NATIONAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD FOR BIOSECURITY



Working Group on Communication of Dual Use Research Results, Methods, and Technologies





Working Group Roster

Voting Members:

- P. Keim (Chair)
- A. Casadevall
- L. Enquist
- D. Franz
- J. Gordon
- S. Ehrlich
- S. Lemon
- A. Sorensen
- T. Shenk

Federal Agency Representatives:

- B. Cuccherini
- D. Dixon
- T. Lomax
- B. Lushniak
- S. Nightingale
- S. Steele
- M. Schmolesky
- R. Walters

(VA) (NIH) (NASA) (FDA) (FDA) (HHS) (DoJ) (DoJ) (State) (Intel.)





 The NSABB Charter states that the NSABB is to "advise on national policies governing publication, public communication, and dissemination of dual use research methodologies and results."



Working Group Charge

Develop guidance and tools to:

- Facilitate consistent and well-considered decisions about communication of information with biosecurity implications
- Demonstrate to the public that scientists recognize, and are being responsive to, concerns about the security implications of their work



 Principles for the responsible communication of research with dual use potential

- Points to consider (i.e. a framework) for identifying and assessing risks and benefits of communicating research information with dual use potential, including options for the communication of such research
- Considerations for the development of a communication plan for research with dual use potential



Possible uses: Review Research proposals Manuscripts Presentations (oral, abstract, posters) Internet postings Education tool

- Raise awareness of DUR issues within the scientific community
- Ethics training



Possible users:

Investigators and research supervisors Students, postdocs and others involved in the research Institutional biosecurity review entity Proposal reviewers • Funding agencies/institutions Government policy makers Journal editors, reviewers and publishers



Outreach to Stakeholders

- Outreach to peers by Working Group members
- Panel Discussion with IBC community, scientists, security policy experts
- Roundtable with editors of scientific journals, including international community



Feedback: Communication Tools

 Liked idea of having tools to formalize or systematize review process

 Liked idea of using tools in ethics training courses



Feedback: Communication of Dual Use Research

- Agreed with emphasizing the importance of how information is presented
- Stressed value of scientists working to enhance public understanding of their research
- Suggested strategies for engaging the general media (e.g. Science Media Center in the UK)

Feedback: Assessment Framework

- Concern that every manuscript submitted for publication would be subject to assessment for dual use potential
- Format of a questionnaire to be completed invoked 'regulatory burden' fears
- Framework should be shorter, not a form to be filled out, but rather 'Points to Consider'
 - PToC format would be useful as a hyperlink for submitting authors and for manuscript reviewers and editors conducting biosecurity reviews



Feedback: DUR as an International Issue

- Dual use research issues not a high a priority in Europe and Asia. Higher priority are public health and infectious diseases
- Frame issues more broadly in terms of well being to mankind rather than US national security concern
- UK has a mechanism for editors to ensure authors have alerted public health authorities in particular circumstances when a publication may cause public concern (e.g. vaccine adverse reactions)



 Principles for the responsible communication of research with dual use potential

- Points to consider (i.e. a framework) for identifying and assessing risks and benefits of communicating research information with dual use potential, including options for the communication of such research
- Considerations for the development of a communication plan for research with dual use potential



Principles for Responsible Communication

 Principles that underpin the responsible communication of dual use research findings

- Communication is vital for scientific progress
- Communicate research to the fullest extent possible
- Need for balance
- Need to assess risks and benefits of communicating information
- Consider a range of communication options
- Communication occurs throughout the research process
- Need to consider <u>what</u> is communicated, and the <u>way</u> in which it is communicated



Principles for Responsible Communication

Added:

- Public trust is essential to the vitality of the life science research enterprise.
 - It has always been important for life scientists to participate in activities that enhance public understanding of their research.
 - Because of the potential for public misunderstanding of, and concerns about dual use research, it is especially important that life scientists engage in outreach on a regular basis to raise awareness of the importance of the research and to reassure the public that the research is being conducted and communicated responsibly.



 Principles for the responsible communication of research with dual use potential

- Points to consider (i.e. a framework) for identifying and assessing risks and benefits of communicating research information with dual use potential, including options for the communication of such research
- Considerations for the development of a communication plan for research with dual use potential

Points to Consider (Assessment Framework)

 Re-formatted questionnaire into a points to consider document – users can tailor and format for their specific purpose(s)

Key features:

- General Overview of Information
- Risk Analysis
- Benefit Analysis
- Risk vs. Benefit Assessment
- Formulation of Recommendation Regarding Communication



Points to Consider (Assessment Framework)

Formulation of Recommendation Regarding Communication

 Decisions about how to responsibly communication research with dual use potential should address content, timing and extent of distribution of the information



Points to Consider (Assessment Framework)

| Content | Communicate as is |
|--------------|---|
| | Addition of contextual Information |
| | Modify or remove substantive information |
| Timing | Communicate immediately |
| | Delay communication |
| Distribution | No limit on distribution |
| | Limit distribution on a 'need to know basis' |
| | Don't communicate |

Added footnote:

 The relevance and/or feasibility of considering limits on the distribution of dual use research will depend on the specific situation.

E.g., while limiting distribution is not a consideration for most scientific journals, it might be a reasonable consideration early on in a research project that yielded information of special significance to public health or national security.



 Principles for the responsible communication of research with dual use potential

- Points to consider (i.e. a framework) for identifying and assessing risks and benefits of communicating research information with dual use potential, including options for the communication of such research
- Considerations for the development of a communication plan for research with dual use potential



Communication Plan

Critical part of decision to communicate

Not only what is said, but how it is said

Promotes public understanding and trust



Ongoing Tasks

 Statement regarding the importance of communicating findings from life sciences research



Oversight Framework Considerations

When and how should dual use research communications be reviewed?

- Identify key points along the research continuum
- Determine necessary expertise for reviewers
- Consider oversight strategies for research not initially identified as dual use



Recommendation to the NSABB

The Communications Working **Group requests the NSABB** consider approving these work products as components of an oversight framework for addressing dual use research of concern