

**12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science CFRS**

Académie des sciences – Institut de France & ICSU Secretariat

Paris, France

5-7 March 2012

**Meeting Report**

**Present** Bengt Gustafsson (Chair), Ashima Anand, Fatma Attia, David Black (*ex officio*), Carol Corillon, Alexander Kaminskii, Peter Mahaffy, Sylvia Rumball, Akilagpa Sawyerr, John Sulston, Ovid Tzeng, David Vaux, Moisés Wasserman, Menahem Yaari, Jiansheng Zhang

**ICSU Secretariat** Roger Pfister, Carthage Smith (*ex officio*)

**1. Welcoming remarks and introduction**

All members attended this meeting, which was the last reunion of CFRS in its present composition.

Prior to the formal meeting, CFRS met with members from the French Academy's committees "Science, éthique et société" and "Défense des Hommes de Science" (CODHOS) to discuss matters of common interest. The Annex to this report summarises the deliberations that took place on the premises of the Académie des sciences, the ICSU National Member in France.

The Chair welcomed David Black as a new member (*ex officio*) of CFRS. Nominated by the Australian Academy of Science, he was elected as Secretary General by the 30<sup>th</sup> ICSU General Assembly in Rome in September 2011.

**Decision**

To thank the French Académie des sciences for hosting the joint meeting with members of the Académie and the first half day of the CFRS meeting, and to thank Marie-Lise Chanin for arranging this.

**2. Adoption of agenda**

Members were reminded that while the meeting report would be made public, the meeting documents were strictly confidential and must not be used beyond the Committee

**Decisions**

- to adopt the agenda;
- to note that meeting documents were strictly confidential.

**3. Report of the 11<sup>th</sup> CFRS meeting and matters arising**

The Committee took note of the report of the previous CFRS meeting, held in Rome. All issues that arose from that meeting would be dealt with during the current meeting.

The possibility of a joint workshop with the Commission on Research Ethics and Bioethics of the Italian National Research Council (CNR), such as considered at the meeting between CFRS and the CNR Commission on the occasion of the 11<sup>th</sup> CFRS meeting in Rome, will be carried forward to the next CFRS meeting.

**Decision**

To note the meeting report.

**4. 30<sup>th</sup> ICSU General Assembly: CFRS's presentation and Statute 5**

On 29 September 2011, in Rome, the Chair presented the Committee's achievements for 2009-11 and its work plan for 2012-14 to the General Assembly. Both documents were approved and well received by the ICSU Membership. The proposed changes to Statute 5, including its title and some of the wording, sparked a lively and thorough debate among the participants. After the vote on the title, deliberations reached an impasse because a number of proposed changes could not be properly addressed *in situ* in plenary. It was therefore decided to form an *ad hoc* working group composed of seven people to review the wording. With the CFRS Chair and C Smith among them, it was ensured that the proposal to the Assembly the next day preserved the essence of what the Committee had proposed initially. The vote on the revised wording was unanimous. By embracing this change, all ICSU Members agreed to uphold and promote the newly listed responsibilities, which had been the aim of CFRS's work from the outset.

In its activities, ICSU was now distinguishing between the universality of science and the Principle of the Universality of Science, which is based on Statute 5. The former incorporates issues related to the conduct of science, capacity building, science education, access to data and information and the relationship between science and society. Underpinning this broader universality concept is the Principle of the Universality of Science, which is more narrowly focused on the freedom and responsibility aspects of the conduct of science.

At the meeting, CFRS members expressed the view that Statute 5 and the concept of the Principle of the Universality of Science should continue to be elaborated by the Committee in future.

The incoming Committee would discuss the contents of the future CFRS work plan in detail at the next meeting.

**Decision**

To note the new wording of ICSU Statute 5.

**5. CFRS section & "Freedom and Responsibility Portal" on the ICSU website**

In Rome, CFRS members were presented with the newly established "Freedom and Responsibility Portal" on the ICSU website. In following up members' comments, links were added to organisations where appropriate, and an RSS facility was in place, related to the "CFRS Blog".

The ICSU Communications and IT section had put in place tools allowing the retrieval of statistical information on access to the ICSU website, including the CFRS section and the "Freedom and Responsibility Portal". The data for the period 1 March 2011 to February 2012 presented to the Committee at the meeting indicated a relatively weak frequency of visits, with peaks after the publication of the "Freedom and Responsibility Portal" in July and around the ICSU General Assembly in September. No inputs were received through the blog facility

that had been added to the Advisory Notes and compiled human rights documents, even though the “CFRS Blog” entries were harvested on the ICSU Facebook page (<https://www.facebook.com/InternationalScience>) and in spite of the Secretariat’s initiatives to encourage relevant stakeholders to provide their comments.

At the meeting, CFRS members proposed several measures with a view to increase the traffic on the website, namely: 1. to review the indexing so that CFRS would appear higher on the list of Google search results; 2. to contact committees among the ICSU Membership of relevance to CFRS’s work, i.e. ethics and human rights committees, and suggest they add links on their websites to the ICSU website; and, 3. to add CFRS and the “Freedom and Responsibility Portal” in Wikipedia’s entries on “Freedom”, “Responsibility” and “ICSU”.

More generally, Committee members proposed that the newly composed CFRS should consider developing a strategy on how to communicate its work more effectively. Other than through the Internet, this could include dissemination at general assemblies of international scientific unions or other ICSU-sponsored meetings.

To encourage a discussion on the results of CFRS’s work, namely the Advisory Notes, CFRS members were invited to add their comments on the blogs in place.

#### **Decisions**

- to ask the Secretariat to implement suggested measures to increase the visibility of CFRS’s work on the Internet;
- to propose to the new CFRS to develop a communication strategy;
- to invite CFRS members to add comments to the blog facility.

## **6. Study on SCFCS/CFRS**

The study by Eleanor Wittmer on the work of CFRS and its predecessor organisations has further progressed since the update provided at the last meeting. During October and November last year, she contacted several Committee members with a questionnaire, responses to which would be integrated anonymously into the final thesis. In December, Ms Wittmer sent the Secretariat provisional drafts of sections of the study for information and feedback.

The Secretariat was asked to maintain contact with Ms Wittmer and inform the Committee about the further progress of the study as appropriate.

#### **Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to inform the Committee about progress of Ms Wittmer’s study as appropriate.

