



Young European Associated Researchers
www.year-network.com

YEAR - Young European Associated Researchers

Rue Joseph II 36-38
1000 Brussels
Belgium

VAT Number: BE 0895 129 559

Alexis Sevault
YEAR External Relations

+47 41 01 99 94
Alexis.Sevault@sintef.no

To:

ALLEA President

Prof. Dr. Günter Stock

Chair, ALLEA Permanent Working Group on Science & Ethics

Prof. Dr. Göran Hermerén

Date: 01.09.2016

Subject: Stakeholder consultation for ALLEA Code of Conduct revision – Phase 1

First, I would like to **thank ALLEA for consulting YEAR** and letting the network of Young Researchers in Europe have a voice in the process of the revision of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity.

As a researcher myself, I felt very interested by the content of the Code of Conduct and could recognize most of the mentioned situations. I feel that this document could be **absolutely useful for early-career researchers** and I am surprised it never came into my hands before a few weeks ago.

Therefore the first issue I would mention is to **enhance the distribution to the research institutes**, with a special **focus on the early-career scientists for the longest-term effect**. To achieve this purpose, the document may as well be **made more friendly, more visual**, maybe by using infographies. YEAR can also use its network to spread the document through our member research institutes.

Reading through the document, I found **Part 1** (Executive Summary) **absolutely well-written**, and of a correct length for the treated topics. The notion of "misconduct" is also clearly explained and contains all of its aspects.

However, **Parts 2.1 and 2.2, do not bring more essential information** than Part 1 itself, and might be obsolete or may dilute the most essential information already provided in Part 1. The **extra level of details and exemplification might not be worth the risk** of having the reader drop out the reading before reaching the Parts 2.3 to 2.5.

Part 2.3 raises different important issues and includes the **"Guidelines for Good Practice Rules" that are a strong point of the document**. Some of the advice can be updated in the light of the **recent EU developments on Open Science and Open Data** for instance.

HSE shall also be further highlighted as misconducts in HSE can have terrible consequences and hurt the picture of research in the public opinion. The main notion I missed from HSE is within the performance of experiments. The **design of a safe environment to carry out research experiments**, sometimes seems to go against efficiency for researchers, but proves to have a high importance in the long-run.

Part 2.4 raises some important points and **may be shortened** to ensure the essential information is not diluted.

Part 2.5, Annex I: Very useful and consistent, it shall probably be kept as it is.

Part 2.5, Annex II: Very useful as well. In addition to it, a link to an **online template of International Consortium Agreement** containing those paragraphs and more, would be an absolutely valuable asset.

Those are my comments as a **researcher**, though I think considering an **institute leader/manager as reader**, similar comments would be raised. Considering now a **politician reader**, the Executive Summary is an excellent input and contains the essence of what is expected from a fair Code of Conduct. I assumed that the document is not addressed to the **general public**. If it shall, the proposed aforementioned infographics might ease their reading of the document.

A few more general comments:

- **"Animals" are mentioned several times** in the document, though the notion rather belongs to "ethics". Maybe this important issue does not require to be highlighted more than once or twice throughout the document. The related paragraph in Part 2.3 "Guidelines for good practice rules" is very well-written and shall be kept.
- The word **"catholicity"** shows up at the end of Part 2.2 and seems out of place.
- **National differences** in legislative requirements and traditions are mentioned but I could not get a feeling of the problems this refers to considering the "Guidelines of Good Practice Rules". I suppose such issues were discussed during the previous writing process but were not mentioned in the Code. It could be interesting to actually mention them explicitly if they are actual issues, since they would constitute essential axis to work on at the European level.

Last but not least, the **"Responsibility for the scientists and researchers of the future"** appears essential though it is not much developed throughout the document. **"Standards for mentorship and supervision"** are named but could actually be **further detailed** since the Code of Conduct seems very adapted to such content as well.

Please let me know if you should have any questions regarding these comments. Looking forward to the Phase II.

Best regards,

Alexis Sevault

YEAR – External Relations | YEAR – Young European Associated Researchers – www.year-network.com

PhD, Research Scientist | SINTEF Energy Research, Dpt of Thermal Energy
+ 47 410 19 994 | Alexis.Sevault@sintef.no | [@AlexisSevault](https://twitter.com/AlexisSevault)