the wording did not give protection of receivers in multiple occupancy apartments. Dr Sisolefsky said that the wording excluded measurements inside a victim apartment. Mr Després said that if a room contained Class A equipment then Class B limits could be applied outside. Mr Dominguez said that the first bullet under Clause 4, which he had called the “escape clause” allowed use of EN55022 Class A limits that other technologies could not use. The Chairman said that he felt that the national comments such as those from Germany were addressed by the present wording.

The discussion moved on to Table 2. The Chairman said that this table had been included because a field test with Option 2 limit appears to be the one that is supported by national committees. The outcome of a future public enquiry would then be quite clear. National committees had not supported Option 3.

Mr Zwingl disagreed because Option 2 limits are much higher than the planning field strength of broadcast transmitters. Therefore he proposed that NB30 would be a more acceptable limit.

Mr Groeger expressed the hope that the JWG would at some stage return to discussing the responses to the questionnaire and how these had been interpreted. However, he felt that he had to make the IARU's position on the emerging outcome of the JWG's work clear at this stage. Mr Groeger said that the IARU considered the proposed standard incorporating Option 2 limits unacceptable, as it did not accord with the essential requirements of the EMC Directive and afforded radio services inadequate protection. He stated that the IARU therefore could not support the output of the JWG and would continue to oppose it by any (legitimate) means at its disposal 'to the bitter end'.

Mr Kerry accepted that countries represented in the JWG would make their own decision, but countries not present may vote positive. Also there is the added concern that industries will use this limit to justify higher limits for the unwanted emissions from equipment.

The French and German administrations also opposed this limit. Mr Hämäläinen said that measurement trials in Finland with fields of 55 dB(μ V)/m outside buildings masked all radio reception.

The Chairman said that 10BaseT does not meet NB30, but it does meet CISPR 22 so possibly the JWG should consider a limit between the two as a compromise. He believed that in this case ducting and screening had an effect on attenuating the field generated, so that Option 2 does in fact represent a loosening of the present limits. Also if the limits were loosened, perhaps it should not be at all frequencies.

Mr Morsman said that much of BT's network was overhead and so ducting and screening were not relevant. He also believed that as the weighted response from national committees favoured Option 2 then the JWG should follow through with this to the next stage.

Mr Reuter suggested that a compromise would either be a flat limit of NB30 or Option 2 with notches. Mr Zwingl said that in PLT trials it was the small signals of radio amateurs that was most susceptible to interference and to some extent the broadcaster services. If the amateur frequencies were notched similar to HomePlug technology, this would help.

Mr Marshall said that this would be a technology dependant solution and so would not be in line with the mandate.

Mr Dominguez said that he would welcome the same limits as HomePlug, which are 15 dB higher than Option 2.

The Chairman said that he had not been able to establish a consensus on either the current draft nor on a compromise limit. He therefore felt that the only solution at the moment was to proceed to formal comment on the amended draft.

5. Provisions for protection of safety and emergency services

This was covered under Item 3 in the report from the editing group. The editing group proposed to remove this section based on the number of comments opposing this. Many administrations maintained that Art 6 (89/336/EEC) covered this and they could act unilaterally. Therefore a harmonised standard was not the appropriate place.

Note that there was some further discussion on this topic under Item 9 and the setting up of a further ad hoc group.

6. Other technical inputs

10_19 Position of Nedap concerning the proposed Product Family Emission Standard for Telecommunication Networks

10_23 Compatibility of PLC-technology and radio services: "mitigated PLC" to obtain some coexistence with radio services

10_24 Liaison from WG FM

10_25 Compatibility of PLC and CTV

These were not discussed in detail, although they were referred to in some of the discussions.

7. Proposal from the Editing Group

10_21 Key points from JWG editing group (2/3 March 2004)

This was covered under Item 3.

8. Plan for progressing the emission standard for telecommunications networks

No immediate action is proposed by the JWG on the harmonised standard. The draft produced at this meeting will be considered again at the next JWG meeting on 30 September/1 October 2004.

9. Request to develop a technical specification under Mandate M/313 10_07r1

The following papers were noted, but there was insufficient time to consider them in any detail.