## **7. Interaction with other academy institutions**

### **7.1 World Science Forum, 16-19 November 2011**

The latest biannual World Science Forum, organised by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and co-sponsored by ICSU, adopted a declaration that contained a recommendation on the “Responsible and ethical conduct of research and innovation”, with the aim to produce a “Universal Code”.

At the CFRS meeting, C Smith clarified that in spite of its sponsorship of the Forum, ICSU was not the owner of that declaration. In discussing if and in what way this affected ICSU’s Statute 5 and therefore CFRS’s mandate, it was reaffirmed that Statute 5 formed the basis for the Committee’s activities and should continue to be elaborated further and concretised.

For that purpose, it was decided that the CFRS booklet “Freedom, Responsibility and Universality of Science” produced in 2008 should be revised and updated by the incoming CFRS. This was a more realistic approach than trying to produce a prescriptive universal code.

#### **Decisions**

- to note the declaration of the World Science Forum;
- to propose to the newly composed CFRS to revise and update the 2008 booklet “Freedom, Responsibility and Universality of Science”.

## **8. Statements and Advisory Notes**

### **8.1 ICSU Statement on Gene Patenting**

At its meeting on 25 September 2011, the ICSU Executive Board considered the ICSU Statement on Gene Patenting, finalised by CFRS in Rome, and approved it without any changes. The statement had since been made available on the ICSU website.

#### **Decision**

To note the publication of the revised ICSU Statement on Gene Patenting on the ICSU website.

### **8.2 CFRS Advisory Note “Sharing scientific data, with a focus on developing countries”**

In Rome, CFRS approved the final version of this Advisory Note, which CODATA and WDS had previously endorsed. Because this joint document was relevant for developing countries, the Secretariat sent it to the ICSU Regional Offices for their comments and remarks. Following their tacit approval, the Advisory Note was published on the ICSU website at the end of November and had since been added to the blog facility. In order to encourage scientists to support the issues contained in the Advisory Note, the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific further issued a news article on its website.

#### **Decision**

To note the publication of this CFRS Advisory Note on the ICSU website.

### **8.3 CFRS Advisory Note “Academia-Industry Partnerships”**

This Advisory Note was related to the international workshop “Private Sector – Academia Interaction” that took place in Sigtuna, Sweden, in November 2011, co-sponsored by CFRS and The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. Based on the discussions in Sigtuna, benefiting from contributions by Uno Svedin from the Stockholm Resilience Centre, and taking into account the workshop report (agenda item 13.2), C Smith produced a first draft that was circulated to CFRS for comments. Prior to the present CFRS meeting, the Advisory Note and the workshop report were also sent to all workshop participants for feedback, emphasising that both documents would be issued under the responsibility of CFRS. The version of the Advisory Note put to CFRS at the present meeting incorporated the responses received from CFRS members, but not all workshop attendees.

The discussion showed that it was important to adapt the Advisory Note so that it reflected that academia-industry relationships differed according to disciplines and countries, and especially between the prevailing conditions in the North and the South. Additionally, it would

be relevant to indicate that there was a need for a new era of academia-industry relationships with new business models. Finally, the Advisory Note should be linked more clearly to Statute 5. Another issue concerned the relevance of this Advisory Note for ICSU's interaction with industry and the private sector. It could serve, in particular, as a point of departure for the collaboration ICSU was seeking during its 10-year "Future Earth" initiative. For this purpose, it might be fed into the work of the ICSU Executive Board and the Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR).

In conclusion, the Chair agreed to review the Advisory Note in collaboration with C Corillon, P Mahaffy and C Smith and circulate the revised version to the Committee for comments. It was considered important, though, not to move too far away from the consensus reached in Sigtuna. In addition, C Corillon and P Mahaffy were asked to write an Executive Summary for the workshop report that accompanied the Advisory Note (agenda item 13.2).

#### **Decisions**

- to ask the Chair to review the Advisory Note in collaboration with C Corillon, P Mahaffy and C Smith;
- to ask the Secretariat to circulate the revised version to CFRS for comments;
- to ask C Corillon and P Mahaffy to write an Executive Summary for the workshop report;
- to ask D Black and C Smith to consider how these documents might be used in the broader context of developing ICSU-industry relations.

## **9. Freedom of science: generic issues**

### **9.1 Independence and freedom of academies: update**

#### **9.1.1 United Kingdom**

In Rome, CFRS considered the agreement, established in July 2011, between the UK Border Agency (UKBA) and the country's academic bodies regarding the vetting visas of foreign scientists who want to work in the UK. In discussing the implications on the role and independence of academies, there was agreement that this scheme was problematic because it was in conflict with the Principle of the Universality of Science. Implementing the decision at that meeting, the Chair and C Smith wrote to The Royal Society, expressing CFRS's concerns about this arrangement and asking to be kept informed about the results of monitoring its impact.

#### **Decision**

To note the correspondence with the Royal Society.

#### **9.1.2 Turkey**

At the last meeting, CFRS noted with concern developments in Turkey's policy toward science organisations during 2011. These included the withdrawal of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) from full membership of ICSU and a government decree on 27 August that affected the autonomy of the Turkish Academy of Sciences (TÜBA). In Rome, the new ICSU Executive Board also considered these developments and was equally concerned.

Subsequently, on 2 November, the Turkish Government issued a second decree reinforcing its decision regarding TÜBA, following which more than half of that academy's 138 members resigned. On 25 November, 17 of them founded the "Science Academy Society" as an independent, self-governing, civil society organisation to promote scientific merit, freedom and integrity.

Reviewing the current situation, CFRS decided that it was appropriate for the ICSU President and the CFRS Chair to write to the President of TÜBİTAK, expressing their concern that the

organisation's withdrawal from full membership of ICSU negatively affected the Turkish science community and its access to the international scientific community. To help remedy this mutually unsatisfactory situation, they would propose a visit of the ICSU leadership to discuss ways and means to improve matters.

**Decision**

To ask the ICSU President and the CFRS Chair to write a joint letter to the President of TÜBİTAK.

## **9.2 Independence and freedom of academies: new case**

In November 2011, the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, an ICSU National Member, approached some European academies for support because of what it described in a letter as a threat to the independence of its institution due to government restructuring attempts. Judging from information in published sources, it appeared that this could be a power struggle with the country's other academy, the Doclean Academy, with underlying political motives.

C Corillon was asked to follow the situation and inform CFRS in case of new developments

**Decision**

To ask C Corillon to follow the situation and report to CFRS in the event of new developments.

