

**4th meeting of the ICSU
Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science (CFRS)**

ICSU Secretariat Paris,
2-3 June, 2008

Meeting Report

Present: Najia Ariguib, Ruth Arnon, Carol Corillon, Bengt Gustafsson (Chair), Peter Mahaffy, Sylvia Rumball, Peter Schindler, John Sulston, Ovid Tzeng, David Vaux, Moises Wasserman, Kan Zhang

ICSU Secretariat: Carthage Smith (*ex officio*)

Apologies for absence: Ana Maria Cetto (*ex officio*) and Peter Anyang 'Nyong 'O

1. Welcoming remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. It was noted that Alice Gast had tendered her resignation from the committee, due to other commitments linked with her new position as University President.

It had been hoped that Declan Butler (Paris correspondent, Nature magazine) could join the committee for lunch on the second day. Unfortunately, he was unable to attend and sent his regrets.

Decision

To invite selected science journalists to the next CFRS meeting in Paris

2. Adoption of agenda

Decision

To adopt the agenda

3. Report of the previous CFRS meeting, report from the Executive Board and matters arising

The Executive Board had held its meeting on 23-24 May, prior to this CFRS meeting, and considered the report of the previous committee meeting and the draft revised 'blue book'. An oral report was given on the Board's discussions, which emphasised the importance of having a clear workplan for presentation at the General Assembly.

There were a number of matters arising from the previous CFRS meeting that were not covered elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting:

Matters arising

Item 10

IUHPS had not responded to the request to produce a history of SCFCS; item 16 – the paper on ‘mobility of researchers and Universality’ had been postponed

With regards to the history, it was disappointing that IUHPS had not responded more positively and it was recognised that a clearer project description was necessary. This should identify the existing source materials or archives and key witnesses who might be interviewed. Potentially, this could be an interesting Masters project and IUHPS should be able to assist in identifying an individual to take it forward

Item 4

The reporting templates for visa problems had not as yet been drafted by the Secretariat and it was agreed that this should be done. Obtaining better information on visa problems was considered to be very important and was an issue that should be taken up in the presentation to the General Assembly in October.

Item 7

The information on CFRS and Universality on the ICSU web-site had not been substantially revised as yet. It was noted that a new ICSU communication Officer had recently been recruited and there were plans for a major over-haul of all web content in 2009.

Item 8

The document on science policies and CFRS interests had been up-dated and was included at annex 1 of the report of the previous meeting.

Item 10

The chairman provided an up-date on the proposals for a foresight study on the public-private interface. Taking this forward was dependent on attracting additional funding (see ahead item 12 of this meeting))

Item 12

Moises Wasserman reported that he had made further enquiries on the Claudio Mendoza case and advised that no action was required from ICSU/CFRS at this stage. Peter Schindler reported on the Schengen visa control situation. His assessment was that there had been no significant change in policy and regulations but that visas problems for scientists entering Europe was an area that merited careful monitoring.

Item 14

It was noted that the workshop with Pugwash on Converging Technologies has been postponed until 2009, with no date fixed as yet. The postponement was due to uncertainty with regards to financial support from the local host organisation in Corsica but it was expected that this would be resolved.

Workshop on Emerging Diseases

A report of the workshop was attached at annex 3 of the meeting report and the various presentations, including videos were made available on-line at <http://iao.sinica.edu.tw/globalhealth/>. These were publicised in both the November and

December issues of the ICSU electronic newsletter INSIGHT, which is distributed to ~3000 registered readers, including all ICSU Members.

Members expressed their satisfaction with the workshop, which had worked well given the time and resource limitations. The commitment of the host organization – the Academy of Sciences located in Taipei - had been crucial. For similar events in the future, it would be important to develop a communication and outreach strategy and to target the international science media, e.g. Science and Nature.

Decisions

Peter Schindler to prepare a project description for work on the history of the Principle of Universality, which can then be used to discuss further with IUHPS;
to request the Secretariat to develop a template for Members to report on visa issues and to include this in the presentation to the General Assembly;
to reaffirm the committee's strong interest in partnering with Pugwash for a workshop on Converging Technologies;
to ensure that future CFRS activities are well publicised and, where appropriate, accompanied from the outset by a media strategy.

