

**8th meeting of the ICSU**  
**Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science (CFRS)**  
Singapore National Academy of Sciences  
Singapore Science Centre  
19-20 July, 2010

**Meeting report**

**Present:** Ashima Anand, Fatma Attia Carol Corillon, Alexander Kaminskii, Peter Mahaffy, Sylvia Rumball (acting chairperson), Akilagpa Sawyerr, John Sulston, Maurice Tchunte (ex officio) Ovid Tzeng, David Vaux, Moises Wasserman, Jiansheng Zhang.

**ICSU Secretariat:** Carthage Smith (ex officio), Nordin Hassan (ROAP)

**Guests:** Bruce MacKellar (RCAP), Roger Pfister, R Subramaniam

**Apologies for absence:** Ruth Arnon (joined by phone for item 7.2) ; Bengt Gustafsson (joined by phone for item 5)

**1. Welcoming remarks and introductions**

In the absence of Bengt Gustafsson, the committee elected Sylvia Rumball as acting chair for this meeting. Bruce MacKellar and Nordin Hassan, representing the ICSU Regional Committee and Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, were welcomed to the meeting as guests

Professor Leo Tan, President of the Singapore Academy of Sciences, welcomed the committee and gave a brief summary of some of the issues confronting the national scientific community, which had developed very rapidly over the past decade. He then introduced Professor Lim Meng, the chief executive of the Singapore Science Centre, and Professor Subramaniam, who had assisted in organising the meeting. There would be an opportunity to further explore freedom and responsibility issues in the local context on the morning following the CFRS meeting, when a meeting had been arranged with several research leaders.

Roger Pfister, the newly appointed Executive Secretary for CFRS, was introduced to the committee. He would formally take up this position on October 1. He would be based in Berne, Switzerland and his post was split 40:60 between supporting CFRS and heading international activity at the Swiss Academy of Natural Sciences. It was a new position entirely supported by the Swiss Academy. It was clarified that in his CFRS role he would report to the Deputy Executive Director at ICSU, who would continue to be an *ex officio* committee member. The administrative support for the committee would continue to be provided by ICSU.

It was noted that Professor Molina, who had originally been selected for the committee had not responded to invitations to serve.

**Decision**

To thank Professors Tan and Meng for generously hosting this meeting  
To welcome Roger Pfister and note the new secretariat arrangements for CFRS, with thanks to the Swiss Academy;  
To request the secretariat to make a final effort to contact Professor Molina

**2. Adoption of agenda**

Members were reminded that the Agenda and Meeting Report were public documents but that the individual meeting documents were confidential.

**Decision**

To adopt the agenda;  
to note that meeting documents are confidential.

**3. Report of the 7th CFRS meeting and 6 May teleconference and matters arising  
B Gustafsson**

Item 4 Persecution of Scholars

Following consideration of a report on the Widespread Persecution of Scholars at the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> CFRS meetings it had been agreed to invite the author, Brendan O'Malley, to discuss with CFRS. This was easier to organise when the committee met at the ICSU Secretariat and it was noted that the next CFRS meeting would be in Colombia.

Item 14 Foresight

At the previous meeting, CFRS had made a number of suggestions for key drivers of science and technology to be included in the ongoing ICSU foresight exercise. C Smith gave a brief update on this exercise, for which input from a number of diverse sources was currently being integrated to develop plausible scenarios for 2031. These could be usefully presented and discussed at the next CFRS meeting

3.1 Amendment of the 7<sup>th</sup> CFRS meeting report

Concerns had been raised at the previous meeting in relation to the situation of some scholars in Turkey (see ahead also, item 7.6) and TUBITAK, the ICSU Turkish National Member, had subsequently been contacted. During this correspondence some amendments to the previously agreed report of the 7th CFRS meeting were agreed in consultation with Bengt Gustafsson, the CFRS chair. However, the other CFRS members were not consulted. An amended report was posted on line in May with a footnote explaining that the relevant text had been amended from the earlier January version.

Members expressed concerns that the agreed meeting report had been altered without consultation with the whole committee.

