

**7th meeting of the ICSU
Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science (CFRS)**

ICSU Secretariat, Paris
23-24 November, 2009

Meeting Report

Present: Ruth Arnon, Ashima Anand, Carol Corillon, Bengt Gustafsson (Chairman), Alexander Kaminskii, Sylvia Rumball, Akilagpa Sawyerr, John Sulston, Ovid Tzeng, David Vaux, Moises Wasserman, Jiansheng Zhang.

ICSU Secretariat: Carthage Smith (*ex officio*); P Cutler (items 14 and 15.1 only); J Legg (item 16)

Apologies for absence: Fatma Attia (joined by phone at start and end of meeting); Peter Mahaffy (joined item 5 by telephone); Mario Molina; Maurice Tchuente (*ex officio*)

(Note: new members are underlined)

1. Welcoming remarks and introductions

The Chairman welcomed members to the first meeting of the new committee and all members briefly introduced themselves.

2. Adoption of agenda

Decision

To adopt the agenda.

3. Terms of Reference and Workplan

As there were several new committee members, a brief introduction was given to the terms of reference and CFRS workplan, 2009-2011. In the subsequent discussion, several members emphasised the importance, as well as the challenge, of addressing the responsibilities' aspects of the committee's remit. Freedoms were relatively easy to define and natural to defend but the responsibilities of individuals and institutions were often more complex and complicated.

4. Minutes of the previous CFRS meeting and matters arising

Item 3 History of SCFCS

Peter Schindler had prepared a short (~2p) history of CFRS and its predecessor committees. This was largely a personal perspective from someone who had served on these committees

for a number of years, including a term as Executive Secretary. It was considered to be a valuable summary that might be of considerable interest to the ICSU membership. The importance of preserving the archives of these previous committees, with a view to carrying out a more systematic and detailed analysis in the future, was emphasised.

Item 7 Science Publication issues

It was reported that ICSU Members had not been contacted with regard to potential bias by journals against authors from Developing countries. On further reflection, the committee agreed that this was a complicated issue, with many groups (developing countries, less prestigious institutions, non-English speakers, junior researchers etc) potentially being subject to negative bias. Positive bias was also an issue that could be distorted further by the practices of certain journals. Potential solutions, such as concealing authors' names for peer-review, had been experimented with but had their own drawbacks. It was agreed that this was an important issue, relating to equity and the universality of science, which should be revisited at the next meeting.

Item 13 Widespread persecution of scholars

Since the previous meeting, the Chair had read the report on the global persecution of scholars but had not had an opportunity to speak with its author Brendan O'Malley.

Decisions

To make the personally-attributed brief history available on the ICSU website;
to confirm the previous decision to tell Peter Lawrence that his case had been considered by the committee;
to ask David Vaux to prepare a briefing paper on potential publication/author bias for consideration at the next meeting;
to invite Brendan O'Malley to a future meeting of CFRS (possibly by tele/video link).

5. Report from the Executive Board on CFRS statements and resources

Position statements

In previous meetings, the committee had discussed mechanisms to engage the Executive Board (EB) and ICSU Members in its activities. One area for potential engagement was the development of position statements. It was agreed that the three statements produced by the committee thus far should be presented to the Executive Board for consideration. This was done at the 101st EB meeting in October 2009 and some concerns were raised about each of the statements and the respective roles of the EB and CFRS in developing policy positions. In particular, the Board encouraged CFRS to continue to examine its statements to ascertain that they are devoid of political wording that does not relate specifically to matters of freedom and responsibility in the conduct of science. The Chairman of CFRS was to be invited to the next Board meeting to discuss the role and terms of reference of the committee

Committee members were pleased that there would be an opportunity for CFRS, through its Chairman, to engage more fully with the Executive Board. With regard to the statements, the Board had not been involved in the process and thinking behind their development. The statements represented the consensus of one committee but it was not surprising that another group of individuals queried specific aspects or wording. With specific regard to political

wording, while this was an issue that CFRS was sensitive to, it also had to be recognised that many of the issues affecting the freedom of scientists are inherently political.