4. Research Integrity

4.1 Quality of data in publications

David Vaux gave a powerpoint presentation on the misuse of statistics and image manipulation in life science publications. This was based on an analysis of published articles, including several recent articles from prestigious journals and well known laboratories. Many recognisable errors, particularly with regards to statistics, were probably inadvertent. However, the manipulation of images was, in several cases, clearly falsification and misconduct. The relative abundance of these errors raised serious questions about the fidelity of the peer review system and editorial process. The difficulty of correcting the scientific record, when errors are identified, was also highlighted. Challenges and rebuttals are still rare, once a paper has been published.

4.2 Virtual Group on Publication Ethics

In considering the follow-up to the first World Conference on Research Integrity at its previous meeting, CFRS agreed that an initiative to develop a universal set of ethical guidelines for scientific publishing should be developed. Sir Roger Elliot (ICSU Treasurer) agreed to coordinate this activity, with David Vaux representing CFRS. A virtual network of interested ICSU Union representatives (~20) has been established and provided initial inputs on a draft document from the STM Publishers Association. There were plans to develop new guidelines, working with both the Association and the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) using an on-line 'Wiki' space.

Several issues were raised in subsequent discussion of both items 4.1 and 4.2:

- Teaching, training and mentoring are fundamental to addressing these misuse and misconduct issues;

- the pressure to publish and the importance attached to numbers of publications is distorting the scientific process. The roles of Institutions, including Universities and funding bodies in promoting the ‘publish or perish’ culture is critical;
- competition between scientific journals also exacerbates the problems;
- in some areas of science, e.g. commercial clinical trials, there has been systematic corporate misconduct with regards to what is (and isn’t) published;
- check lists for editors and reviewers can help in identifying errors before they are published;
- there needs to be compliance mechanisms to deal with misconduct;
- reliable data is needed to identify the scale of the problem. The publication of annual reports by journals including numbers of papers submitted, rejected, erroneous etc. would help;
- there needs to be re-adjustment in many parts of the scientific system to emphasise and reward quality rather than quantity of publications;
- perhaps more questions should be asked of authors whose output exceeds what might be reasonably expected – is it actually possible to author more than say 20 papers per year?
- the publication and science communication process is evolving rapidly, with on-line blogs etc. How can quality and integrity be assured in this new virtual world?

4.3 Survey of National Members

It had been agreed at the previous meeting to consult with ICSU National Members on the mechanisms that exist to deal with breaches of research integrity. David Vaux had provided a model template for providing the relevant information and this was transformed into an on-line questionnaire that was sent to all National Members. 19 (out of 113) Members responded. An analysis of these responses was provided for consideration by the committee.

The poor response rate was of concern but from the sample that had responded it was clear that universities were the institutions that had the central role to play in promoting research integrity and dealing with misconduct. ICSU Members could also play an important leadership role.

4.4 Planning for a 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity

A preliminary planning meeting for a 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity had been hosted by OECD in March. It was provisionally agreed that a 2nd Conference should be held in Asia – most likely Singapore. The minutes of this planning meeting, which was attended by Carthage Smith, were provided here for consideration by CFRS members.

The importance of ICSU involvement in addressing the systematic and institutional issues relating to research integrity was stressed. A focus for the conference on promoting an honest research culture would be appropriate. Committee members from Asia, emphasised that simply promoting awareness of the issues was important in many countries in the region. It would also be important to include relations with industry in the Conference agenda and issues such as the out-sourcing of clinical trials.

Decision

To produce a CFRS statement on maintaining integrity in scientific publications in order to bring issues of concern to the attention of ICSU Members (action: Bengt, David, Ovid and John);
 to make the outcomes of the research integrity survey available to ICSU Members on line, respecting confidentiality as necessary;
 to recommend that ICSU play a major role in organising the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity.