**Decision**

To reaffirm the previous decision to invite Brendan O'Malley to contribute to a future CFRS meeting;  
 to include Foresight and the ICSU Strategic plan on the agenda for the next CFRS meeting;  
 to agree that amendments to the approved reports of CFRS meetings should only be made in exceptional circumstances and after consultation with the whole committee.

**4. Report from the Executive Board on CFRS statements**

Following on from previous CFRS and Executive Board (EB) discussions, Bengt Gustafsson had attended the 102nd EB meeting in April to discuss CFRS activities, including the production of statements. Some concern had been expressed that CFRS had published statements that were *de facto* considered to be ICSU policy, whereas policy-setting responsibility rested primarily with the EB. In discussion with the EB, it was recognised that CFRS was a policy committee and, within its areas of responsibility, it had an important advisory role to the ICSU membership. Producing statements was one mechanism for fulfilling this function. It was agreed that the distinction should be made between formal ICSU policy statements and CFRS 'advisories/memos' and that CFRS should be alert to issues which might fall under the former category and interact with the Board accordingly.

In discussion, members recognised that the criteria and procedures for producing CFRS statements were not clearly articulated and that, based on the accumulated experience to date, it was timely to agree on these.

**Decision**

To note the Board decision that CFRS should continue to have the authority to produce statements under its own name, provided that these represent the consensus of the full committee, and are agreed by the *ex officio* members;  
 to consider the criteria and process for producing CFRS statements at the next CFRS meeting

**5. CFRS workshops**

## 5.1 Science Communication (Bogota)

M Wassermann updated members on the progress in organising the workshop in Bogota on "Science communication: rights and responsibilities of the science community and the media". The funding and logistical arrangements were in place for a meeting with upto 700 participants in November 2010. The ICSU Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean had been informed. 20 grants were available to support the attendance of graduate students in science or journalism studies from Universities in the region. The conference proceedings would be published and the presentations would be recorded on video and made available on-line.

## 5.2 Private sector-academia interactions (Sweden)

Bengt Gustafsson reported that although the funding had been secured, progress had not been as rapid as he would have hoped in organising this workshop. Following

recommendations from CFRS at the previous meeting that the focus be broadened to include specific expertise from outside the science and business sectors, the main sponsors had not yet reached a consensus on this. A further meeting of the local organising committee was planned for September and he still hoped that the workshop would take place in late 2011.

CFRS members reasserted their view that the focus should be broader than traditional technology transfer mechanisms between business and industry and needed to be placed in the larger global context of the rights and responsibilities of public and private sector science. In order to achieve this it would be important to include relevant expertise, for example on patents and IPR, and to explore mechanisms for an equitable distribution of the societal benefits of research. Such expertise should be present at the workshop, although not necessarily on the scientific organising committee which had to be limited in size.

### 5.3 Science in contemporary wars (Sweden)

Bengt Gustafsson reported that he had identified local organising partners and a likely funder and was working on a funding application to support this workshop. He had contacted a number of scientists and experts in human-rights and international law and had received several suggestions as regards the programme.

In discussion, it was agreed that the International Pugwash organisation would be an appropriate co-sponsor.

### 5.4 Science and Religion (Norway)

This topic had been suggested by the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters. Bengt Gustafsson had made direct contact with the two lead persons at the Academy, who were developing a list of potential contacts.

### 5.5 International sharing of scientific data (USA)

The US National Academy of Sciences had now submitted a detailed proposal for this workshop, which was to be organised in collaboration with CFRS and the US Committee on Data for Science and Technology (US-CODATA). The proposed title was “The case for international sharing of scientific data: a focus on developing countries” and the workshop would be conducted and reported in line with US-National Research Council procedures.

Members welcomed this proposal which was in response to the invitation circulated to member organisations in 2009. CFRS members agreed that it was a well-considered proposal, with many aspects which were clearly related to the freedom and responsibilities of science. Data and information access had been a recurrent theme of interest in CFRS meetings and access to data was specifically highlighted in statute 5.

### 5.6 Science and Policy (Denmark)

A lead person had been identified by the Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters and had been contacted by Bengt Gustafsson. A meeting was planned for early September to develop this further.