10_10 *EC mandate M/313 on EMC of telecom and ICT networks, Intended proceedings on the expected documents - CENELEC*

10_11 *UK response to ETSI/CENELEC JWG on Request to Develop a Technical Specification under Mandate 313*

10_22 *Proposal for the JWG on telecom networks - Robert De Vré*

10_26 *Introduction to proposal for the JWG on telecom networks - Robert De Vré*

10_27 *Note on purpose of TS for telecom networks - Robert De Vré*

The Chairman asked Mr Brefort to introduce the subject.

Mr Brefort explained the basis for the Commission's request in the letter to CENELEC and ETSI. He observed that there are still a lot of comments on the proposed standard and probably the subject was not yet sufficiently mature for a standard that would last for the next decade. This was in fact the conclusion of the Commission 6 months ago. The Commission has at its disposal the EMC Directive for harmonised standards across the member states and other Directives to promote competition. It was decided to take the option that would allow the development of PLC in a controlled way. Member States would allow this deployment to a set of rules as a starting point only. The Commission intends therefore to issue a recommendation based on current knowledge and the request contained in the Commission's letter is for technical information to be added to the recommendation to be used as a starting point for minimal problems of compatibility. If a network is compliant with these values then it is presumed to be compliant with the EMC Directive. The recommendation also covers how a Member State can resolve complaints of interference by means of common value in a second limit that is lower than the compliance limit and which is chosen so as to have only a small probability of harmful interference but a member state can still do what is necessary to resolve a complaint. No response to the letter has yet been received from CENELEC or ETSI. If there is no response then the decision will be taken by Member States.

The Chairman said that CENELEC BT was currently meeting and he understood that the Commission's request had been accepted. Mr Mattsson said that that he understood the response from ETSI was also imminent.

Mr Dittrich said that he was aware of documented cases of interference that that had not yet been made public because while the complaints were in the hands of lawyers. He believed

that this delay should not be necessary if the interference was above the limit. The Chairman said that he was also aware of such cases, but member states are asked to monitor cases and report to the Commission. The Chairman, directing himself at Mr Brefort, requested the Commission to put pressure on national administrations to ensure open and full reporting of interference cases. Mr Brefort replied that this obligation on member states was clear in the letter.

Mr Long said that if there were allegations that administrations were hiding information on interference cases then this should be substantiated. The UK had no naturally occurring complaints on PLT and only one reported case on ADSL. However, he acknowledged that those that went actively looking for problems were likely to find them.

Mr Groeger said that as the proposed limits in the Technical Specification intended to provide the basis for the PLC trials, which, in his opinion, should more appropriately be described as full deployment by stealth, did not adequately protect radio services, he expected a large number of interference cases to arise. In the light of numerous complaints that reports about interference arising from PLC operations were being deliberately suppressed, distorted and/or ignored the IARU demanded that a proper framework be established to ensure comprehensive reporting and proper assessment of interference cases during the 'trial'. Mr Groeger emphasized that such a framework must include a campaign to publicize the nature, timing, location and possible effects of the trials as experience pointed to a clear correlation between the increasing number of interference cases being reported and the growing level of public awareness of PLC technology and its possible effects. Mr Groeger rebutted Mr Brefort's claim that the limits proposed for adoption in the technical specification conformed with the EMC directive, stating that categorically they did not.

Mr Price agreed that the recommendation should have a framework on how to proceed with the gathering of information.

The Chairman said that he felt that it was essential that monitoring of field trials should be carried out and reported in a way that would be meaningful for the future development of standards. By this he meant that information should be reported in terms of parameters that could be understood and which allowed the JWG to adjust limits as appropriate. He proposed that Mr Groeger should come up with a suggestion to the JWG as to how to have a common approach for assessing the results of field trials.

Action: Joachim Groeger

Mr Brefort said that Member States should be in doubt as to the limits and so the answer is to try it and collect data. The framework has been left to Member States, but he noted the point made. The request is a precautionary approach different than the original one in the mandate. The mandate is for all networks, but the letter is for access PLT networks alone. The letter does not specifically mention avoidance of interference, but this should be obvious.