5. The revised ‘Blue Book’

5.1 The ‘Blue book’, including input from ICSU Members

Following the discussion at the previous CFRS meeting, amendments were made to the draft document and it was approved electronically by committee members before being sent out to the ICSU Membership for consultation. 17 Members responded and, whilst generally supportive, a number of concerns were raised. The Executive Board has also been asked to consider the document at its meeting in May and an oral up-date from the Board was provided. The committee was now being asked to consider these in-puts and agree on revisions to the text. The aim was to have the final version published and available at the General Assembly in October.

The committee went through each of the Members responses individually and agreed on associated changes to the existing document. Members views were divergent on several issues and further clarification in the preface of the purpose of the document would be helpful. The focus on ICSU and the previous SCFCS activities also needed to be diluted to make the document attractive to a wider audience.

5.2 Statement of the Principle of Universality

In considering the revision of the blue book, the issue was raised as to whether the wording of the Principle of Universality, which currently focuses on scientific freedoms, should be amended to more explicitly incorporate scientific responsibilities. There had been electronic correspondence on this issue involving several committee members and the Secretariat.

Changes to the ICSU statutes, including statute 5, the Principal of Universality, have to be agreed by the ICSU General Assembly. It was noted that the current wording had been agreed at the previous ICSU General Assembly after a long debate. In proposing further revisions it was important to try and preserve as far as possible text that had already been negotiated and agreed.

The CFRS Members were unanimous in their view that the statute had to be changed to more explicitly include responsibilities. Two options were considered: 1) the addition of an additional sentence on responsibilities at the end of the current wording, and 2) the incorporation of an additional sentence into the body of the current text. The latter option was preferred by the majority of members and the proposed new text is at annex 1 of this report.

It was also noted that the full wording of statute 5 – with or without the revision – was somewhat awkward but, as it had served the community well up until now, a complete re-write was not necessary.

Decisions

To thank Members for their input to the document;
 to revise the document and send it out again to Members for consultation prior to the Officers' meeting on 26 July (action: Carthage Smith);
 to agree on revised wording for the Principle of Universality (see [annex 1](#)) to be considered by the Officers and then recommended to the General Assembly as a change to ICSU statute 5.

6. Middle East

6.1 ICSU position statement

At the previous meeting the Secretariat was asked "to prepare a balanced position statement supporting the various initiatives to establish closer academic cooperation between Israel and Palestine." ICSU had published a statement in 2002, in response to a proposed boycott of Israeli academics and CFRS itself sent a letter to Nature in June 2007 on this same issue. Other organisations, including the USNAS and Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities had produced related statements. Committee members were asked to advise on the content of a new ICSU statement.

It was agreed that there were two important issues that should be stressed: 1) the importance of promoting bi-lateral cooperation in education and research; 2) the importance of international (and ICSU Member) support for these cooperation efforts.

6.2 Freedom of movement of Palestinian scientists and students

Following previous committee discussions, and a worsening of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, an up-date on the situation regarding freedom of movement of Palestinian scientists and students was provided. This included recent press articles and information from Gisha (Legal Centre for Freedom of Movement, Israel) concerning the withdrawal of Fulbright scholarships for seven students trapped in the Gaza strip, who had been accepted at US Universities. Members were asked to consider whether there were any actions, in addition to a position statement, that ICSU could take to help ameliorate the situation.

The complexity of the situation in this region was noted together with the distinctions between different types of student (BA, MA, PhD). With regard to the West Bank, there was an annual quota of 70 students, who were allowed to attend Universities in Israel, with preference being given to postgraduates. This quota was in itself a problem and the Universities and Israeli Academy were arguing strongly that only genuine security concerns relating to individual cases were a legitimate reason to refuse entry. ICSU's support of this position in addressing individual cases could be helpful.

With regard to the Gaza strip, all exit routes were currently closed for individuals except for humanitarian cases. This included the gate to Egypt. This meant that not only was study in Israel prohibited but also passage to the West Bank or to other countries was blocked, which is what had happened with the Fulbright scholars. It was being argued that education and research should be considered as humanitarian issues and so a secure transit pathway should be provided for all *bona fide* students and scholars. Indeed, the situation with regards to the Fulbright scholars had focussed attention on this issue and there was now some movement toward a change in policy. [At the end of the CFRS meeting a report from Gisha confirmed that the scholarships had been restored and four of the students had been given permission to leave Gaza for visa interviews at the US consulate in Jerusalem.]