Resources for CFRS

Following the 29th General Assembly in Maputo in 2008, the Executive Board had written to all ICSU National Members, soliciting support for CFRS activities. Several members had expressed an interest in co-sponsoring workshops (see ahead item 6) and the Switzerland Academy of Sciences had generously offered to host a secretariat for CFRS. The Executive Board has accepted this offer from Switzerland, which included part-time (~0.5 FTE) scientific/admin support. In discussion, committee members agreed on essential aspects of the job description for this post:

- The support person at the Swiss Academy should report to ICSU (C Smith) and have a close working relationship with the CFRS chairperson;
- this person ideally should have experience running projects;
- responsibilities include: 1) case work; 2) project management, e.g. workshops; 3) seeking funding for projects; 4) organising and recording CFRS meetings; 5) website maintenance and development.

As a policy committee, the importance of maintaining strong links with the ICSU secretariat, Board and Members was emphasised.

Decisions

To note the Executive Board's concerns and reaffirm the importance of CFRS statements as a mechanism for communicating and engaging the ICSU Membership on essential issues; to request the Secretariat to finalise negotiations with the Swiss Academy of Sciences regarding its generous offer of support for the Committee.

6. CFRS workshops

6.1 Science in contemporary wars (Sweden)

This topic had been on the CFRS agenda for some time. The chairman reported that he had started negotiations with a number of potential partners and funders in Sweden. There was considerable interest and ~20% of the funding had been secured.

Decision

To invite the Chair to proceed with funding applications and report back to CFRS, with a view to establishing a scientific advisory committee, in May 2010.

6.2 Science, media and the public (Bogota, Columbia)

Moises Wasserman presented a preliminary proposal for this 2 day workshop to be held at the end of November 2010 and sponsored by the National University of Colombia, the Academy and other local institutions. Funding had been secured. It was noted that the topic was very broad, although the focus would be mainly on Latin America. Members made a number of suggestions for potential participants and topics. It was suggested also that satellite meetings with a more local emphasis might be considered

Decision

To propose Ashima Anand, Carol Corillon and David Vaux as members of the scientific advisory committee;
to propose that the ICSU Regional Committee for Latin America also be represented on the advisory committee.

6.3 Private sector-academia interactions (Sweden)

The Chairman reported that plans for this workshop were proceeding well. €60k had been secured out of an estimated total budget of €100k and a project leader had been identified. Several CFRS members had agreed by email to serve on the Advisory committee. The main co-sponsors were the Royal Swedish Academies of Science and Engineering, with funding from a state agency for innovation. Additional funding was also being sought from industry. The aim was to hold the workshop in early 2011.

It was recognised that there were both systemic (e.g. institutional values) and specific (e.g. contract management) issues that raised concerns in relation to rights and responsibilities. Both sets of issues needed to be addressed, although there was potentially a long list of specific topics and not all of these could be included. A possible focus could be on understanding different perspectives and building mutually beneficial partnerships between academia and industry. In this context, it would be important to have the private sector represented on the advisory committee, although this should be independent of any funding provision.

Decision

To endorse the proposal of Ruth Arnon, Sylvia Rumball, John Sulston and Ovid Tzeng for membership of the scientific advisory committee;
to agree that the private sector should be represented on the advisory committee but, this should be independent of any funding contribution;
to agree that a final draft of the programme should be presented to CFRS in May.

6.4 Science and policy advice (Denmark)

The Chairman reported that he was planning to meet soon with the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, which was planning a workshop in either autumn 2010 or Spring 2011. This workshop would be in line with the broad criteria defined by CFRS for its international workshops and the hope was that the host would pay for CFRS members to attend.

Decision

The Chair to report back at the next CFRS meeting;
Fatma Attia to represent CFRS on the scientific advisory committee, if appropriate.

6.5 Science-antiscience (Norway)

The Chairman reported that the Norwegian Academy of Sciences and Letters had approached him about this workshop, which would also cover aspects of the relationship between religion and science. A focus on the philosophy of science

could be of interest but it would be important to see an agenda for the meeting before making a firm commitment to co-sponsor it.

Decision

David Vaux to represent CFRS on the scientific advisory committee and report back at the next CFRS meeting

6.6 Other workshops

Two other potential workshops were discussed:

- The Academy of Sciences, located in Taipei, was interested in developing a workshop on ‘the knowledge divide – rights and responsibilities of scientists’.
- The US National Academy of Sciences had expressed an interest in organising a meeting on ‘access to data, information and research materials’.