The Chairman said that Mr Bogers had told him that the limit in the TS should be the highest that state-of-the-art PLC systems needed to operate with no mention of EMC, therefore the work could be done in ESTSI PLT or CENELEC SC205A.. Mr Dominguez confirmed that it was his understanding that the letter only referred to PLC and that it should be compatible with the current roll-out.

Mr Brefort said that if there was a lack of clarity then please ask the Commission officially to avoid confusion. The general feedback has been that the current state-of-the-art PLC is not leading to a large number of complaints.

Mr Groeger said that in the light of the considerable debate over how to interpret the Commission's letter request for a technical specification, it appeared necessary for the Commission to clarify its exact requirements by issuing a new mandate. Mr Groeger further expressed his concern at the Commission's apparent attempt to 'move the goal posts' through its letter. He pointed out that the Commission's position, as signalled in its letter, no longer appeared to be technology neutral because it quite clearly favoured PLC.

Mr Kerry asked if the Commission had any proposals for in-house PLC, which could interfere with access systems. Member States should only allow CE-marked products on the market. Mr Zwingl said that PLC modems were being CE-marked against a Technical Construction File by one Competent Body despite the fact that they were injecting above what is in the standard. Mr Long said that it was up to the manufacturer whether he wished to use a harmonised standard or a Technical Construction File.

Mr Court queried why new terms such as "harmful interference" had been used rather than "meet the Essential Requirements of the EMC Directive". Mr Brefort said that he used it because it was used in the Commission recommendation and there was no need to mention the EMCD because it is law.

Mr Groeger asked what size trial the Commission contemplated, i.e. how many PLC systems it expected to be deployed. Mr Brefort declared himself unable to detail the number of systems, the likely duration of the trials and attendant investment levels. Mr Groeger expressed his surprise at the apparent absence of proper project definition and pre-planning..

Mr Groeger further asked how the Commission intended to deal with the inevitable intense lobbying efforts by the PLC industry and their likely claims of economic loss and wholesale destruction of jobs if, as he expected, PLC systems cause widespread interference and needed to be shut down as a consequence.

Mr Brefort said that he did not know the number, but he did not expect a large number of complaints.

Mr Groeger asked if it was the Commission's intention to suspend the EMC Directive for the duration of the PLC trials, as the proposed interference limits in the technical specification patently did not comply with the essential requirements of the EMC Directive. Mr Brefort stated in response that he did not have to answer this question because the PLC trial would proceed within the constraints of the EMC Directive.

Mr Palkovich said that there had been 15 field trials in Austria with all but one shut down for economic reasons. There had been many notified interference cases (more than 100)

The Chairman said that he had concluded that the Technical Specification should be produced in the JWG and this would contain the compliance limit to be used as an interim measure in the roll-out. He believed that the Commission recommendation had chosen NB30 as the complaints handling limit. The JWG therefore had to come to a conclusion on the compliance limit to be used in the Technical Specification that would in turn be referenced in the Commission's recommendation. The CENELEC responses on the Harmonised Standard favoured Option 2, but there was an ETSI majority (at least for administrations) for Option 3. This meant that there could be opposing responses to a public enquiry, which would have to be approved by ETSI ERM. He therefore proposed to put the choice of field limit for the Harmonised Standard on hold until the result for the Technical Specification was known.

The JWG discussed the compliance limit for the Technical Specification. Views were once again divided between Option 1, 2 and 3 and various compromises were discussed.

Mr Veyres proposed electric field measurements at 10 m above 5 MHz and magnetic field measurements at 3 m at lower frequencies, but there was no support. The Chairman said that as none of the compromises had been accepted then the alternative was to remain with Option 2 for the TS. However a show of hands showed a majority in the room for Option 1.

Draft Commission Recommendation

The Chairman said that he had only just realised that many of those present in the room had not seen the text of the Commission's draft recommendation. He asked for it to be projected so that the main points could be explained. Mr Brefort agreed that the text could be made public.

Secretarial note: This is now document 10_28

Mr Brefort explained the main points in the draft. He said that this was the input document to the recent Commission workshop. There had been just a few comments from national administrations and these would be taken into account before the document went to COCOM in May.