It was recognised that there were specific issues relating to this particular conflict but that CFRS could add its support to the efforts of the Academies, Universities and organisations such as Gisha to assist individuals. At a more generic policy level there were important lessons to be learned in relation to the freedom and responsibilities of scientists in armed conflict situations, e.g. the value of international solidarity.

Decisions

To request the Secretariat to draft a revised ICSU position statement on the Israeli-Palestinian situation;

to request Carol Corillon, on behalf of CFRS, to write to al- Quds University proposing help/support on specific cases that they might bring to the attention of the committee;

to develop a well-researched policy paper on the freedom and responsibilities of scientists in armed conflict situations for submission to *Nature* or *Science* (action: initial inputs from all members to Bengt by 20 June).

7. Cuba and the USA

As agreed at the previous meeting, the Chairman had written to the US State Department in February, requesting clarification of the US visa policy in relation to Cuban scientists. This was followed up by a visit to the US State Department, including the Cuban visa Office, by Carthage Smith in April. One of the specific cases that was discussed at that meeting was Dr Nunez, who had re-applied for a visa to attend a meeting in the USA. US-NAS has recently been notified that he will now receive a visa. Thus, although there has been no formal written response as yet to the Chairman's letter, there were positive signs that the situation may be improving.

It was recognized that the overall policy relating to US visas for Cuba was unlikely to change in the immediate future and that ICSU support to US-NAS on individual cases was the most effective way to proceed.

Decision

To note the positive progress regarding the visa to Dr Nunez

8. Ongoing and new cases

8.1 Marc van Roosmalen (Brazil) – up-date

The Brazilian Academy of Sciences was contacted in relation to this case, which was discussed at the previous meeting. The Academy had considered the case and decided that no intervention was warranted from it at this juncture. Whilst the 15 year sentence certainly seemed harsh it was not clear to members how this related to normal sentencing practices under Brazilian law.

8.2 Ibni Oumar Mahamat Saleh (Chad)

This case had been brought to the attention of ICSU by the International Mathematical Union. Dr Saleh was an eminent Chadian mathematician and former Minister, who was acting opposition coalition spokesman, when he was detained during a rebel attack in the Chadian capital, Ndjamena in February 2008. His case had been taken up

by science and human rights organisations, including several ICSU Members affiliated with the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies, and a petition had been widely circulated on his behalf. Diplomatic interventions from the French Government and European parliament had also been organised. However, there had been no news of Dr Saleh's whereabouts or state of health since his detention and it was now assumed that he was dead.

The only potential action at this stage was for ICSU to add its voice to that of other organisations calling for a full investigation of this case by the Chadian authorities. This was a human rights case, which was related to Dr Saleh's political role and not his status as a scientist. It was already being followed-up by human rights organisations. However, it was a very distressing case that had been brought to the attention of ICSU by a Member organisation. Given ICSU's location in France and its strong support from the French government, it was agreed that a communication to the relevant French authorities was appropriate. This should be coordinated with the French Academy and concern was expressed that the Academy had not responded to earlier enquiries from ICSU on this case.

8.3 Igor Sutyagin (Russia)

Igor Sutyagin was a Russian physicist who was serving a 15-year sentence of hard labour for allegedly committing treason. He was prosecuted for passing classified information to a UK-based consulting firm, Alternative Futures, which was purported to be a cover for US military intelligence. He denied the charges and protested that all the information that he had provided was already in the public domain. Human Rights Watch had monitored his trial and subsequent treatment and had voiced serious concerns. Moreover, this was only one of several similar cases in which scientists, journalists and environmentalists had been prosecuted after working with foreign entities on issues deemed to be sensitive by the Russian security forces.

The information on the individual case was difficult to interpret although the concerns of human rights groups were noted. With regard to the remit of CFRS, the issue on which further action might be appropriate was the apparently systematic attempts to discourage scientists from making normal contacts with their foreign counterparts. It was likely that this issue had been discussed within Russian academia and it was agreed that more information should be sought before deciding on any specific actions. It was agreed that both the Russian Academy and the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics should be contacted.