## **9.3 CFRS initiative on academic freedom**

At previous meetings, CFRS members had noted that academic freedom and scientific autonomy were being encroached upon due to the politicisation of science in several countries around the globe. Preliminary contacts with the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) during 2011 had indicated an interest on their part to work with CFRS to organise a workshop on the particular situation at universities. The "Statement on Academic Freedom" the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) issued in October 2011 further emphasised the potential importance of such an event.

More recently, at the AAAS meeting in Vancouver in mid-February, the allegation of "muzzling" was raised against the Canadian Government. Scientists employed by the federal government and journalists said that communication about research funded by taxpayer's money had been hampered, or even suppressed, in certain cases since the government introduced a media protocol in 2008. Similar concerns existed in other countries.

This increased pressure on both individual scientists and academic institutions was calling into question the Principle of the Universality of Science. Seriously concerned by these trends, and recognising that individual and institutional freedoms were interrelated, Committee members decided that action should be taken on both issues to support the science community. A Sawyerr, J Sulston and C Corillon, with the support of the Secretariat, were asked draft a letter to the ICSU Membership, asking them to look into the situation and to consider measures that could be taken to protect scientists against legal repercussions when speaking out about their research. This correspondence would provide examples of how cases were dealt with in different contexts and would refer to the Singapore Statement and the CFRS booklet "Freedom, Responsibility & Universality of Science". In addition, with the Secretariat's support, F Attia, A Sawyerr and M Yaari were asked to assemble legal texts to provide examples of countries where academic freedom was guaranteed. Similarly to the human rights documentation, these might subsequently be published on the "Freedom and Responsibility Portal" of the ICSU website, accompanied by an introduction. Finally, and regarding the specific situation in Canada, P Mahaffy was asked to prepare a letter to the Canadian authorities with copy to The Royal Society of Canada to express CFRS's concern and

ask for more information.

#### **Decisions**

- to ask A Sawyerr, J Sulston and C Corillon, with the support of the Secretariat, to draft a letter to the ICSU Membership regarding possible measures to protect scientists against legal repercussions when speaking out about their research;
- to ask F Attia, A Sawyerr and M Yaari, supported by the Secretariat, to assemble legal texts underpinning the freedom of academic institutions;
- to ask P Mahaffy to draft a letter to the Canadian authorities regarding the “muzzling” allegations.

### **9.4 The UN sanctions system and the freedom of science**

Following discussions at the Rome meeting on the personal situation of J Rahighi from Iran (agenda item 10.1.4), the Secretariat was asked to explore the system of UN sanctions lists. The results of these enquiries were provided now in summary to CFRS members:

*Within the UN system, both the General Assembly and the Security Council had the authority to adopt resolutions. While the former were non-binding towards member states, those by the Security Council were, if made with reference to Chapter VII of the UN Charter that was dealing with “Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression.” In the corresponding actions, the Security Council was authorised to adopt resolutions under Article 41, which did not involve the use of armed forces, or Article 42, which included such measures. In Resolution 1737 of 23 December 2006, the Security Council made reference to Chapter VII and Article 41 when obliging members states “to exercise vigilance regarding the entry into or transit through their territories of individuals who are engaged in, directly associated with or providing support for Iran’s proliferation sensitive nuclear activities or for the development of nuclear weapon delivery systems” (Article 10). J Rahighi was not listed in the annexe to this resolution, but to Resolution 1929 of 9 June 2010, which recalled Resolution 1737.*

As a result, UN member states were obliged not to let J Rahighi enter their territory. As the legal scholar we contacted on this case had noted, these sanctions lists were highly problematic from a human rights perspective, because no appeal to an independent court was possible.

Although no formal action was decided upon, C Corillon was asked to further examine the possibility of appealing against UN Security Council resolutions.

#### **Decisions**

- to note the UN sanctions system;
- to ask C Corillon to further examine the possibility of appealing against UN Security Council resolutions.

### **9.5 The right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress**

The right “to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications” was contained in Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which entered into force in 1976 and which is among the legal instruments listed on the ICSU website’s “Freedom and Responsibility Portal”. The mandate of the “Independent Expert in the Field of Cultural Rights”, established by the UN Human Rights Council in 2009, made explicit reference to this right, thus highlighting its significance as integral to the realisation of human rights generally. However, a need was identified to further develop the scope, core contents and state obligations of this right. The Independent Expert therefore decided to launch a discussion about the conceptual and practical issues at the intersection of science and human rights. For that purpose, representatives from different sectors were invited to a

closed consultative meeting of experts, which took place at the UN in Geneva on 5-6 December 2011. On behalf of the Committee, R Pfister provided the CFRS's perspective on the first day of the meeting.

In considering his meeting report and the draft report of the Independent Expert, Committee members noted that the latter supported what CFRS was doing already. They were pleased, in particular, to see that the document not only covered negative rights, but also reflected on the more contested positive rights, such as medical or climate change rights. It was also noted that the report adequately brought out the tension between intellectual property (IP) issues, namely the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), and human rights. Finally, it was argued that some of CFRS's work could be referenced in the relevant sections.

It was decided that CFRS members should provide their comments to the Secretariat for transmission to the Independent Expert. Timing was important, as the Independent Expert's final report would be published by June this year.

#### **Decisions**

- to note the report by the Secretariat on the meeting organised by the Independent Expert in the Field of Cultural Rights in Geneva;
- to ask Committee members to provide their comments on the draft report by the Independent Expert;
- to ask the Secretariat to convey these comments to the Independent Expert for consideration.

### **9.6 Dual use technologies**

In December 2011, the US National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB) had asked that the results of a study conducted by researchers in the United States and the Netherlands would be published only partially, with restrictions, in *Nature* and *Science*. Never before had such a decision been taken. It was based on the NSABB's assessment that the risk of abuse needed to be given more weight than the freedom to publish. In this particular case, scientists created a highly transmissible form of a deadly flu virus that did not normally spread from person to person, therefore creating the potential trigger for a pandemic with potentially catastrophic consequences or serving bioterrorists as a deadly weapon.

This situation raised critical issues with regard to Statute 5 and the Universality of Science Principle. It was relevant for CFRS's work because it concerned access to data and information as well as rights and responsibilities of scientists in the conduct of their work. The discussion at the meeting centred on whether it was legitimate to restrain the freedom of scientists to select their research topic or publicise research findings. Adding to this was the fact that it was not always possible to know in advance whether a particular piece of research included elements that might be dangerous for society. Furthermore, what could be considered to be safe today could become unsafe in the future due to technological or other progress. Many research results could be used for both safe and unsafe purposes, depending on whose hands they fell into.