Sylvia Rumball reported that when she visited the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, the Malaysian Academy had expressed an interest in hosting a workshop. It was also noted that China:CAST had extended its offer to host a workshop.

Decision

To invite Ovid Tzeng to develop a proposal for a workshop on the knowledge divide; to request the Secretariat to follow up with the US National Academy of Sciences.

In a final discussion of the workshops, it was emphasised that they should all be well documented and generate products that are useful to the ICSU Members and scientific community. The outreach/communication elements of the workshops needed to be addressed as an integral part of the scientific planning for the events.

7. Wording of Statute 5

Following the discussion at the previous meeting, Peter Mahaffey had orchestrated an email discussion on proposed new wording for the Principle of Universality, Statute 5. This discussion was now broadened to include other members of the committee and a number of issues were agreed as follows:

1. The statement of the principle and the text on application of the principle should be separated.
2. Freedoms and responsibilities are linked and ideally should fit together in the same paragraph.
3. The first sentence of the principle should reflect ICSU’s mission, which is not just about scientific progress but science for the benefit of society.

4. Responsibilities function at a number of levels--from the individual to the Institution. However, the term 'collective responsibilities' was open to misinterpretation and should be avoided.

The challenge of communicating to the Executive Board and the ICSU Membership the rationale for any proposed changes was emphasised and it was agreed that an explanatory note would be helpful in this regard. It was noted that a draft would have to be approved by the Executive Board before any consultation with Members and that the next Executive Board meeting was to be held in early April

Decision

Peter Mahaffey to take the lead, together with Sylvia Rumball, Ovid Tzeng, Aki Sawyerr and Maurice Tchuente, in preparing a proposal for revised wording and an explanatory memorandum by end March 2010.

8. Turkey¹

In March 2009, it had been reported in several media outlets that the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) had censored the publication of a story on Darwin in one of the country's leading scientific journals. TUBITAK, being ICSU's Member in Turkey, was contacted in writing and invited to respond to these reports. The organisation provided a robust reply, explaining, from its perspective, the events that led to the media reports and regretting the misunderstandings that resulted in allegations of censorship. It added that the June issue of its journal was largely devoted to Darwin and evolution. TUBITAK affirmed its commitment to freedom of expression and freedom of research.

It was brought to the attention of CFRS (by the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies) that a number of internationally recognised and respected Turkish academics had been arrested over the past two years and were facing trial on a variety of charges associated with alleged plans to overthrow the current, democratically elected, Islamist government. A group of about 200 people had been charged with belonging to a so-called Ergenekon armed terrorist network. This group appeared to include a number of identified criminals, but also academics and others who were believed to have done nothing more than exercise their rights to freedom of opinion and expression. Most of the jailed academics were avowed secularists and several had resolutely resisted what they perceived as efforts to assert Islamic influence over Turkey's universities. An incomplete list of 13 senior academics, including Dr. Mehmet Haberal, who is the rector of Başkent University and a respected transplant surgeon, as well as several former University rectors who were currently facing trial, was made available to CFRS. An article on this situation was expected to be published soon in the online bulletin University Values.
<http://scholarsatrisk.nyu.edu/Documents/bulletin.html> .

Committee members expressed their serious concern about this situation.

Decision

¹ The text reporting this item has been amended on 20/5/2010 from that originally posted on 27/1/2010

The chairman to write to TUBITAK, applauding its commitment to freedom of expression and enclosing a copy of the article published in University Values.

9 Israel and Palestine

It was reported that a letter from the Chairman had been published recently in the correspondence section of the journal Nature (Nature, 461, p723). The letter highlighted the problems for Palestinian scientists wishing to enter Israel and for Iranian scientists wishing to enter Europe. The roots of both problems lay in National Security considerations but the effect was to discriminate against scientists on the basis of nationality.

The Secretariat recently has been informed by the Secretary General of the International Geographical Union (IGU) that the Union's decision to hold a Regional Conference in Tel Aviv had been challenged. The Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) had requested that IGU move the conference to another venue and called for a boycott if this did not occur. The IGU Executive Committee had rejected this request and invited PACBI to send a representative to the conference to participate in a session on the ethical and responsible practice of science in situations of military and political conflict. CFRS members were strongly supportive of the IGU stance, whilst emphasising that every effort should be made to ensure that Palestinian scientists could attend the conference.