8.4 Binyak Sen (India)

Dr Sen – an Indian paediatrician, community health specialist and human rights advocate – had been detained by police in the central Indian state of Chhattisgarh on May 14, 2007. After several months, he was eventually charged with terrorist offences that related to his medical and human rights work. His trial began on April 30, 2008. He remained in prison and was in poor health.

Dr Sen had received several prestigious national and international awards, including being honoured by the Indian Academy of Social Sciences in December, 2007. In April 2008, the Global Health Council awarded him the Jonathan Mann Award for global Health and Human Rights. In May 2008, a public letter signed by 25 Nobel Laureates was sent to several national and state-level officials in India. This requested

that Dr Sen be released on humanitarian grounds and allowed to receive his award and continue his medical work.

In considering whether CFRS should endorse the Nobel Laureates' letter, it was noted that support from the Indian science community could be influential in this case.

8.5 Freddy Peccerelli (Guatemala)

Mr Peccerelli was Executive Director of the Guatemalan Anthropology Foundation (FAFG), who had dedicated his professional life to gathering evidence to document human rights atrocities in his country. During the past several years Mr Peccerelli and other members of the FAFG staff and their families had received death threats and intimidation because of their work. Despite interventions from the inter-American organisations, the Guatemalan government had apparently failed to thoroughly investigate the death threats and to provide adequate protection. Mr Peccerelli had received international recognition for his commitment and courage, including the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program Award in 2004.

It was noted that ICSU had a National Scientific Associate in Guatemala and that the President of this academy, Carmen Smoyou, was also on the ICSU Regional committee for Latin America and the Caribbean. Her advice should be sought before deciding on any action from CFRS.

8.6 Professor Mohammed Sayder Rahman Khan (Bangladesh)

This case had been brought to the attention of the ICSU Secretariat by IUPAP following a general "action alert" from AAAS. Professor Khan had been arrested, together with several other academic colleagues, following a riot on university campuses in Bangladesh in August 2007. He was subsequently acquitted and released, although it appeared that four of his colleagues were scheduled to go to trial in December 2007.

When this case had first been notified to the Secretariat, the specific situation concerning Professor Khan and his colleagues was unclear. The Bangladesh Academy of Sciences had been contacted for advice but did not respond. In the light of reports that Professor Khan had been released, it was not clear that any intervention from ICSU would be beneficial and so no action was taken. However, the committee members agreed that it was important to try and get a response, even at this late stage, from the Bangladesh Academy.

Several of these cases were already being considered by the US-NAS Committee on Human Rights and the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies, as well as organisations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. The committee was asked to consider the added-value of any additional interventions from ICSU – both in relation to these specific cases and more generally.

It was agreed that the main focus for CFRS should be on infringements of the Principle of Universality and not human rights cases *per se*. At the same time, there were cases of persecution of individual scientists, in which an ICSU intervention could add value to that of other organisations. Such cases should be considered on a 'case by case' basis.

Cases themselves might be brought to the attention of CFRS by a number of sources: 1. ICSU Members; 2. the Secretariat and individual committee members; 3. referral from the International Human Rights Network. The role of Carol Corillon (coordinator of the latter Network) in providing information on these cases was crucial.

Decision

To request Carol Corillon to continue to monitor developments in relation to the van Roosmalen case but to take no further action, for the time being;
 to request the Secretariat to approach the French Academy of Sciences again, with a view to writing to the French Government concerning the case of Ibni Oumar Mahamat Saleh;
 to request the Secretariat to contact the Russian Academy and IUPAP and for all CFRS members to explore other relevant contacts with Russia, concerning the case of Igor Sutyagin;
 to request the Secretariat to contact the Indian National Science Academy with regard to the case of Binayak Sen;
 to contact Carmen Samoyou regarding the case of Freddy Peccerelli and to request the Secretariat to bring this case to the attention of the Regional Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean.
 to contact the Bangladesh Academy of Sciences again in relation to the case of Professor Khan and colleagues;
 to affirm that the major focus of CFRS with regard to specific cases should be breaches the Principle of Universality and that support on human rights cases should continue to be considered on a case by case basis.