Many international activities had been organised to examine these issues, including an international forum on biosecurity sponsored by ICSU in cooperation with the US National Academy of Sciences in 2005. What was new in the present context was the actual imposition of censorship. The issue would be further discussed at the next CFRS meeting in order to decide on whether and how to become involved. In preparation for this, it would be helpful to assemble the key statements and guidelines that had been produced over the past decade on dual-use/bio-security.



**Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to assemble key statements and guidelines regarding dual use/biosecurity and the publication of related research results.

**10. Freedom of science: individual cases****10.1 Update on past cases****10.1.1 UNESCO-Obiang Nguema Mbasogo International Prize for Research in the Life Sciences**

CFRS had previously asked UNESCO not to take on this prize. Within days after its meeting in Rome, the UNESCO Executive Board was going to reconsider its previous decision on suspending the prize. CFRS therefore confirmed its position against awarding the prize, with the Chair communicating this view to the UNESCO Director-General in writing on 25 September 2011. Acknowledging this correspondence on 12 October, she indicated that the UNESCO Executive Board had decided to establish a working group to resolve the situation at its meeting in April 2012, as appeals to the President of Equatorial Guinea to withdraw the prize from UNESCO had been unsuccessful.

Because the outcome of this process was unpredictable, CFRS members authorised the Chair and C Smith to take action that would appropriately reflect the Committee's stance against this prize.

**Decision**

To authorise the Chair and C Smith to take appropriate action following the decision of the UNESCO Executive Board.

**10.1.2 IUPAC 11<sup>th</sup> Eurasia Conference, Jordan**

Following a decision at the CFRS meeting in May 2011 to seek further clarification about the absence of Israeli scientists among the more than 100 invited speakers at this conference in October 2010 in Jordan, P Mahaffy prepared a written inquiry to the President of the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC), Professor Nicole Moreau. The CFRS Chair communicated this query to Nicole Moreau during the ICSU General Assembly in Rome. In response, the IUPAC Secretariat provided the CFRS Secretariat with some correspondence on the matter, dating from before the 11<sup>th</sup> Eurasia Conference. Because this left the central question unanswered, whether or not any Israeli scientists had been invited, the Committee decided to now approach the conference organisers directly to obtain that information.

**Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to enquire with the conference organisers whether or not any Israeli scientists had been invited.

**10.1.3 Jameel Zayed, Israel**

Having examined the case of this Cambridge PhD student, who was prevented from entering Israel in 2009, at three previous meetings, attempts had been made to obtain more information on the specificities for this entry denial on the grounds of security reasons. In Rome, M Yaari agreed to further look into this case and contacted HaMoked and Gisha for assistance. The mission of these two Israeli human rights NGOs was to assist Palestinians of the Occupied Territories whose rights were violated due to Israel's policies and to protect the freedom of movement of Palestinians respectively. Following these approaches, the Secretariat was asked for further case details, which were obtained directly from J Zayed shortly before the present meeting.

Under the given circumstances, no additional insights in the circumstances could be won, but HaMoked and Gisha were now aware of this case and would get involved in the event of future problems. No further action by CFRS was therefore indicated, but the UK Academies Human Rights Committee, which had been involved, would still be thanked in writing for their engagement and support in this case and be informed about what CFRS had undertaken.

**Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to write to the UK Academies Human Rights Committee to thank them for their engagement and inform them about CFRS's undertakings.

**10.1.4 Javad Rahighi, Iran**

CFRS had examined the case of this Iranian physicist twice previously and again in Rome. Taking into account the opinion of an expert in international law at that meeting, CFRS proposed to J Rahighi by e-mail on 10 October to write to the EU and UN authorities, challenging their allegations that his work was related or linked to the Iranian atomic programme. The General Assembly of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP) took place on 2-4 November 2011 and CFRS obtained copies of letters dated 10 and 11 October from two physicists in Iran, asking IUPAP to intervene on behalf of J Rahighi to have his name removed from the EU sanctions lists.

**Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to inform IUPAP in writing about CFRS's activities on this case.

**10.1.5 Maksim Popov and Saidqul Ashurov, Uzbekistan**

Following CFRS's consideration of the case of M Popov at two previous meetings, enquiries had been made to the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, an ICSU National Member with Observer status, and the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS). Whereas IUPsyS was not aware of this case and could not assist, the Uzbek Academy did not respond to the written queries. In Rome, the Secretariat was therefore asked to raise the issue again with the National Member in Uzbekistan. On 15 December it was reported that M Popov had been released from prison on 9 June 2011 – his release was not made public at the time. Nonetheless, in its letter dated 21 December, CFRS reiterated this case, expressing its concern to the Uzbek Academy. This letter also included mention of S Ashurov, the Chief Metallurgist for Oxus Gold plc., who was accused of revealing state secrets, and whose situation had also been considered in Rome.

Because no response came forth to these renewed written approaches, CFRS asked the Secretariat to seek direct personal contact with ICSU's National Member in Uzbekistan to obtain more information.

**Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to personally contact the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences to obtain more information.

**10.1.6 Valentin Danilov, Russia**

This Russian physicist was charged of treason and fraud for allegedly having sold "state secrets" to a Chinese company and scientific institute, and for allegedly having embezzled project funds. Because the judiciary's handling of this case reportedly failed to meet international fair trial standards, Committee members asked the Chair in Rome to write to the Russian Ministry of Education and Science to express CFRS's concerns about the case and ask that V Danilov be granted parole for having served two-thirds of his sentence, for his good conduct as well as for humanitarian and health reasons.

At the present meeting, CFRS members considered a draft letter, which was approved. The Secretariat was asked to fax the correspondence to Moscow.

**Decision**

To write to the Russian authorities to express CFRS's concern and ask them to grant V Danilov parole.