### 5.7 The knowledge divide (China: Taipei)

Ovid Tzeng reiterated China: Taipei's interest in this topic, re access to the benefits of science and scientific information. He had discussed the topic with Jiansheng Zhang (China: CAST), including the possibility of collaboration on the workshop, and Jiansheng responded positively. Ovid had identified potential funding sources, which might be used to support such a workshop in cities other than Taipei.

### 5.8 Other

John Sulston reported that he had recently been involved in a panel discussion on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) organised by the Royal Society and there might be a possibility of following up on some aspects of this with a workshop. There was considerable enthusiasm from the committee for this idea.

#### **Decision**

To note with satisfaction the progress on the science communication workshop;  
 to reaffirm the broader global focus of the private sector-academia interactions workshop and the need to include specific expertise from outside the traditional science and private sector;  
 to encourage the chairman to approach International Pugwash in relation to the workshop on science and contemporary wars;  
 to formally write to the relevant lead partners for workshops 5.4 and 5.6, expressing ICSU's satisfaction and encouragement and confirming CFRS support.  
 to welcome the opportunity to co-sponsor the US-NAS workshop on data sharing and request the Secretariat, on behalf of the committee, to liaise with the organisers:  
 John Sulston to explore with the UK Royal Society the possibility of a workshop on IPR.

## **6. Wording of Statute 5**

It had been discussed and agreed at previous meetings that the Principle of Universality, ICSU statute 5, needed to be up-dated to reflect the balance between the freedoms and responsibilities of science. The Executive Board had agreed to this and given some suggestions as to how it might be achieved, whilst noting that any statute change would require support from the Membership and would have to be formally approved at the General Assembly in 2011.

A sub-group of CFRS had met immediately prior to this meeting to finalise revised wording for statute 5 together with an explanatory memorandum. These were based on extensive previous discussions and email correspondence. Links were made, as appropriate, to the established conventions on human rights and science (item 8.1). Members were satisfied that the revised wording (see [annex 1](#)) had achieved the desired balance.

**Decision**

To recommend to the Executive Board that it approve the revised wording for statute 5 and circulate this to Members for consideration.

**7. Individual cases**

## 7.1 Up-dates on past cases

The case of Binayak Sen, a medical doctor who had been imprisoned in 2007 whilst awaiting trial in India on charges of involvement with terrorists, had been considered previously by the committee. He was granted unconditional release on bail by the Supreme Court in May 2009 and his trial was ongoing.

**Decision**

To take no action at this stage but continue to monitor the case of Binayek Sen

## 7.2 Israel, scholarly access and HUGO

The committee was provided with information on several recent incidents involving Israel and scholarly access:

1. Information had been provided by the UK Royal Society concerning the case of Mr Jameel Zayed, a PhD student at the University of Cambridge, who had been refused entry to Israel at Tel Aviv airport. He was a UK citizen and had been informed that he should not attempt to enter Israel again until 2015, which jeopardised a planned bi-lateral research project between the Universities of Cambridge and Tel Aviv. This case had attracted considerable publicity and anti-Israeli sentiment in the UK. Members agreed that this was essentially a bi-lateral case and it was noted that the Israeli Academy could not proceed with enquiries unless it was formally contacted.
2. Following up on an issue that had been discussed at the previous CFRS meeting, the International Geographical Union had now received an open letter from the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic Boycott of Israel (PACBI) protesting at the Union's decision to maintain its regional meeting in Israel.
3. A news flash from the International Academics Friends of Israel (IAFI) in June had called for a planned meeting in Dubai of the Human Genome Organisation (HUGO) to be relocated because of entry restrictions on Israeli academics. Ruth Arnon had spoken with Israeli scientists involved with HUGO and advised that this issue was likely to resolve itself and no action from CFRS was necessary at this stage.
4. A brief report in the Chronicle of Higher Education in May indicated that a senior Israeli scientist had been denied an entry visa to Egypt to attend a scientific conference in May. A separate report in December 2009 from Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME) indicated that a team from Areil University, Israel, had been excluded from a 'solar decathlon' competition for political reasons. Members were concerned at these past cases, which shed light on the recurrent problems for scientists in the Middle East. It was important for ICSU and its

Members to Adhere to the Principle of Universality - to continue to promote collaboration and oppose discrimination, independent of political considerations.