He said that the important article was Article 3. If there is a suspected non-compliance the administration should raise this with the Network Operator and use appropriate measures to bring the network into compliance. Until such time as this is a harmonised standard then networks in accordance with the radiated limits in Part A of the Annex (the TS) are considered as compliant. Member States may also take additional measures under Article 6 of the EMC Directive where there is a likelihood of harmful interference and they should then consider applying the limits established in Part B of the Annex, which are presumed to be equivalent to NB30. Article 4 deals with mitigation measures that operators are encouraged to provide. The remaining articles propose that information should be fed back to CENELEC and ETSI in order to contribute modifications to the draft HS and the TS. Member States should report on a yearly basis to the Commission, starting 1 January 2005, on their experiences as regards the deployment and operations of powerline communications in their country and provide any relevant measurement data.

The JWG discussed the consequences of this at length, but no consensus view emerged. Mr Zwingl and Mr Groeger both objected to Article 2, which called on Member States to lift any remaining legal restrictions on companies to deploy powerline communications networks and services, because this would have a detrimental effect on radio and did not fit the EMC Directive. Mr Brefort disagreed with this.

Regarding the collection of data from the trials, Mr Brefort said that the detail was not yet decided, but it would be passed to the JWG to elaborate.

Mr Groeger suggested taking a vote on the value of the radiated limit for Part A of the annex to establish the feeling in the room. The Chairman agreed with this but requested that members should try to reflect the view of their national committees as far as possible. 21 persons supported Option 2 and 20 persons objected to Option 2.

The Chairman said that the Commission had not realised that Technical Specification was a formal term in ETSI and CENELEC and were prepared to take what was "on the table" at the end of the meeting. He asked the Commission to confirm this.

Mr Brefort confirmed that the Commission would take what was available and would use it or not according to the view of Member States.

Mr Gauger was concerned that the JWG would no longer have control of this document. The Chairman said that it still would go to Member States for approval.

Mr Dominguez said that the ETSI and CENELEC PLC committees should be consulted to ensure that it was compatible with state-of-the-art PLC. The Chairman said that the ETSI and CENELEC Secretariats would deal with the formal procedure.

Mr Court proposed that a similar method of measurement, including the type of detectors employed in the measurement process (e.g. quasi peak and average), should be the same in Part B as proposed for Part A of the Annex to the draft Recommendation. This was agreed. Also more clarification was required on which frequencies should be protected.

Mr Brefort agreed to respond on this.

Note: All resulting actions are recorded under Item 12 below.

10. Plan for progressing the technical specification under Mandate M/313

See Item 12 below.

11. Other inputs

10_08 Status of MPT 1570 – Ministerial Statement

The document was noted.

12. Actions for next meeting

Mr Groeger will propose a common approach to the JWG for assessing the results of field trials so that the information would be meaningful for the future development of standards and expressed in terms of parameters that could be understood and which would allow the JWG to adjust limits as appropriate.

Action: Joachim Groeger

The editing group will meet on 19 March 2004 to tidy up the draft HS produced under Item 4 and to make editorial changes appropriate for a Technical Specification for access PLT systems.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

The draft TS will be forwarded to ETSI and CENELEC Secretariats for a decision on further processing. The accompanying letter will indicate that the document represents a majority view at the meeting and that there was considerable opposition from some members and observers.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

The ETSI and CENELEC Secretariats will be requested to remind the Commission of the view expressed by the JWG that a similar method of measurement, including the type of detectors employed in the measurement process (e.g. quasi peak and average), should be the same in Part B as proposed for Part A of the Annex to the draft Recommendation.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

The ETSI and CENELEC Secretariats will be requested to notify the Commission that the JWG would appreciate clarification on the required treatment of safety services in the Harmonised Standard under preparation in the JWG, in response to Mandate 313. There appears to be some confusion in the context of Article 6 of the EMC Directive where some Member States believe safety services should be treated only at the national level; other administrations and information from CEPT/ECC however have suggested that harmonised limits in 'harmonised frequency bands' utilised in Europe for safety services e.g. for civil aviation, should be included in the harmonised standard.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

An Ad Hoc Task Force will be set up to further consider safety and emergency frequencies and in particular which of these frequencies are harmonised across Europe. The Task Force will report at the next JWG meeting.