10.1.7 Omid Kokabee, Massoud Ali Mohammadi, Fereydoon Abbasi and Majid Shahriari, Iran  
These cases concerned physicists from and/or in Iran. O Kokabee, an Iranian doctoral student at the University of Texas at Austin, had been detained in his home country since February 2011 on charges of "communicating with a hostile government" and "illegitimate earnings." A remote-controlled bomb assassinated MA Mohammadi, professor of elementary particle physics at Tehran University and Iran's representative to the SESAME Project, in January 2010. On 29 November that year, a magnetised bomb that detonated on his car injured F Abbasi, a nuclear physicist at Shahid Beheshti University, who was appointed as a Vice President of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) upon his recovery. That same day, M Shahriari, lecturing at the same university, was assassinated in a separate bomb attack similar to that against F Abbasi. President Ahmadinejad accused Israel and the US government of involvement in the assassination. Given the uncertainty regarding the actual circumstances in all four cases, the CFRS Chair wrote to the University of Tehran, ICSU's National Member in Iran, expressing the Committee's concern as well as asking for their views and for additional information.

In light of a further assassination of an Iranian physicist (agenda item 10.2.2), the Chair was asked to write to the Iranian Government to express the Committee's concern about the attacks against the Iranian physicists and to support the call of the country's High Council for Human Rights to the UN High Commission for Human Rights to appoint a special rapporteur to investigate the issue.

**Decision**

To ask the Chair to write to the Iranian Government to express CFRS's concern and to support their call for an independent international investigation (see also agenda item 10.2.2).

10.1.8 Bahá'í community leaders, Iran

Since 2008, seven leaders of the Iranian Bahá'í religious community have been imprisoned. Four of them are scientists and taught young Bahá'í, which is illegal, but the primary motivation for their arrest appears to be their roles as leaders of the religious group.

Since Statute 5 opposes discrimination in the conduct of science due to factors such as religion, this situation was in breach of the Principle of the Universality of Science. The Committee therefore decided to ask the Chair to write to the Iranian Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, making the case for the right of scientists to conduct their work freely and without discrimination.

**Decision**

To ask the Chair to write to the Iranian Ministry of Science, Research and Technology with reference to Statute 5.

10.1.9 Adlène Hicheur, France

This French-Algerian physicist had been held in preventive detention without charges or trial in a French prison since October 2009, on suspicion of conspiring with an Algerian al-Qaeda branch. As decided at the 11<sup>th</sup> CFRS meeting in Rome, the Secretariat contacted the Laboratory for High Energy Physics (LHEP) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL), where A Hicheur worked at the time of his arrest in France, and the Swiss authorities, because of their investigation into this case during 2010, to obtain further details. The EPFL laboratory could not provide additional insight, but because of their concern, several of A Hicheur's former colleagues at EPFL and at the Geneva-based European Organisation for Nuclear Research (CERN) have been maintaining the website

<http://soutien.hicheur.pagesperso-orange.fr> in his support. This contains, inter alia, a letter signed by close to 300 individuals in an effort to bring about A Hicheur's release or a trial in a regular court case. Regarding the investigation in Switzerland, the Tribunal de Grande Instance de Paris, a civil court of the first instance with judges specialised notably in anti-terrorism, had approached the Swiss Federal Office of Justice in November 2009 with a mutual judicial assistance request related to its own investigations. The Office of the Attorney General in Switzerland provided the French authorities with evidence it had collected as part of the assistance procedure, which was concluded in May 2010. The Office's independent criminal investigation against unknown persons because of membership in a criminal organisation was terminated in November 2010, because the alleged perpetrators could not be determined. In France, the Académie des sciences' Human Rights Committee CODHOS had been working on the case of A Hicheur, sending letters to the Ministry of Justice and of the Interior and asking that he either be brought to trial or be released. The plight of A Hicheur had been publicised in *Nature* and other media in October 2011.

Committee members were pleased to learn that A Hicheur's trial in court was now set for 29-30 March 2012. Even so, they agreed that the detention without trial for two and a half years was a matter of serious concern and therefore asked the Secretariat to communicate this stance in writing to the French Ministry of Justice.

#### **Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to write to the French Ministry of Justice, indicating that the Committee was pleased to see that the trial now takes place, but expressing that the duration of the detention was a matter of serious concern.

#### **10.1.10 Fredy Peccerelli, Guatemala**

The Committee considered this case back in 2008, after F Peccerelli and other staff of the Guatemalan Forensic Anthropology Foundation (FAFG) with their families had received multiple death threats and had been subjected to serious acts of intimidation as a result of F Peccerelli's work to gather evidence to document human rights atrocities in his country. In August 2011, F Peccerelli and his sister were again exposed to intimidation, following which the Guatemalan authorities ordered 24-hour police protection, but coverage remained intermittent. Following the Rome meeting, the Chair expressed the Committee's concern in a letter dated 20 January 2012 to the Vice-Minister for Security in the newly composed Guatemalan Government, with a copy to the ICSU National Member, the Academy of Medical, Physical and Natural Sciences of Guatemala.

#### **Decision**

To note the correspondence.

#### **10.1.11 Health professionals, Bahrain, Libya, Syria and Yemen**

At the last meeting, CFRS considered the situation of health care professionals during recent protests in several countries in North Africa and in the Middle East, taking note of credible reports of security forces shooting at, threatening and arresting doctors and nurses. This violated the concept of medical neutrality, aimed at ensuring that health professionals could provide health care to those in need, regardless of the patients' political, religious or ethnic affiliations. Although this kind of concern was not central to CFRS's activities, the Secretariat was asked to enquire with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) whether it should take any role in this. For that purpose it established contact with Dr Robin Coupland. As the ICRC's medical adviser, he was the lead author of the 2011 ICRC report "Health Care in Danger: Making the Case," based on his longstanding experience as the organisation's field surgeon in several countries in conflict. This first in-depth report formed the basis for an action plan to tackle the problems and dangers medical staff faced in conflict zones. The ICRC and the Red Crescent Movement adopted this plan at their international conference at the end of November 2011. In welcoming the CFRS inquiry, Dr Coupland explained that the ICRC action plan relied on three pillars: to launch an awareness raising campaign among the

involved actors; to establish a “community of concern” to have a network to report on what is happening in the field; and to hold a symposium on 23 April 2012 in London for stakeholders, including academia, to generate recommendations for national and international policymakers.

In Paris, Committee members were shown a list of numerous health professionals in Bahrain and Syria who had been subject to adverse treatment related to their profession. In order to clarify whether CFRS should become engaged in these and the other cases and what role it could possibly play, it was decided that the Secretariat would take part in the symposium in April in London. This would serve as an opportunity for a dialogue with representatives of the World Medical Association (WMA), a co-organiser of the event. The Secretariat would report to Committee members thereafter.

**Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to take part in the “Health care in danger” symposium in April and report to CFRS on the outcome of discussions.

**10.1.12 Xue Feng, China**

X Feng, a Chinese-born US geologist, was detained in 2007 while on a business trip in China, subsequently charged with “gathering intelligence” and “unlawfully sending abroad state secrets”. In Rome, and again at the present meeting, the Committee asked C Corillon to continue to follow this case and report in the event of relevant new developments.

**Decision**

To ask C Corillon to continue to monitor this case and report in the event of relevant new developments.

**10.2 New individual cases****10.2.1 University of Sydney and scientific exchange with Israeli scientists**

The visit of a delegation of Israeli scientists to the University of Sydney for a scientific exchange in early November 2011 caused some controversy, because the director of the university’s Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Associate Professor Jake Lynch, called for a boycott of that meeting, arguing it would offend the Muslim community. The Head of the Palestinian Delegation to Australia was not in favour of a boycott, however, and consultations with the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific as well as with representatives of the Australian Academy of Science did not indicate the necessity for any action. In the event, the visit did take place and was not accompanied by any protests or boycotts.

**Decision**

To note the information.

**10.2.2 Mostafa Ahmadi-Roshan, Iran**

In a case that has links to agenda item 10.1.7, M Ahmadi-Roshan was assassinated on 11 January 2012 by a bomber on a motorcycle. M Ahmadi-Roshan, a graduate in chemical engineering from Sharif University of Technology, served as the deputy director of marketing at the Natanz uranium enrichment facility, one of two known sites where Iranian scientists are suspected to work toward the creation of a nuclear weapon. The killing drew wide international media coverage and, as was the case in the other three cases, the Iranian Government accused the US and Israel of having been the masterminds.

The action decided upon under agenda item 10.1.7 would include the case of M Ahmadi-Roshan.

**Decision**

See action decided under agenda item 10.1.7.

**10.2.3 20 health professionals in Bahrain**

In September 2011, 20 Bahraini health professionals were convicted of a range of serious crimes following a military trial that reportedly failed to meet international fair trial standards. Given the nature of these cases, the CFRS's possible action regarding the health professionals that were exposed to adverse treatment in several North African and Middle East countries (agenda item 10.1.11) would include these cases.

**Decision**

See action decided under agenda item 10.1.11.

**10.2.4 Ramin Zibaei, Iran**

This psychologist and Dean of the Faculty of Social Science at the Bahá'í Institute of Higher Education has been detained in Iran since May 2011, subsequently charged with "conspiracy against national security" and "conspiracy against the Islamic Republic of Iran." Because his personal situation fell in the ambit of that of the Bahá'í community leaders considered under agenda item 10.1.8, the Committee's decided action would include R Zibaei.

**Decision**

See action decided under agenda item 10.1.8.

**10.2.5 Büşra Ersanlı, Turkey**

A political scientist and faculty member in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Marmara University in Istanbul, B Ersanlı was also a non-Kurdish member of the Assembly of the Peace and Democracy Party (Barış ve Demokrasi Partisi, BDP). On 28 October 2011, she and several dozen people were arrested in connection with an on-going crackdown on Kurdish political parties. Subsequently, charges were brought against her because of suspected links to the violent Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), an outlawed separatist Kurdish rebel group. However, B Ersanlı reportedly never advocated violence and the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies was trying to assist her by writing letters of support.

Because there were indications of this case being a breach of the Principle of Universality of Science, Committee members asked the Chair to write to the Turkish Ministry of Justice to ask for further information on this case and for the release of B Ersanlı on bail.

**Decision**

To ask the Chair to write to the Turkish Ministry of Justice, asking for further information and for the release of B Ersanlı on bail.

**11 Freedom of Science: CFRS and the protection of the rights of scientists**

Since the Rome meeting, the draft document describing CFRS's role in addressing human rights abuses of scientists had benefited from further clarifications provided by the Chair, A Sawyerr, C Corillon and P Mahaffy. The updated version was now put to the Committee for consideration. Minor comments were brought forward and A Sawyerr and the Secretariat were asked to finalise the document for publication on the ICSU website as part of the "Freedom & Responsibility Portal".

**Decision**

To ask A Sawyerr and the Secretariat to finalise the document and subsequently publish it on the ICSU Website.

## **12 Advice to organisers of scientific meetings**

Presented with a revised version of the CFRS guidelines, developed in the late 1990s, to organisers of scientific meetings, Committee members asked the Secretariat in Rome to further review the document and, in particular, to incorporate reference to Statute 5. A new first draft was circulated among a small group of CFRS members, among whom S Rumball, A Sawyerr and P Mahaffy provided constructive comments. With these being incorporated, the Committee was presented now with a revised version and asked for further minor changes, including the document's structure.

A Sawyerr, P Mahaffy and S Rumball were asked to draft a finalised version that would subsequently be circulated among all members for comments and eventual publication on the ICSU website in the "Freedom & Responsibility Portal".

### **Decision**

To ask A Sawyerr, P Mahaffy and S Rumball to draft a finalised version for circulation among Committee members for eventual publication on the ICSU website.

## **13. Workshops**

### **13.1 Science Communication (2010, Bogotá, Colombia)**

The proceedings from the International Forum "Science communication" that CFRS had co-sponsored with the National University of Colombia in Bogotá in November 2010 had now been published. M Wasserman presented copies of the volume, published in English and Spanish and including a CD-ROM, to the Committee.

The CFRS members congratulated M Wasserman for this workshop outcome.

### **Decision**

To take note of the publication and congratulate M Wasserman.

### **13.2 Private Sector – Academia Interactions (2011, Sigtuna, Sweden)**

Together with The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, CFRS organised this international workshop on 22-25 November 2011 in Sigtuna, Sweden (see also agenda item 8.3). It drew a large audience, with more than 50 participants, primarily from the research and science community and the private sector. CFRS was represented by the Chair, who initiated and greatly facilitated the event, members A Anand, S Rumball, A Sawyerr, J Sulston and C Smith as well as by R Pfister from the Secretariat.