**Decision**

To note, with concern, the various reports where Israeli scholars and institutions had been subject to restrictions on freedom of association;  
to make enquiries with the UK Royal Society regarding the case of Jameel Zayed;  
to reiterate the support to IGU in resisting the call for a boycott of Israel;  
Ruth Arnon to continue to monitor the situation concerning the HUGO meeting and to inform CFRS if any future action was required

7.3 Ernesto Bustamente (Peru)

The case of Dr Ernesto Bustamente, an eminent Peruvian biologist, had attracted the attention of the scientific press, including SciDev.net. He had been found guilty of defamation by a Criminal Court in Peru after he criticised a colleague's research on genetically modified maize. The work in question had been announced but not yet published in a peer-reviewed journal, when it was criticised in the news media by Dr Bustamente. He was then pursued for defamation, found guilty and given a suspended sentence for up to a year. A statement had been issued by the Peruvian Academy of Sciences in support of Dr Bustamente and asking that 'measures are taken so that matters of debate and scientific opinion that only should be resolved among scientists and not by the judiciary never again are aired in the courts.'

This was considered to be largely a national issue that was most likely to be corrected via the national justice system in the court of appeal. Moreover, it appeared that scientific works are exempt from being classified as libel in the Peruvian criminal code. However, members noted that this was not the case in all countries, including the UK and the several countries with a British-based legal system. Here there were several cases of concern, in which scientists were being prosecuted for having made critical public statements based on scientific arguments. This was clearly contrary to the Principle of Universality and freedom of expression. It was reported that in the UK the laws on libel were currently undergoing review and the issue of scientific works was likely to be addressed.

**Decision**

To express support to the Peruvian Academy for its statement relating to Dr Bustamante;  
To monitor the situation for libel cases concerning scientific works

7.4 Massoud Ali Mohammadi and Iranian cases

The murder in January 2010 of Ali Mohammadi, a professor of elementary particle physics at Tehran University, had received worldwide media coverage. It was a subject of claims and counter-claims, with the Iranian government accusing US security forces and the USA accusing the Iranian authorities. There had been calls from international academic groups for the Iranian authorities to launch an immediate investigation into his apparent assassination. It was noted that amongst his various

international responsibilities, Professor Mohammadi had served as Iran's representative to the Synchrotron-light for Experimental Science and Applications in the Middle East (SESAME) project, which operates under UNESCO. Given the political discord, it was apparent that CFRS itself could not affect this case but expressing concern could have some value.

As discussed at the previous meeting, there were reports that a large number of academics and students remained missing, following government crackdowns after the presidential elections in 2009. A number of Iranian Baha'i leaders were arrested in the crackdown and accused of fermenting the unrest. This group, including 4 health professionals and engineers, was facing trial for "being corrupt on Earth", which is considered a crime against God and carries the death penalty.

Members expressed considerable concern about these cases and the situation for scientists and students in Iran, who actively opposed the regime. At the same time it was recognised that these cases did not relate to their status as scientists *per se* or their conduct of science. The majority of scientists in Iran continued to practise their research without any interference. However, it could be argued that the responsibility of scientists to their students and society more broadly cannot be separated from their role as scientists.

As in the previous meeting, members continued to be concerned that any public action from ICSU-CFRS might aggravate rather than ameliorate the situation. Several of the individuals who were reported missing were associated with the University of Tehran, the ICSU national Member.

#### **Decision**

To contact UNESCO concerning the case of Professor Ali Mohammadi  
To continue to closely monitor the situation regarding the persecution of Iranian Academics and students

#### 7.5 L'Aquila cases (Italy)

Following the earthquake in Aquila, Italy in April 2009, scientists who had served on a committee (the Abruzzi Regional High Risk Committee) that had failed to predict the earthquake had recently been indicted. This case had been covered in the journal *Nature* and the national media and the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics had issued a related statement in June 2010. This statement drew on the Principle of Universality and asserted that 'no scientist.. should be prosecuted for having expressed a scientific opinion based on available knowledge..' and 'condemns unacceptable political and judicial interference into scientific issues'.