Decision

To post the letter to Nature on the ICSU website;
to express full support for the position taken by IGU to maintain its Regional Conference in Tel Aviv and welcome Palestinian participants.

10 Iran

It was reported at the previous meeting that Iranian scientists were having problems obtaining visas to enter some European countries. For example, a case had been reported recently by the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, of a leading Iranian medical physicist who was denied a visa to attend a meeting in Germany. These problems for scientists from Iran provided part of the stimulus for the Chairman's letter to Nature (previous item). More recently there had been reports of discrimination by Iran against scientists from other countries wishing to travel there.

It now appeared that a large number of Iranian scientists, academics and students were being persecuted within their home country. CFRS was provided with information on 14 academics and 35 students who were believed to have been detained for various alleged anti-government activities. These individual cases were being monitored by human rights organisations and several individuals reportedly had been tortured. A number of detainees were associated with the University of Tehran, the National ICSU Member.

It was reported separately to the committee that activist Azerbaijani students in Iran were also being persecuted – imprisoned or prevented from continuing their studies. The students were reclaiming the right to education in their mother tongue and were publicly opposing government policies.

It appeared that in Iran there was a systematic clampdown on any perceived opposition to the government. In this context the potential action that could reasonably be expected of ICSU's National Member was severely limited. Reliable information was difficult to obtain and it was unclear to what extent the broader Iranian scientific community felt threatened. Despite the apparent gravity of the situation, there was concern that any precipitous action by CFRS might aggravate rather than alleviate the current situation.

Decision

Individual CFRS members and the secretariat to pursue relevant contacts to obtain further information on the situation for scientists in Iran.

11. Visas and the USA

The problems for visiting scientists to obtain entry visas to the US had been a long-standing item on the agenda of CFRS. The overall situation with regard to visa delays and total number of visas issued appeared to be improving. However, visa applications by nationals of some countries were still subject to extended delays.

It was reported that the Secretary General of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG) had recently applied two months in advance for a visa to attend a December meeting in the US of the American Geophysical Union. Despite having previously visited the US on several occasions, a new visa had not yet been granted. The US National Academy of Sciences had intervened on his behalf with the US State Department to try to accelerate the process. Although it was unclear why the delay occurred, it was perhaps related to his status as a Russian passport holder

Decision

To note the overall improvement in the visa situation in the USA, while recognising that some individual visa applications were still subject to extended delays.

12 Individual cases

Past cases

It was reported that Binayak Sen, the Indian paediatrician accused of assisting terrorists, had been released on bail but that the case against him had not been dismissed. A letter to the Indian Prime Minister had been prepared, as agreed previously by CFRS, but for the time being it was 'on hold'.

No further information had been obtained on the status of the Alaei brothers in Iran, who had been convicted for "cooperating with an enemy government" (see item 10).

New cases

12.1 Yale and the Danish cartoons

The American Association of University Professors had issued a statement criticising a decision by Yale University Press to exclude from a book about the controversy over cartoon images of the Prophet Mohammed, the actual images that caused the controversy. Originally, these images had been published in Denmark in 2005 and stimulated violent incidents across

the World. In contrast to the position taken by Yale, it appeared that Duke University had agreed to re-publish the cartoons.

Although this incident did not directly concern science, it raised important issues about self-censorship and public benefit, freedom of speech versus offence and anti-Muslim versus fundamentalist trends. All of these were relevant to science.

12.2 Turkmenistan and student travel

In August, Human Rights Watch issued a statement calling for removal of a travel ban on students in Turkmenistan bound for foreign private universities. The government-imposed ban was in conflict with UN covenants guaranteeing freedom of movement of individuals and access to higher education.

Members noted that Turkmenistan was one of several countries where restrictions on the freedoms of students were imposed either by the national authorities or outside forces. Other examples that the committee had considered occurred in Turkey, Iran and Palestine. These restrictions applied not only to students of science but they did affect science students.

12.3 Russia and science communications

An article from The New York Times (October 27, 2009), on vetting of scientific communications in Russia, was presented to CFRS. It was reported that State University Professors had to submit their work to administrators and obtain their permission before publishing it abroad or presenting it at overseas conferences. The article also acknowledged that an increase in oversight mechanisms in some Russian Universities was merited; but that it was a question of balance.