In line with ICSU's mission to strengthen international science for the benefit of society, the event served to gather information and a variety of views from a global perspective on how academia, particularly scientists, and industry could effectively create productive partnerships. C Corillon and P Mahaffy served as rapporteurs and wrote a comprehensive and concise workshop report. While not attempting to be a consensus document, it presented some of the issues on which a general agreement emerged at the workshop. A first draft was circulated to the CFRS Chair and C Smith for their feedback. The revised version was then sent to the CFRS members that participated at the workshop and subsequently to the remaining members for their comments. The version of the report presented to CFRS now incorporated the responses received. This version had also recently been circulated among all workshop participants for their feedback, clearly indicating that it was a CFRS report.

The Committee asked C Corillon and P Mahaffy, in consultation with the Chair and C Smith, to integrate the proposed amendments at their discretion. In that context it would be im-

portant to clearly link this document with the Advisory Note that was being developed in parallel (agenda item 8.3), to promote its dissemination among the scientific community. For this purpose, the two rapporteurs, applauded for their work, were asked to consider writing an executive summary. The Secretariat would then publish the final version of the report on the ICSU website's "Freedom and Responsibility Portal", aiming at stimulating further dialogue to develop and strengthen industry-academia relations for the benefit society.

#### **Decisions**

- to ask C Corillon and P Mahaffy to finalise the report;
- to ask the Secretariat to publish the final version on the ICSU website.

### **13.3 Science and Policy Advice (2013, Denmark)**

In Rome, the CFRS Chair confirmed that the focus of this workshop, planned to be organised by the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters and initially scheduled to be held in autumn 2012 in Denmark, would be on climate change as an example of science advice to policy. Critical for the event was the participation of the EU Commissioner for Climate Action, Connie Hedegaard from Denmark, as a keynote speaker. However, she would not be available until spring 2013.

At the present meeting, it was decided that CFRS should continue to pursue its interest in co-organising and taking part in this workshop. The Chair, who was also a member of the Danish Academy, offered to provide a link with them even after the formal end of his CFRS engagement, and in particular to Hans Thybo, Professor in Geography and Geology at the University of Copenhagen and chair of the Academy's working group that was planning this workshop. The Secretariat was asked to write to Hans Thybo to express the Committee's interest in remaining involved.

#### **Decision**

To ask the Secretariat to write to Hans Thybo from the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters to express the Committee's interest in remaining involved in this workshop.

### **13.4 Science and Pseudo-Science (2013/14, Norway)**

This workshop was planned by Professor Nils Christian Stenseth, Chair of the University of Oslo's Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis and member of The Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters. The progress in this case was not as initially expected due to a number of factors beyond CFRS's control. The situation now appeared to be that a realistic time for the workshop would be autumn 2013 or early 2014.

It was decided that CFRS would maintain its interest in this workshop, follow developments and take action as appropriate.

#### **Decision**

To note the developments on this workshop.

### **13.5 Science in contemporary wars (2013/14, Sweden)**

The Chair had a strong interest in this workshop, for the organisation of which the Swedish Pugwash Group, supported by the International Pugwash and the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation had shown their interest. O Tzeng indicated a possibility for finding funds in Taiwan if the workshop were to be held there. To take the initiative forward, CFRS decided at the present meeting to establish a group led by the Chair with the members A Anand, F Attia, P Mahaffy, O Tzeng and M Yaari to delineate the subject of the workshop by mid-2012. Matters of



potential interest were new types of war with no clear frontiers and the role of science, the historical dimension of scientific innovations resulting from wars, science as a contributor to new means of conducting war, including biological and chemical warfare. It was noted that the Israeli and Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities were organising a series of workshops on science and peace that could inform the CFRS plans.

A realistic timeframe for this workshop was 2013 or 2014.

#### **Decision**

To establish a working group composed of the Chair with A Anand, F Attia, P Mahaffy, O Tzeng and M Yaari and ask them to delineate the subject of the workshop by mid-2012, with subsequent consultation of the entire Committee for comments.

### **13.6 Science assessment (2013/14, China: CAST)**

The China Association of Science and Technology (CAST) as well as the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) were interested in organising a CFRS-sponsored workshop on this topic in mainland China, possibly in conjunction with a meeting of the Committee.

In discussing the subject matter of such a workshop, it was considered important to link the issues of assessing research results and research institutions, incentives for research and science integrity. One conclusion from the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity (WCRI) was that the whole system for research assessment, incentives and rewards could in some circumstances favour scientific misconduct. Due to the country's scientific enterprise growing so fast, China was facing particular challenges. A pertinent question would be how the assessment systems, which include the university rankings schemes, could be improved to promote research integrity. The insights from a workshop co-sponsored by CFRS could be fed into the 3<sup>rd</sup> WCRI. In that context, C Smith was asked to follow up again with the organisers of the WCRI, Melissa Anderson and Nicholas Steneck. If the CFRS workshop was to take place in China, the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific might also be involved.

In conclusion, S Rumball, O Tzeng and D Vaux were asked to be part of an organising committee led by the Secretariat to elaborate a programme proposal for consideration at the next CFRS meeting. J Zhang would assist in a co-ordinating role for CAST/CAS.

#### **Decisions**

- to ask the Secretariat, with S Rumball, O Tzeng and D Vaux, to elaborate a programme proposal for consideration at the next CFRS meeting;
- to ask C Smith to send a renewed query to the organisers of the 3<sup>rd</sup> WCRI, indicating CFRS's interest in co-sponsoring the conference.

### **13.7 Valuing science in the digital age: alternative metrics for future science (2012, United Kingdom)**

Based on their on-going study "Science as a Public Enterprise", scheduled to be released in May 2012, the UK Royal Society invited CFRS to co-sponsor a workshop on "Valuing science in the digital age: alternative metrics for future science". In order to clarify the extent of the involvement and the nature of the contribution asked from CFRS, the Chair and C Smith had contact with The Royal Society. The report from the on-going study would be but one input to the workshop, which would be quite distinct and focus on possible future indices and measures to promote a more open scientific enterprise, with a particular emphasis on the freedom and responsibilities of scientists. While the on-going study was too advanced for CFRS to have an impact on it, the Committee could be strongly involved in organising the workshop. The Royal Society was, indeed, interested in such a contribution to gain a global perspective. They would like to see CFRS members taking part in a joint Royal Society-CFRS organising committee meeting on 18-20 June and the actual workshop planned for 3-5

September, with the aim of attracting some 20-30 participants. Both meetings would take place in the United Kingdom. In preparation for this, The Royal Society would make a draft copy of the report available to CFRS at the end of April.