In discussion, members noted that this particular case was complicated by apparently inaccurate communication of the scientific expert committee's advice at the time of the earthquake. The case raised a number of generic issues regarding scientific advice and science for policy. It was important that responsible scientists continued to be able provide advice to the best of their capacity without fear of subsequent prosecution. At the same time it was also important to make the clear distinction from negligence, for which individuals could justifiably be prosecuted.

**Decision**

To express support for the statement from IUGG on freedom to conduct science and the responsibilities of scientists

## 7.6 Turkish cases

The case of Dr Haberal and a number of his colleagues, who had been arrested and accused of being part of an anti-government terrorist organisation, was considered at the previous CFRS meeting. A letter subsequently had been sent to ICSU's National Member, the scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK), asking for clarification of the situation regarding Dr Haberal and his colleagues. The response was that this case should be left to the hands of the independent judiciary.

It was noted that the European Union had sent a warning to Turkey in February 2010 "not to allow legal proceedings to be used as a pretext to exert undue pressure on critical journalists, academics or opposition politicians".

**Decision**

To contact TUBITAK again expressing continued concern regarding the case of Dr Haberal and his colleagues and requesting an update on the situation.

## 7.7 Cuban cases

As reported in the mainstream media, a number of 'political' prisoners in Cuba had been transferred or released from detention in June 2010. Several academics, including Jose Luis Garcia Paneque, Hector Maseda and Arnaldo Ramos Lauzarique, who had been imprisoned for several years, had been moved to prisons closer to their homes, although they and other colleagues remained in detention. Human rights organisations and academic networks had been campaigning for the release of these prisoners, although it was an intervention from representatives of the catholic church that appeared to stimulate the recent positive developments.

It was noted that CFRS had previously taken up the case of Cuban scientists who had been denied visas to the USA but had not previously considered the case of those who were imprisoned in Cuba. As in several previous items considered at this meeting it was difficult to separate the 'political' aspects of these cases from the academic freedom and human rights aspects. Nevertheless, the recent positive developments were to be welcomed and it was appropriate to communicate this message to the Cuban Academy of Sciences - ICSU's National Member. In so doing, it was noted that the ICSU Executive Board had accepted an invitation to meet in Cuba in April 2011.

**Decision**

To write to the Cuban Academy of Sciences welcoming the recent positive development regarding imprisoned academics.

## 7.8 UNESCO-Obiang Nguema Mbasogo International Prize

A decision by UNESCO to co-sponsor a life sciences prize with the President of Equatorial Guinea had attracted strong protests from the international community, human rights organisations and academic networks. Mr Obiang, whose dictatorship had been in power for 30 years, had been repeatedly criticised by the UN and other organisations for corruption and abuse of human rights. At a recent information meeting of UNESCO's Executive Board on 15 June, the Director General, Irina Bokova, had postponed a decision on the award of the prize to be reconsidered in October.

In discussion, it was acknowledged that the sources of funding for science prizes could often be questioned for 'ethical/moral' reasons. Many disreputable persons, including political leaders and their associates, had established funds for science and health care or other worthy activities. However, the nature of the Obiang prize, which provided international publicity for a regime that was universally condemned, meant that it should not be accepted. Its award would be offensive both to the people suffering in Equatorial Guinea and to the international science community.

It was noted that there had been recent discussions within ICSU about diversification of funding, including seeking sponsorship for a possible science prize. Members considered that it was very important for ICSU to clarify its policy and criteria for soliciting and accepting external funds and for crediting co-sponsors.

### **Decision**

To write to The Director General of UNESCO expressing support for her decision not to set a date for the awarding of the UNESCO-Obiang Nguema Mbasogo International Prize;

to recommend to the Executive Board that it develop a clear policy on co-sponsorship and the acceptance of external funds, including private sector funds, for ICSU activities.

## 7.9 Criteria for cases

Having considered the various cases at this meeting, some members expressed confusion as to why particular cases appeared on the agenda and the limits of what it is and isn't appropriate for the Committee to consider. In particular, the line between individual cases that specifically involve the conduct of science and those that involve the human rights of persons who happen to be scientists was unclear. The adopted 'case by case' approach would benefit from being situated in an overall guidance framework.

