

ICBEN Business Meeting Minutes

Meeting of 2nd December 2021 (online on Zoom)

Present: Mark Brink, Charlotte Clark, Dirk Schreckenberg; Michael Smith; Sofie Fredriksson; Mikael Ogren; Benjamin Fenech; Jordis Wothge; Mathias Basner; Kerstin Persson Waye; Lex Brown; Ravi Reddy; Thu Lan Nguyen; John Everett Marsh; Tony Brammer; Jorunn Evandt; Kristina Erdelyi; Truls Gjestland; Elise van Kempen; Sabine Janssen; Norm Bronner; Irene van Kamp.

Apologies: Barbara Griefahn; Soames Job; Stephen Stansfeld; Peter Lercher; Sabine Schlittmeier; Adrian Fuente; Jorunn Evandt; Sarah Verhulst

Minutes prepared by Charlotte Clark

Agenda

1. Definition of noise
2. Changes to the ICBEN Constitution
3. Overview papers
4. ICBEN survey data repository
5. ISO Non-Acoustic Factors working group
6. ICBEN Belgrade 2023
7. AOB
 - a. Team structure
 - b. Team events
 - c. Other

Item	Action	Date completed
Housekeeping		
a. A list of Executive Committee members was shown and will be shared with the Executive Committee. Please send any updates to contact details to Charlotte Clark by Friday 17 th December.	All	
b. The minutes from the June Business Meeting will be reshared. Please let Charlotte Clark know of any amendments by Friday 17 th December.	CC to share minutes. All to review	
c. It was noted that for voting during the Business Meeting that a majority of two-thirds was required.		
1. Definition of Noise		
a. Mark Brink led discussions of whether ICBEN should adopt a definition of noise. Daniel Fink's paper on the definition of noise had been shared prior to the meeting. Mark Brink proposed adding a definition to the ICBEN constitution. Mathias Basner outlined the reasoning behind adding in the term 'harmful' to the definition. Noise can be harmful even if not unwanted. Kerstin Persson-Waye suggested that the definition could encompass just harmful sound, to remove the subjective component of sound as being unwanted. Also suggested adding 'potentially harmful' but others felt this definition may weaken the argument about the importance of noise is if was described as 'potentially harmful'. Ben Fenech suggested that the term 'potentially' is not good for those		

<p>working in policy as it potentially weakens the impact and there is plenty of evidence that noise causes harm. Kerstin Persson-Waye discussed that whether noise is 'harmful' depends on the dose, the level and the situation. The term 'potentially' is more nuanced. Mark Brink set out that he would like ICBEN to have an official definition, similar to the WHO definition of health, that sets out the official position for defining noise. Norm Bronner set out that the term 'unwanted' could potentially be problematic. Lex Brown argued that 'unwanted' was an important part of the definition as current policy and regulation use this definition and dropping the term could cause issues. Lex Brown supported adding 'harmful' and use of the 'and/or' language. Dirk Schreckenbergr agreed that keeping 'unwanted' in the definition was important as organisations already rely on this definition and cautioned against treating annoyance separately from health effects. Noise is harmful sound, and that definition complies with WHO approach. Mathias Basner discussed the importance of getting the definition right, as it impacts the whole field and will have downstream effects. Suggested it might need further exploration in an ICBEN publication. John Marsh discussed how the definitions proposed might not work well for cognitive listening studies. If people choose to listen to something it can be difficult to describe it as noise in the cognitive field. Kerstin Persson Waye supported the proposal for a discussion paper as there needs to be a good basis for the wording chosen. Lex Brown cautioned against waiting for a discussion paper to inform the definition, as a definition is needed now and ICBEN need to be at the forefront. Tony Brammer discussed how the definition might work in light of the use of noise to mask sound in office settings. Tony Brammer was not sure that the definition worked for these contexts. Mathias Basner suggested we be brave and adopt a definition, but then follow up with a discussion paper to justify the decision. Elise van Kempen discussed how the definition would not be appropriate for positive sounds or restorative effects. Others argued that ICBEN is focused on negative effect and Mathias Basner pointed out that the current definition also has these difficulties. Kerstin Persson Waye suggested that the discussion today had highlighted that further time was needed to discuss. Benjamin Fenech highlighted that an ICBEN publication would need to cover different ground from the Fink paper: are we sure that the Fink paper doesn't inform our discussion. A number of polls were then held to agree future actions.</p>		
<p>b. Do we want to vote on adding a definition of noise to the Constitution today: Now or later (20 people participated). Now= 13 Later=7: 13/20 65% voted for 'now' just short of the 2/3 majority required.</p>		
<p>c. Voting on potential definitions of noise (individuals could vote for as many of the definitions as they agreed with – 21 people participated) A: noise is unwanted or harmful sound (31%) B1: noise is unwanted and/or harmful sound (36%)</p>		