9. Future support for the Committee

Following discussion at the previous meeting, a consensus list of potential workshop topics was agreed by electronic consultation. This formed the basis of a funding application which was prepared by the chairman, in conjunction with the Swedish Academy, and submitted to a Swedish Foundation. Regrettably the application was unsuccessful and a re-submission was not invited.

The chairman presented an up-date on other funding possibilities. Funding was required for workshops to take forward the various topics discussed by the committee to date and also for additional staff support for the committee's other work. The workshop in Taipei had been a good example of how with a relatively small amount of funding from a host country and good local staff assistance, a successful event could be organised. The challenge now was to systemise this process, organising one event per year and improving the associated outreach and communication.

One possibility would be to invite ICSU National Members to host CFRS workshops on a rotating basis – providing support for the workshop itself and also seconding staff support for both the workshop and CFRS during a one year period,. It was recognised that there could be distinct advantages in sharing the ownership of such events with ICSU Members from the outset. The Swedish Academy of Sciences had expressed its interest in supporting a first workshop on science, media and the public.

Decision

To note the unsuccessful application; and,

to develop a brief workshop profile, including details of potential topics for discussion with ICSU National Members;
 to request selected committee Members to assist in approaching their National Academies, to explore their interest in supporting a CFRS workshop;
 to request the Chair to follow-up with the Swedish Academy of Sciences, with a view to organising a workshop on “Science, media and the public” in autumn 2009;
 to discuss with interested National Members at the 29th ICSU General Assembly.

10. Future Work-plan and presentation to the 29th ICSU General Assembly

The committee had to agree on a work-plan for the next three years to present to the ICSU General Assembly in October. Some aspects of this, e.g. workshops, might be dependent on attracting additional funding but it was important that ‘core activities’ be defined, which could be accommodated within the current resources of the committee.

Achievements that were expected to be accomplished by the time of the General Assembly included:

- A revised blue book
- Actions on various individual cases,
- Public statements/letters on Iraq, Israeli scientists, Cuban visas
- Taipei forum and workshop
- Research Integrity Conference and follow-up – jointly with other partners
- Various consultations with Members to get their views on priorities
- Publication of CFRS meeting reports on the ICSU websight, with highlights in INSIGHT, the ICSU e-newsletter

With regards to a future work-plan, many topics had been identified in previous meetings as potential priorities, including:

- Various science policies issues (see [annex 1](#) of previous meeting minutes);
- Prioritised workshop topics: private sector-academia interactions; science and armed conflicts; science, media and the public; science and policy advice; science, ethics and the cyber world;
- Research integrity;
- The importance of communication, ‘openness’ and engagement with ICSU Members, local scientific communities and other stakeholders.

In preparation for the General Assembly, the challenge was to identify which of these various issues could be taken forward within current resource limitations. What was required for each priority area and what could realistically be achieved over the next 3 years? In developing the work-plan it was important to consider how the work of CFRS be amplified beyond the committee itself.

Decision

to request the Chair and Secretariat, with input from Sylvia Rumball, to develop a concise structured future work-plan by September 1st for consideration by all committee members.

11. Issues raised by committee members

A variety of issues had been raised by committee members in communications since the previous meeting. The relevant members presented these issues briefly for consideration by the committee

11.1 FASTS Forum, Australia

David Vaux reported on a forum that had been organised by the Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Societies (FASTS) to discuss rights and obligations of scientists and researchers, in February 2008. This followed an initiative from the Australian Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, Tim Carr, to develop a charter for scientists similar to that which had been developed for UK government scientists.

It was noted that such initiatives at the National level were an important opportunity for outreach and information exchange for CFRS. The secretariat had already written to the Executive Director of FASTS offering the committee's support for its initiative.

11.2 Publication ethics and Croatia

In one of the sessions at the World Conference on Research Integrity concerns had been raised about corruption and plagiarism in the Croatian medical community in relation to disputes regarding the Croatian Medical Journal. These had subsequently featured in a news article in Science (vol 32, pp304-305, April, 2008).

This was the only Croatian journal cited in Current Contents and so there was much pressure on the editors from prospective authors. This had led to considerable acrimony and a series of allegations and counter-allegations that was undermining the editors' positions. This was in many ways an extreme manifestation of the issues discussed earlier by the committee under items 4.1 and 4.2, regarding publication ethics.