A Kaminskii reported that, from his experience, the publications issue was not a systemic problem, although the level of oversight apparently differed between Institutes. Similarly, with regard to attendance at international meetings, there was a certain amount of paperwork that had to be completed to get authorisation but this was a bureaucratic nuisance rather than a substantive obstacle to free movement of scientists. A serious problem for Russian scientists was the length of time it took to have visa requests processed for attendance at scientific conferences, particularly in the USA. There was also a specific concern that physicists from some US institutes were being prohibited from attending international meetings, for example in China.

12.4 Venezuela and scientific autonomy

C Corillon reported concerns that had arisen, from a number of sources, about the politicisation of science in Venezuela. It appeared that research funding was increasingly restricted and available only for projects that aligned closely with national policies. National autonomous universities were under pressure to focus exclusively on government-selected areas of applied research. Scientists in all government institutions required consent from the authorities to express their opinions on any 'political' matter. The balance between promoting and supporting research for national interests and maintaining scientific freedom and autonomy was threatened.

12.5. UK and independence of scientific advice

The case of Professor David Nutt, who was recently dismissed from his position as scientific advisor to the UK Government, was briefly considered by CFRS. Professor Nutt had given advice on recreational drug use that was contrary to existing UK policy. When his recommendations did not lead to a change in policy, he expressed his views publicly and was summarily dismissed by the minister.

This case was considered as an example of the challenges faced by scientists acting in political advisory roles. When science advice is at odds with political agendas, then conflicts can be difficult to manage. At the same time, it was recognised that scientific advice was only one factor in the development of government policies. Ultimately, governments are entitled to recruit and dismiss scientific advisors as they consider appropriate, provided that due respect of such individuals is maintained. In this particular instance, Professor Nutt had preserved his own scientific integrity and the support of the academic community. Furthermore, the UK government had been prompted by this affair to develop new 'rules of engagement' to ensure the independence of scientific advisors.

Decision

To request C Corillon to continue to monitor the situation of Binayak Sen and inform the committee of any necessary action;
to monitor cases of self-censorship within academia and science in particular;
to consider for the next CFRS meeting whether a statement on students and the Principle of Universality should be developed;
to ask C Corillon to make enquiries as to the situation of US physicists wishing to attend international meetings;
to monitor the situation for science in Venezuela;
to reaffirm the previous decision to develop criteria for cases that are appropriate for consideration by CFRS.

13 Meetings

Past meetings

13.1 COMEST meeting

S Rumball had represented CFRS at the 6th Ordinary Session of the UNESCO World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) in Kuala Lumpur in June 2009. COMEST is an advisory body composed of 18 independent experts. ICSU is invited to its meetings as an observer. UNESCO had been invited to the first CFRS meeting in 2007, when it had been agreed that there was potential for collaboration between the Commission and CFRS.

COMEST was now working in two main areas of interest to CFRS: 1. environmental ethics, and 2. up-dating a declaration on the status of scientific workers. It was agreed that developing links on these topics would be useful. In addition, it was suggested that there might be interest from COMEST in participating in some of the planned CFRS workshops (item 6).

13.2 EASE science editors' meeting

David Vaux had represented CFRS at a meeting of the European Association of Science Editors (EASE) in Pisa, Italy, September 2009. He had made a presentation on the (mis)use of statistics and manipulation of images in scientific publications. This included identification of several practical measures that could be adopted by journals to improve the scientific record. There had been a call at the meeting for the establishment of universal standards for conflict of interest declarations.

In discussions, the issues associated with open access publishing were raised. The rights and responsibilities of scientists and scientific institutions with regard to open access publishing was identified as an important area for consideration.

Future meetings

13.3 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity

The 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity was scheduled to take place in Singapore on 21-24 July, 2010. Members agreed that CFRS participation in this conference was important and they agreed to nominate speakers/presenters, particularly from the Asian region. It was suggested that the conference should focus on creating a research environment to foster research integrity. It should analyse the factors that induce misbehaviour in science and not simply adopt a normative approach to developing guidelines and rules.

13.4 Shanghai World Trade Fair

John Sulston, had been invited by Professor Guy de Thé from the Inter-Academy Medical Panel (IAMP) to participate in the World Trade Fair Forum on Health in Megacities in Shanghai in October, 2010. Sulston proposed to speak on the responsibility of scientists with regard to world medicine. Members agreed that this was an appropriate meeting and topic for a contribution from CFRS. John's participation should also be seen as an opportunity to raise the visibility and profile of CFRS.