It was clarified that cases on the agenda came from 4 sources: 1) referrals from ICSU Members; 2) science cases in the media; 3) cases referred by committee members; 4) cases being monitored by the International Human Rights Network of Academies and Scholarly Societies, to which CFRS might add value. For many of these individual cases, the committee's role was simply to encourage the relevant National Member to follow up. The importance of these individual cases for identifying generic policy issues that should be followed up by CFRS was emphasised.

**Decision**

To request the secretariat to prepare for its next meeting draft criteria for cases to be considered by CFRS

**8. Potential Statements**

## 8.1 Science and Human Rights

Following-up the scoping paper that she had prepared for the previous meeting, Carol Corillon now presented a list of the main science-related texts from various international covenants and agreements relating to human rights. The original intention had been to produce a CFRS statement based on an analysis of this listing. However, members agreed in discussion that the full list in its present form was a useful reference document without any further analysis. It needed a general introduction and clearer cross-referencing to the various source documents and then it should be provided as a resource for the ICSU membership.

**Decision**

To finalise the list of science-related human-rights instruments, prepare a document with an introduction and clear cross-referencing and post it as a reference resource on the website (Action: Carol, Aki and Fatma).

## 8.2 Publication/author bias

David Vaux presented a briefing paper, which he had been invited to prepare at the previous meeting, on bias in scientific publishing. This topic had originally arisen because of concern about discrimination against authors from developing countries and/or lesser-known institutions. David's paper broadened the range of biases to include bias towards positive findings, eg in clinical trials, and bias by journal reviewers. Several recent initiatives, including registries for clinical trials, had been taken to address the first issue. Bias by reviewers, including both editors and peer reviewers could arise for a number of reasons, including competition, prestige of the authors, nationality, gender etc. One mechanism, for reducing such bias was double-blind reviewing, in which the reviewers (and possibly the editors) are not told the name of the authors or their address or affiliation. It would be interesting to explore whether the ICSU Members, involved in science publishing, had considered adopting this mechanism.

**Decision**

To include publication bias issues in a future on-line dialogue on scientific responsibilities and the scientific record, once the new ICSU web-site has been launched;  
to prepare a Discussion document on policies concerning publishing, including double-blind reviewing and consult with the ICSU membership (Action: David, Carthage and Fatma)

### 8.3 Intellectual Property rights

A recent court ruling in the USA had overturned patents held by the company Myriad on the BRCA1 breast cancer susceptibility gene. This controversial patent had been strongly opposed by patient groups and academic researchers. It was granted on a gene sequence and not an application and thus potentially restricted any research on this gene. Partially in response to the original BRCA1 patent claim and similar claims on gene sequences, ICSU had published a statement in June 2002 on gene patenting. This was revised from an earlier 1992 statement that had opposed the patenting of cDNA sequences of unknown function. The 2002 statement took into account European legislation and allowed for patenting of DNA sequences under certain conditions.

Gene patenting has significant implications for the principle of universality of science and the access and use of research materials as well as access to the benefits of science. Committee members considered that the 2002 statement did not state strongly enough the case against patenting of DNA sequences, re. open access to fundamental genetic data for research. The over-turning of the BRCA1 patent provided an opportune moment for ICSU to up-date its current position.

#### **Decision**

To advise the Executive Board that the ICSU statement on gene patenting should be up-dated and to offer to assist in achieving this.

## 9. Scientific publishing issues

### 9.1 Pressures and plagiarism

D Vaux introduced an article, which had been published in *Nature* (vol 463, Jan 2010) entitled 'publish or perish in China'. This highlighted multiple cases of plagiarism in crystallography publications from one research group in China. The pressure to publish and associated incentives and monetary awards for publications were considered to be the underlying cause of this dishonesty.

Authorship and attribution, incentives and evaluation were central to science systems in all countries and had been discussed several times previously by CSPR in relation to research integrity. It was becoming clear that the pressure to publish was distorting the practice of science in many areas.

### 9.2 Measuring credit

An article had been published in *Nature* in December 2009 describing a proposed author ID system, whereby every scientist would be identified by a unique digital identifier that could be used to identify all his/her published contributions (in journals, datasets, web blogs etc). This had potential to more fully attribute credit and enable assessment of the complete scientific contribution of individuals.