CFRS agreed to co-sponsor this workshop in a situation of equal partnership with The Royal Society. This engagement would take place in three stages: reviewing the draft report and providing comments, participation at the preparatory meeting and then the workshop itself. The Chair was prepared to serve in all three phases. Among the members, A Anand, A Sawyerr, J Sulston, O Tzeng and M Wasserman signalled they would be available.

The Chair would communicate this general commitment to Geoffrey Boulton, the chair of the on-going Royal Society study.

#### **Decision**

To ask the Chair to communicate to Geoffrey Boulton CFRS's interest in becoming involved in preparing and co-sponsoring this joint Royal Society-CFRS workshop.

### **14. Future CFRS membership**

The terms of several CFRS members, who had been serving for six years, would end in 2012. This was therefore the last meeting of the Committee in its present composition. On 17 October 2011, ICSU launched an open call among its Membership for nominations of new members. At the meeting, C Smith reported that 25 nominations had been received by the deadline of 16 December, and that the ICSU Executive Board would consider these proposals at its forthcoming meeting on 2-3 April and would decide on the prolongation of the terms of those members who could, in principle, stay on the Committee. The ICSU Secretariat would formally invite the selected candidates to join CFRS.

It was clarified that the term of the current Chair and all members would continue until the date of the next CFRS meeting, i.e. October 2012.

#### **Decision**

To note the ICSU call to its Membership to nominate new CFRS members and the information provided by C Smith.

### **15. Future CFRS meetings**

Although the established routine was for CFRS to alternate its meetings between the ICSU Secretariat in Paris and other hosts, it was decided to hold the next meeting in Paris again. The provisional dates chosen were the weeks beginning on 8 October or 15 October. Once the new CFRS members were known, the Secretariat would contact the entire Committee to establish the most suitable date. Further, and so that the Committee's work could feed into that of the ICSU Executive Board, the ICSU Secretariat would coordinate the date with the latter's meeting.

#### **Decisions**

- to note that the next CFRS meeting would take place in Paris in the week of 8 or 15 October 2012;
- to ask the Secretariat to establish the final date in correspondence with all members of the newly composed Committee.

## 16. Feedback from CFRS members

In looking back on six years of CFRS's work, the Chair invited members to provide their feedback on how they experienced serving on the Committee and to make proposals on how to possibly further enhance the effectiveness of its work. The suggestions principally concerned the following areas:

- dissemination of CFRS's work: to convey and publicise the results of what CFRS was doing more actively into the science community. Specific measures proposed to achieve this goal were to give the Committee more space at the ICSU General Assembly, to provide slots for its presentation at ICSU sponsored conferences, to increase and be creative in the interaction with the ICSU Membership in general and the younger generation in particular as well as to translate its products into other major languages;
- communication within ICSU: to step up communication of CFRS's work within ICSU, notably to the Executive Board and the Committee on Scientific Planning and Review, but also to its other bodies;
- communication within CFRS: while personal contact between Committee members was found to be of crucial importance, attempts should nevertheless be made to try and have some meetings over Skype;
- guidelines for CFRS members: it would be helpful for new members to have some indications regarding what is expected from them and what their responsibilities are as Committee members.

The Chair expressed his thanks to all Committee members for their contribution to CFRS's work.

### Decisions

- to note the feedback provided by CFRS members;
- to ask the Secretariat to consider possibilities for implementing the suggested measures.

## 17. Any other business

C Smith informed members that in order to further enhance communication with the ICSU leadership, the CFRS Chair would be invited to attend the ICSU Executive Board meeting once a year to report about the Committee's work.

A Kaminskii raised the issue that free and open access to scientific journals in physics was of concern and that this should be discussed in CFRS. The Chair asked him to take this matter to the next Committee meeting.

On behalf of the ICSU President and Executive Board, C Smith thanked the Chair and all members of CFRS for their dedicated service.

### Decisions

- to note that the CFRS Chair would attend the ICSU Executive Board meeting once a year to report about the Committee's work;
- to raise the matter of open access to scientific journals at the next CFRS meeting.
- to note ICSU's appreciation to the Chair and all Committee members, whose terms of service were coming to an end.

**Annex**  
**Meeting between ICSU CFRS and members of**  
**the Académie des sciences – Institut de France**

The Académie des sciences – Institut de France is the French National Member in ICSU, whose membership is managed by the French National Committee for International Scientific Unions (COFUSI).

On 5 March, all members of the ICSU Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science (CFRS) had a half-day meeting with representatives of the French Academy's committees "Science, éthique et société", "Défense des Hommes de Science" (CODHOS) and COFUSI.<sup>1</sup>

In opening the meeting the CFRS Chair described the mission and work of CFRS, emphasising the Committee's interest in receiving proposals from the ICSU Membership for topics of future workshops. This was followed by presentations of Edouard Brézin on CODHOS and of Anne Fagot-Largeault on the Academy's science, ethics and society committee:

- CODHOS, established in 1978, was dealing with cases of individual scientists who were being exposed to persecution because of their scientific work as well as with generic problems related to the conduct of science. Its 20 members met 5-6 times per year to examine the relevant dossiers and decide on possible actions, based on information received predominantly from the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies. Particular mention was made of CODHOS's interventions in the case of the Algerian physicist Adlène Hicheur who has been detained in a French prison without trial for more than two years;
- the science, ethics and society committee, with 20 members, was established in its present form in July 2010. It was previously called "Science et société". In the short time of its existence with this extended scope, this committee had established a database on scientific integrity, defined guidelines regarding the attribution of prizes by the Academy and given consideration to improving the communication of the work done at the Academy to a wider public.

The discussion among the participants of the meeting brought to the fore the following issues:

- the need to more actively communicate CFRS's work to the ICSU Membership and their ethics committees or other relevant entities. This could be done by writing to them, proposing to add links from their website to the CFRS section on the ICSU website and vice versa;
- the potential benefits in intensifying the exchange of information between CFRS and the human rights committee's in the ICSU Membership regarding the cases of individual scientists;
- the challenge of getting young scientists involved the activities of academy organisations and letting them take responsibilities in/for science aside from their individual careers.

---

<sup>1</sup> These were: Anne Fagot-Largeault (President) and Jean-Pierre Kahane (Committee "Science, éthique et société"), Edouard Brézin (CODHOS), Marie-Lise Chanin (French National Committee for International Scientific Unions, COFUSI) and Jean-François Bach (Perpetual Secretary, Académie des sciences).