11.3 Torture and the role of psychologists

Sylvia Rumball reported that the Australian Psychological Society had recently passed a resolution rejecting any involvement of its members in torture or other forms of cruel degrading or inhuman treatment. At the same time, there was a heated debate ongoing within the American Psychological Society, with military psychologists arguing against opponents that their participation helped to make interrogations safe, ethical and legal.

It was noted that the medical community had been engaged in similar debates with similarly divergent views being expressed. The debate was also occurring across the psychological community in other countries and it was an issue that the International Union of Psychological Sciences (IUPsyS) should have a position on. It was noted that this issue was also relevant to item 6 and the freedom and responsibilities of scientists in war situations.

11.4 Ethics of Science meeting in Israel

Ruth Arnon reported on the Jerusalem Ethics Conference that she had been involved in organising at the end of May. Several of the topics on the agenda had also been discussed by CFRS. One area that attracted particular attention was the ethics of research with vulnerable populations. The role of the media and ethics of scientific publications were also covered.

11.5 Research collections

Carthage Smith reported on an initiative from the OECD Global Science Forum to document and develop guidelines for scientific collections. Access to scientific materials was clearly within the remit of CFRS but was not an area in which ICSU had historically been much involved with – in contrast to its active involvement on data and information issues. A workshop was planned for 17-18 July in Washington DC, which would explore potential mechanisms for ensuring an international coordination and harmonisation function for diverse scientific collections.

Members noted the geographical bias of this OECD initiative to date and recognised a potentially important role for ICSU in ensuring that it developed a more global perspective. Many of the most important scientific collections, e.g. for biodiversity, originated in developing countries and there were justifiable concerns about ‘piracy’ by richer nations. The very broad scope of what might be included under research collections was also a subject of debate, with some areas, such as human tissue samples, already having well-developed guidelines in many countries, and other areas having no common approach. One of the main concerns was defining responsibility for the funding and maintenance of existing and new collections, which need to be acknowledged as a critical part of the infrastructure of science.

Decisions

to reaffirm the importance of CFRS members being engaged at the national and local level, when appropriate;
 to request David Vaux to monitor the situation with the Croatian Medical Journal;
 to request the Secretariat to contact IUPsyS, regarding its policy *visa vie* torture;
 to agree that research collections was an important area for CFRS and that Carol Corillon will represent CFRS at the Washington meeting in July.

12. Reflections on the first two years of CFRS functioning

The decision to establish CFRS was taken at the 28th ICSU General Assembly in 2005 and the Chair would be reporting back to the Assembly in October 2008. It was timely to reflect on the functioning of the committee to date: what had worked? What had not worked? What could be improved? In addition, several members had also been present on the previous SCFCS committee and it was informative to have their views on the new committee and how it was responding to its extended remit that now included both freedoms and responsibilities.

There was a round-table discussion during which all members expressed their satisfaction with progress to date and a number of specific issues were identified as follows:

- Specific products were important but not all the products of the committee were directly measurable;
- forming strategic partnerships with Members and other organisations, such as Pugwash, was important;
- there was a gap with regards to important developing world issues;
- the challenge was to provide adequate support to busy committee members;
- could possibly systemise electronic communication to increase effectiveness

- the broadened remit to include responsibilities and link this to changes in society, is an ongoing challenge;
- the Regional Offices have a potentially important role to play;
- need to somehow be more forward looking; the committee's monitoring and advisory role has yet to be fully defined;
- the challenge with regards to responsibilities is to balance individual desires and aspirations with cooperation and sharing. Hyper-competition is behind many of the concerns relating to science;
- specific cases are important and help to provide the context for other issues;
- resource limitations need to be addressed; need to scope, prioritise and focus;
- on some issues it would be good to have commissioned background papers;
- raising the profile and visibility of CFRS (and ICSU) is a major challenge

Decision

To integrate the various issues raised (above) into the development of the work-plan for 2009-2011 (item 10)

13. Committee membership and turnover

It was noted that, in line with standard ICSU procedures, the committee membership was to be renewed after 3 years, i.e. following the 6th meeting of the committee in mid 2009. All members were appointed for three-years, potentially renewable once and the assumption was that ~50% of members will be renewed at any one time. The decision on membership – both renewals and new appointments is made by the Executive Board, with nominations being sought from all ICSU Members. CFRS itself would also be invited to propose nominations. The present membership would continue for one more meeting after the General Assembly in Maputo, i.e. its final meeting would be in the first half of 2009.