### 9.3 Publication guidelines and codes

Following discussions at the 1<sup>st</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity in 2008, it had been agreed that ICSU would work with the UK-based Scientific Committee on Publication Ethics (SCOPE) and the STM Publishers association to try and develop international guidelines on scientific publications. After an initial consultation, there had been little visible progress until STM had very recently produced draft International standards/best practices for editors. This draft was presented to CFRS for information and it was noted that SCOPE had produced similar guidelines.

The STM guidelines focussed on the role of editors and were limited in their coverage of authorship and peer-review. These were areas where ICSU could contribute and it was noted that there would be a series of sessions and a workshop devoted to scientific publications at the World Conference on Research Integrity over the next few days.

#### **Decision**

To introduce these issues, where appropriate, into the discussions at the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity

## 10. World Conference on Research Integrity, 22-24 July

### 10.1 Conference agenda and CFRS role(s)

The conference agenda and papers are available at <https://www.wcri2010.org/index.asp>. ICSU was one of several supporting organisations for the Conference and several CFRS members would be speaking in plenary or parallel sessions. This was recognised as an important opportunity to highlight the work of CFRS and engage with institutions and individuals on critical aspects of the rights and responsibilities of science

### 10.2 Science and Ethics

John Sulston had written a short article on levels of integrity in science – personal, collective, institutional. This had been published as a feature in *Biochemical Society* in 2008. As it was very pertinent to the forthcoming conference, members had asked that the article be circulated. The definition of various levels of responsibility was also considered to be very relevant to statute 5 (see annex 1).

### 10.3 Proposal for an International Ombudsman

At the 6<sup>th</sup> CFRS meeting (May, 2009) the case of Peter Lawrence, Cambridge, UK had been considered. He had complained to *Cell* about a publication from a US Group which reproduced much of his own earlier work without any attribution. The journal had taken no action and the case had been the subject of an on-line blog that attracted considerable attention. In a recent communication with Professor Lawrence, he had proposed the need for an international ombudsman to deal with cases, relating to research integrity, that could not be resolved via other mechanisms. The need for some kind of international research integrity monitoring or appeal system might be raised at

the forthcoming conference but it was not obvious how such a structure could have the authority to be effective.

**Decision**

To consider the outcomes and potential implications of the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity at the next CFRS meeting

11. Any other business

11.1 Links between CFRS and ICSU Regional Offices

Bruce Mc Kellar and Nordin Hassan were invited to give their views on the meeting and how the ICSU Regional structures might help CFRS in its work and vice versa. It was noted that the CFRS reports did go to the Regional Committees for consideration but this was mainly a reporting exercise. There was considerable potential for the regional structures to help both in identifying issues for CFRS to consider and in implementing actions – both on individual cases and on activities such as workshops. The resources of the regional offices were limited but they could provide valuable contacts to individuals and institutions via their regional networks. An example of this was Iran, which was represented on the Regional Committee for Asia and the Pacific and had been very constructive in helping develop links with Central Asian countries.

**Decision**

To involve the ICSU Regional structures in CFRS activities, where appropriate

12. Dates of the next meetings

Members were reminded that they had previously agreed to hold the next meeting in Bogota, immediately prior to the workshop on science communication. They were also committed to a meeting in association with the ICSU General Assembly and all members were invited to stay for the Assembly itself.

**Decision**

To agree the dates of future meetings as follows:

- **16-17 November, 2010**, Bogota, (followed by w.shop 18-19 Nov)
- First half 2011 tbd (possibly in Berne)
- **24 September, 2011**, Rome, (ICSU General Assembly, 26-30 Sept.)

To note that the current committee membership would continue until after the first meeting in 2012

**Annex 1.** Explanatory memorandum and revised wording for statute 5

\*\*\*\*\*

**Wednesday 21 July: Meeting with members of Singapore Academy of Sciences**

Professor Leo Tan and several Academic leaders from the main Universities and Institutes in Singapore, and from a range of disciplines, met with CFRS members for a 3hr discussion on 21 July. This gave the committee a unique insight into the science and education system in

Singapore and into some of the challenges regarding freedom and responsibility of science. Thus far, there had not been many high profile cases of serious research misconduct in Singapore but the system was very competitive and so that there was a lot of pressure on younger scientists. The cultural barriers to prevent cheating were strong but the local science community was very international and so these cultural norms were also being confronted with other worldviews.