Decision

To invite COMEST to be represented at the CFRS workshops;
to discuss open access to scientific information at the next CFRS meeting;
to agree to CFRS participation in the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity and recommend to the Executive Board that ICSU be a co-sponsor of this conference;
to endorse John Sulston's participation, representing ICSU-CFRS, in the World Trade Fair.

14 Foresight

In preparation for the 2nd ICSU Strategic Plan, 2012-2017, a science foresight exercise had been launched by the Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR). CFRS members were now asked to contribute to this and reflect on the key drivers that were likely to influence science and society over the next 2 decades.

Members made a number of suggestions, including the following:

- The knowledge divide

- Specialisation and selection in science
- Agenda setting and the role of the private sector
- Scientific knowledge versus faith; rational versus irrational decision making
- Local and national politics
- Scientific literacy and understanding of science
- Population growth, energy production, water
- Food production and attitudes
- Climate change and natural disasters
- Geo-politics and power relations
- Economics and funding for science
- Major technological breakthroughs, e.g. in renewable energy
- Interplay between technology and society
- Travel and distance communications
- Internet and mobile communications
- The virtual world/virtual reality
- Choice of economic models and indicators for development (the ‘new economists’)
- Integration of natural and social sciences
- Population growth and demographics
- Data stewardship and access
- Acceptance of science

All of these ideas would be integrated with contributions from other sources, including an on-line consultation to develop plausible future scenarios to guide ICSU’s longer-term strategies.

15 Potential Statements

15.1 Universality in the Polar Regions

An earlier version of this statement had been considered by CFRS at its previous meeting. A near-final draft was now presented. It was clarified that the audience included polar scientists and political stakeholders. Members were satisfied with the content of the current statement and suggestions were made as to how the ‘packaging’ might be improved to highlight the recommendations.

15.2 Use of animals in research

It was reported that animal rights activists in the US had been protesting the use of primates in experimentation. Four universities had been named and accused of violations. CFRS did not have sufficient information to make any judgement on these accusations but recognized that the more general issue of the use of animals in research was relevant to the rights and responsibilities of scientists. It was noted that ICSU had released a statement in 1996 on ‘Principles for the use of Animals in Research and Education’.

Members considered that the 1996 statement remained pertinent. However, it was considered that consultation with the Biological Unions would be worthwhile.

15.3 Science and Human Rights

Following the decision at the previous CFRS meeting, C Corillon had prepared a brief scoping paper for a statement on science and human rights. There were many international agreements on human rights which were relevant to scientists and to focus the statement, a choice would have to be made as to which agreements to reference. One obvious starting point was the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, with other agreements perhaps being considered only where they specifically refer to science.

It was recognised that the Principle of Universality was itself an outflow of international human rights agreements. There were also issues relating to the practice of science that needed to be considered in the context of human rights. It was important to consider both the rights of individual scientists and the responsibility of scientists to uphold and support human rights. As a first step, it was considered useful to carry out a broad scan and list all references to science in the primary declarations and covenants. In step two, an analysis of the essential implications for science could then generate a separate short paper/statement.

Decision

To approve the statement on Universality in the Polar Regions;
to solicit comments from the Biological Unions on the 1996 statement on the use of animals in research;
to invite C Corillon to further develop a list of relevant science-related human rights texts and then a statement based on an analysis of the most important texts.

16 Outreach and website developments

Jacinta Legg, the ICSU communications officer, presented the plans for re-development of the ICSU web-site. The Universality of Science and the work of CFRS would be more visible on the new site and there would be possibilities for developing on-line blogs and discussion fora. The work of CFRS was one area that had been identified for the use of these interactive communication tools.

17 Dates of upcoming meetings

The dates and locations of the next committee meetings were dictated by other meetings and conferences which CFRS had agreed to attend. At the same time, there was a need for interaction earlier in 2010 to make decisions on the various workshops that were currently developing.

Decision

To hold a virtual meeting (teleconference) on 6 May, 2010;
to meet prior to the World Conference on Research Integrity (21-24 July) in Singapore on 19-20 July;
to meet in Bogota on 15-16 November, prior to the workshop on Science, Media and the Public (17-19 November).