Action: Joachim Groeger

A liaison statement will be prepared in order to inform ECC of the results of this meeting enclosing these minutes, the draft TS, the draft HS together with a short explanation of the lack of consensus with reference to the minutes and the dates of the next meeting.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

The JWG will meet on 30 September and 1 October 2004 at ETSI to further develop the harmonised standard and to receive input from the ad hoc task force on safety and emergency frequencies.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

13. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

14. Dates and place of next meeting

The next meeting will take place on **30 September and 1 October 2004 at ETSI**. The meeting will start at 13:30 on 30 September and will finish by 17:30 on 1 October.

Secretarial Note: At the time of confirmation of these minutes the proposed date of the next JWG meeting was under review and will most probably change. Members will be informed of any decision on a new date in due course.

Meeting Documents

Documents for meeting 10 may be found at :-

<http://docbox.etsi.org/erm/ermemc/JWG/meeting10/>

Document list

Reference	Title	Source
10_01r10	Meeting Agenda (revision 10)	JWG Secretary
10_02r1	CONFIRMED MINUTES of 9th meeting of the JWG on 23-24 June 2003 at ETSI, Sophia Antipolis France	JWG Secretary
10_03	Product family emission standard for telecommunication networks	JWG Secretary
10_03r1	Product family emission standard for electronic communication networks	JWG Secretary
10_04	Questionnaire relating to the draft Product Family emission standard for telecommunication networks	JWG Secretary
10_05	Provisions for protection of safety and emergency services	JWG Secretary
10_06	Draft EN 302 262 + questionnaire (As above in ETSI format)	ETSI Secretariat
10_07r1	Request to develop a technical specification under mandate M313	European Commission
10_08	Status of MPT 1570 – Ministerial Statement	The UK Parliament
10_10	EC MANDATE M/313 ON EMC OF TELECOM AND ICT NETWORKS Intended proceedings on the expected documents	CENELEC
10_11	UK response to ETSI/CENELEC JWG on Request to Develop a Technical Specification under Mandate 313	UK National Committee
10_13r2	Collation of responses from National Committees of CENELEC on JWG(03)10_04	JWG Secretary
10_14r3	Collation of responses from ETSI Members on JWG(03)10_04	JWG Secretary
10_14r4	Collation of responses from ETSI Members on JWG(03)10_04 (uploaded during the meeting with “Secrétariat à l’Industrie” changed to “Ministère Délégué à l’Industrie”.	JWG Secretary
10_15r1	Collation of comments from National Committees of CENELEC on JWG(03)10_03	JWG Secretary
10_16r3	Collation of comments from ETSI Members on JWG(03)10_03	JWG Secretary
10_17r1	Collation of comments from National Committees of CENELEC on JWG(03)10_05	JWG Secretary
10_18r2	Collation of comments from ETSI Members on JWG(03)10_05	JWG Secretary
10_19	Position of Nedap concerning the proposed Product Family Emission Standard for Telecommunication Networks	Nedap
10_20	Short analysis of the CENELEC and ETSI answers and comments to the JWG draft for telecom networks	Robert De Vré
10_21	Key points from JWG editing group (2/3 March 2004)	JWG Secretary
10_22	Proposal for the JWG on telecom networks	Robert De Vre
10_23	Compatibility of PLC-technology and radio services: “mitigated PLC” to obtain some coexistence with radio services	Deutsche Telekom
10_24	Liaison from WG FM	Wendelin Reuter

Reference	Title	Source
10_25	Compatibility of PLC and CTV	FICORA
10_26	Introduction to proposal for the JWG on telecom networks	Robert De Vré
10_27	Note on purpose of TS for telecom networks	Robert De Vré
Uploaded during JWG Meeting		
10_28	European Commission recommendation on broadband communications through powerlines	European Commission
Uploaded during JWG Editing Group meeting on 19 March 2004		
10_29	Draft technical specification for powerline access systems	JWG Secretary
10_30	Letter from JWG Chairman to ETSI and CENELEC Secretariats	JWG Secretary