

RECOMMENDATIONS: KEY INGREDIENTS FOR EXTENDING THE FRAMEWORK

Based on consultations and input [from the processes described above] and on deliberations in the ad-hoc working group, the ad-hoc working group offers the following recommendations to the Executive Board and Board of Deans.

- 1) The working group concludes that there is sufficient support for the notion that, academic freedom and academic responsibility go hand in hand. Therefore, the Framework must be supplemented with additional assessment criteria for other core tasks of the university alongside research, as well as a clear set of indicators to determine if and when the university should start (re)assessing existing collaborations.
- 2) New and existing collaborations should be assessed on the basis of the same standards. Given that the current Framework only caters for new collaborations, the supplemented framework should include indicators that could call for (re)assessment of existing collaborations in exceptional political circumstances, such as ongoing and emerging wars or conflicts involving war crimes or crimes against humanity, or the perpetration of gross and systematic violations of human rights in a country or area where a partner organization is based. Additionally, indicators to assess the potential involvement of a partner in war crimes or gross and systematic human rights violations should be developed. These indicators should be practicable and provide transparency and contribute to the university's ability of being a reliable partner.
- 3) As a general principle, assessing ongoing collaborations should only be considered in the gravest of circumstances, taking into consideration contractual obligations and the impact on the relationships with partners and funding organisations. Termination should only take place under conditions which do not prejudice the rights and interests of bona fide third parties and taking into consideration harm to partners and funding organisations.
- 4) The supplemented Framework should define criteria for "trusted sources" (e.g., objective and reliable information and/or advice from official international organisations, such as the UN or the EU or international courts) to rely on for assessments of institutional or project-based international collaborations. In addition, country- and region-specific expertise available at the university itself could be consulted.
- 5) In addition to a set of overarching criteria, the Framework should be extended with additional sub-sets of criteria for specific core areas, such as education, and patient care.
- 6) Alongside the project-to-project level assessment, which is currently in place, collaborations with organisations in exceptional political circumstances (based on the set of indicators mentioned under point 2) should receive extra scrutiny. For this purpose, a risk assessment framework should be developed for these types of "higher risk" collaborations and included in the supplemental framework, allowing for a nuanced and detailed evaluation of the (envisaged) collaboration and the third party (or parties) involved.

- 7) While the UvA should set its own ethical standards and provide its own interpretation of "academic responsibility", (inter)national coordination and if possible, alignment should be pursued. The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity is a successful example of such a joint national ethical framework.
- 8) It is advisable to leave room for differentiation between different organizational units (e.g., faculties) of an institution on the one hand, and an entire institution on the other hand, in this risk assessment framework, which will be integrated into the supplemental framework.
- 9) The supplemented framework should include clear process steps and possible scenarios on the consequences of (temporary) suspensions of collaborations. Moreover, the Framework should be practicable, and for this a robust process and division of labour must be specified.
- 10) In addition to the supplemented framework, an "explainer" must be developed, outlining the types of collaborations (institutional, project-based etc.) as well as the relevant mandates and responsibilities for decision-making for each type of collaboration.
- 11) The working group recommends continuing the process for developing a supplemental framework after the summer break, as this important exercise will require continued efforts to ensure a practicable, robust framework and procedures will be specified. This continued process will require both an allocation of adequate resources as well as a clear process of connecting this work to other existing UvA-wide advisory committees and platforms.