Several of the current CFRS members had continued through from the previous SCFCS committee and would thus have completed 6 or more years by 2009. Also, for various reasons, some members had been unable to attend several meetings. These were factors that would be taken into account when considering the turnover of the committee. Members were now asked to identify particular areas (geographical or disciplinary) of expertise that would strengthen the committee in the light of its remit and future priorities.

Peter Schindler informed members that after ~12 years service on SCFCS and now CFRS, that he would stand down in 2009.

Decisions

To note the lack of effective representation from Sub-Saharan Africa and the former Soviet block countries;
to highlight social sciences, international law and science journalism as areas that might usefully contribute to CFRS work; and,
all CFRS members to identify potential new committee members for consideration at the next meeting.

14. Date and location of next meetings

It was noted that the next meeting of the committee was planned for Saturday 18th October in Maputo, prior to the ICSU General Assembly. All CFRS members were invited to stay on in Maputo until 24th October for the duration of the General Assembly. The formal presentation of CFRS activities by the committee Chairman was scheduled to take place on Thursday 23rd in the morning.

Committee members reaffirmed their desire to interact with the local scientific community and ICSU Members at the General Assembly. Three opportunities for engagement were discussed:

1. On Saturday 18th: part of the CFRS meeting could be organised as an open forum, with local academics being invited to present their concerns and activities in relation to freedom and responsibilities of science;
2. on Monday 20: an evening event could potentially be organised following the Science in Africa forum;
3. on Tuesday 21: CFRS could make a presentation at the Unions meeting, possibly focussing on scientific publications, re item 4.1.

The Chairman also raised the possibility of popular lectures and the importance of involving students and younger scientists in any activities was emphasised.

Looking forward to the 6th CFRS meeting, it was noted that this would be the final meeting of the current committee members and should take place in the first half of 2009. If the joint Pugwash workshop on converging technologies was rescheduled for this period then that would determine the dates and location, i.e. Corsica. Otherwise a provisional date for a meeting in Paris was agreed.

Decision

To note the date of the next CFRS meeting on 18th October in Maputo to request the Secretariat to explore all opportunities for CFRS engagement with the local scientific community and ICSU Members at the General Assembly. to provisionally agree that the 6th CFRS meeting should be held on 20-21 April, 2009 in Paris.

15. Any Other Business

Decision

It was agreed that all papers, including late papers, and presentations that are considered at CFRS meetings should be made available to committee members in the dedicated extranet on the ICSU website.

Annex 1 Proposed revision to ICSU statute 5

Annex 1**Proposed revision to ICSU statute 5****The Principle of the Universality of Science (ICSU Statute 5)**

The Principle of the Universality of Science is fundamental to scientific progress. This principle embodies freedom of movement, association, expression and communication for scientists as well as equitable access to data, information and research materials. Equally important, it embodies scientists' individual responsibilities to conduct their work with honesty, integrity, openness and respect, and collective responsibilities to maximise the benefit and minimise the misuse of science for society as a whole. In pursuing its objectives in respect of the rights and responsibilities of scientists, the International Council for Science (ICSU) actively upholds this principle, and, in so doing, opposes any discrimination on the basis of such factors as ethnic origin, religion, citizenship, language, political stance, gender, sex or age. ICSU shall not accept disruption of its own activities by statements or actions that intentionally or otherwise prevent the application of this principle.

The proposed new text proposed by CFRS at its 4th meeting in June, 2008, is underlined.

Rationale: CFRS has been asked by the General Assembly to take on an expanded remit including both scientific freedom and responsibilities. The major argument for this was that scientists cannot expect to be granted special freedoms by society unless they are also willing to accept the responsibilities inherent in these freedoms.