	B2: noise is harmful and/or unwanted sound (17%) C: noise is potentially harmful sound (12%) D: noise is harmful sound (5%) This meant that definition A and B1 went forward for the next poll.		
d.	Please vote for one definition (21 people participated) A: noise is unwanted or harmful sound (19%) B1: noise is unwanted and/or harmful sound (81%)		
e.	Please vote for whether we should decide in 6 months after a discussion paper has been presented (20 participants): Decide now whether to include the definition (B1) in the constitution (50%) Decide later (50%)		
f.	The results of the polls informed the decision that we would further review the Fink paper; consider preparing our own discussion paper; and taking another vote at the Executive Committee.		
g.	Please let Charlotte Clark know if you are interested in contributing to a discussion paper by 17 th December	All	
h.	Charlotte Clark to set up Doodle poll for meeting date in 6 months' time.	Charlotte Clark to set up Doodle poll.	
2. Changes to the Constitution			
i.	Mark Brink and Charlotte Clark presented an updated word document with track changes to the constitution. These changes remove gender-specific terminology; tidying presentation; clarify attendance and voting at Business Meetings.		
j.	Tony Brammer raised an issue with the 'term' inadequately in Article IV, Section 3 of the constitution suggesting less negative terminology e.g., 'not performing the duties of office'. It was agreed to postpone the discussion of this issue to the next meeting in 6 months.	Charlotte Clark to add to agenda for next meeting.	
k.	A poll was held on the proposed amendments to the Constitution and the action was carried. Please vote if you are happy to accept the amendments to the constitution (21 participants) Yes (100%) No (0%)	Charlotte Clark to share finalised version of the constitution. Mark Brink to update ICBEN website.	
3. Overview papers			
l.	Mark Brink introduced a discussion of the missing overview papers from Team Chairs/Co-chairs at ICBEN 2021, highlighting the importance of these papers and suggesting that their requirement might be added to the Constitution. There was general support for the papers but Irene van Kamp highlighted issues (particularly with IJERPH) of trying to publish these papers after the conference, as journal editors often consider the material plagiarised, even though written by the same authors. Editors can also consider the material to have already been published. Mathias Basner highlighted that previously a special issue of Noise and Health had		

<p>published reviews from one conference. Mark Brink mentioned that Goran Belojevic who is organising the Belgrade 2023 conference has plans to publish some conference material in Noise and Health (Goran is Editor). Charlotte Clark asked whether Team Chairs/Co-chairs had been clear on the requirement for the summary paper?</p>		
<p>m. A poll was held (19 participants) on whether to add a policy position that we expect Team Chairs to produce an overview paper prior to the IC BEN conference: Agree (95%) Disagree 5%. It was therefore agreed to add a sentence on the requirement to the 'Agreed policy positions for IC BEN' section of the Constitution setting out the requirement to produce an overview paper prior to the IC BEN Congress.</p>	<p>Charlotte Clark to update on latest version of the Constitution. Mark Brink to upload to IC BEN website.</p>	
<p>4. IC BEN survey data repository</p>		
<p>n. Thu Lan Nguyen (Chair Team 6) presented on work to date developing the annoyance survey data repository. (See slides). The repository aims to host original data from annoyance surveys internationally, to enable synthesised analyses to be carried out. There followed discussions of data privacy issues. Mark Brink discussed how issues had been checked with legal counsellors but that not all issues had been resolved. Dirk Schreckenber g noted that 'informed consent' was needed to be able to use the data from an annoyance survey for the repository. A task force is currently working on the repository (Thu Lan Nguyen, Mark Brink, Jordis Wothge, Dirk Schreckenber g) and the plan is to set out recommendations for those conducting surveys about how to get consent to cover legal requirements. Irene van Kamp and Elise van Kempen spoke about their experiences with data privacy issues within the EU Equal-life project. It was agreed that all parties would have a further discussion outside the Business Meeting to discuss data privacy issues further.</p>	<p>Thu Lan Nguyen to follow up with Irene van Kamp/Elise van Kempen and other interested parties to discuss data access issues further.</p>	
<p>o. Truls Gjestland stated his support for the initiative, cautioning that in the slides it should be acknowledged that Jim Fields had an archive of surveys before TNO and that this archive formed part of the subsequent TNO archive.</p>	<p>Thu Lan Nguyen to update in further versions of the slides about the repository.</p>	
<p>p. Mathias Basner cautioned about not being able to get some identifiable data into the repository (e.g., sex; age) as the data may not be very useful without this type of information. It may be possible to offer two versions of the repository (as is often done for sensitive data) with the more sensitive data requiring an application process and ethics/IRB permission to ensure that data is handled properly. Could a secure site be set up to host the data?</p>		
<p>5. ISO Non-Acoustic Factors working group</p>		

q.	Benjamin Fenech (Chair Team 9) presented on the work setting up the ISO Non-Acoustic Factors working group (See slides). The slides include a working definition of non-acoustic factors and scope of work.		
r.	Benjamin highlighted the need for a secretary for the working group who would engage and liaise with the ISO Member States. Please contact Benjamin if you can help with this role.	All – please contact Benjamin if you can provide secretarial support for the project.	
6. ICBEN Belgrade 2023			
s.	Mark Brink gave a brief update on planning for Belgrade 2023.		
7. AOB – Team Structure			
t.	Mark Brink summarised that potential changes to the Team Structure had been discussed in the last Business Meeting. As this is not a pressing issue it was suggested that further discussion of potential changes to the Team Structure be postponed until we can discuss again face-to-face at the Belgrade 2023 Business Meeting.	Charlotte Clark to add to Agenda for Business Meeting in Belgrade 2023.	
7. AOB – Team Events			
u.	Jordis Wothge described plans in Team 6 to hold a workshop in 2022 to strengthen activities and communication within the Team. Other Teams are encouraged to host similar events.		
7. AOB – Other			
v.	Elise van Kempen raised the issue of the Teams inputting into other noise conferences. It was suggested that ICA (International Congress on Acoustics) and Internoise make good options in-between the ICBEN conference.		
w.	Truls Gjestland gave an update on Larry Finegold's health and is in contact with Larry's relatives.		
x.	Mark Brink described ongoing work funded by WHO Europe updating the disability weights for use in Burden of Disease assessments for noise effects on health.		