**Thursday, Friday, Saturday, 22-24 July: 2<sup>nd</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity**

CFRS members attended the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity, which was co-organised by the US Office of Research Integrity and the European Science Foundation, with support from ICSU. Carthage Smith represented ICSU on the Conference organising committee. David Vaux and Ovid Tzeng gave plenary talks at the Conference and several other committee members gave presentations in the various parallel sessions. The Conference was attended by ~350 scientists, research policy makers and administrators. The main outcome was a Singapore Statement of principles for research integrity.

## **Annex 1 Explanatory memorandum and revised wording for statute 5**

### **Explanatory Note:**

Reflecting the mandate implicit in its title, the Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the Conduct of Science (CFRS) was invited by the ICSU Executive Board in 2009 to “consider revising Statute 5 to more explicitly include scientific responsibilities, with a view to presenting this to the 30th General Assembly.”

In carrying out this task, CFRS has based its revisions to the existing Statute 5 on the following guidelines.

1. The statement of the principle and the text on the application of the principle should be separated into two paragraphs.
2. The Statute should begin by reflecting the intent of the revised principle of the Universality of Science, mentioning both the free and responsible practice of science, and the importance of such practice both in advancing scientific progress and in benefitting society.
3. Freedom and responsibility in the practice of science are inextricably linked, and the wording of the principle should reflect this – fitting them together in the same paragraph.
4. The statement on freedom (beginning with “Such practice...”) is taken directly from the existing Statute 5, and the wording has not been changed, as it has served the global science community well.
5. The statement on responsibility (beginning with “Just as important...”) is new and is included to demonstrate the symmetry that is necessary in the free and responsible practice of science. Responsibilities function at a continuum of levels--from the individual to the institution and state to the communal (collective) responsibilities to society as a whole. This is captured by the words “...at all levels...”
6. The statement on responsibility should not be limited to the responsibility of scientists, but should encompass both the practice and communication of science.
7. The descriptors for responsibility in the practice and communication of science are listed as: “integrity, respect, fairness, trustworthiness, and transparency.” Many alternative descriptors were considered, and CFRS felt that this list encompasses the key elements of responsibility, while avoiding unnecessary duplication. The list is also resonant with descriptors used during presentations at the 2010 World Conference on Research Integrity, held in Singapore in July 2010.
8. The statement on responsibility should include both maximizing the benefits and minimizing the misuse of science, and also should include both present and future generations.
9. The second paragraph, which focuses on application of the Principle of Universality, retains most of the wording from the original Statute. One important addition is the phrase “...ICSU promotes equitable access to science and its benefits...” This is done for two reasons. (a) The previous wording stated only the negative – what ICSU opposes. (b) The new wording reflects the strong emphasis on the fundamental human right of access to the benefits of science in globally accepted documents that address the responsible practice of science, such as Article 27 of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the Vienna Declaration; the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights; and the UNESCO Venice Statement on the Right to Enjoy the Benefits of Scientific Progress and its Applications.
10. The last sentence on application has been edited slightly from the two sentences found in the original wording, to simplify and improve the flow of ideas.

**(Proposed Wording)**

**The Principle of the Universality of Science (ICSU Statute 5)**

The free and responsible practice of science is fundamental to scientific advancement and human, societal and environmental well-being. Such practice, in all its aspects, requires freedom of movement, association, expression and communication for scientists, as well as equitable access to data, information and research materials. Just as important, it requires responsibility at all levels to carry out and communicate scientific work with integrity, respect, fairness, trustworthiness, and transparency; and to maximize the benefit and minimize the misuse of science for present and future generations.

In advocating the free and responsible practice of science, ICSU promotes equitable access to science and its benefits, and opposes discrimination based on such factors as ethnic origin, religion, citizenship, language, political stance, gender, sex or age. ICSU shall not accept statements or actions that prevent the universal application of this principle.

---

**(Original Wording)**

**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. 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.