



Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture  
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation



*Comité international  
de bioéthique (CIB)*

*International Bioethics  
Committee (IBC)*

Distribution: limited

SHS/EST/02/CIB-9/5  
Paris, 15 November 2002  
Original: English

## **Preliminary Report on the Possibility of Elaborating a Universal Instrument on Bioethics**

**WORKING GROUP OF THE IBC ON THE  
POSSIBILITY OF ELABORATING A UNIVERSAL INSTRUMENT ON BIOETHICS**

---

Rapporteurs:  
*Leonardo De Castro and Giovanni Berlinguer*

Division of the Ethics of Science and Technology

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. By virtue of 31 C/Resolution 22 entitled “Bioethics Programme: Priorities and Perspectives”, the General Conference of UNESCO, at its 31st session, invited the Director-General to submit to it at its 32nd session in 2003 “*the technical and legal studies undertaken regarding the possibility of elaborating universal norms on bioethics*”.

2. Furthermore, the participants in the Round Table of Ministers of Science on “Bioethics: International Implications” (Paris, 22-23 October 2001) invited UNESCO “*to examine the possibility of developing, starting from the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, a universal instrument on bioethics, in association with national ethics committees and similar bodies, in cooperation with the governments of Member States and relevant international organizations, chiefly the United Nations and the specialized agencies of the United Nations system and other competent organizations at the international and regional level, and in consultation with the public and private sectors, the scientific community and representatives of civil society*” (par. 7 (viii) of the Communiqué of the Round Table).


3. At its Eighth Session (Paris, 12-14 September 2001), the IBC therefore decided to include this issue in its work plans and to set up a Working Group, which met for the first time at UNESCO Headquarters on 18 and 19 April 2002 to discuss the possibility of drafting a universal instrument on bioethics (see Composition of the Working Group in Annex). This document is a preliminary report based on the discussions during the meeting of the working group.

## **II. PRESENT CONTEXT: EXISTING INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

4. Certain key texts, such as the Hippocratic Oath, have defined the principles and forged the corresponding concepts on which bioethics is predicated. However, it is on the pedestal of the values enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) that bioethics is, indisputably, founded. Other texts, such as the Nuremberg Code (1947), the Declaration of Helsinki (1964) of the World Medical Association (WMA) – some of whose features are spelled out in greater detail in the Declarations of Tokyo (1975), Venice (1983) and Hong Kong (1989) – and the International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects (1992) prepared by the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) - recently revised - have established rules for the protection of persons taking part in biomedical research, and defined the principles that should govern clinical tests involving human beings. Finally, given the magnitude of the ethical issues raised by genetics, UNESCO has contributed, thanks to the political will expressed by the international community, to the formulation of basic principles through the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, adopted unanimously and by acclamation by the General Conference in 1997 and endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1998.

5. At regional level, the only instrument on bioethics that exists today remains the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and the Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine: Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, drawn up within the framework of the Council of Europe, adopted in 1997 and opened since then for accession and ratification.

### III. NEED FOR AND FEASIBILITY OF A TEXT OF A UNIVERSAL NATURE ON BIOETHICS

6. The need for universal ethical guidelines covering all issues raised in this field is felt more and more by specialists and decision-makers as well as within the civil society and the international community. In this respect, the Declaration on Science and the Use of Scientific Knowledge and the Science Agenda – Framework for Action<sup>(1)</sup>, adopted in 1999 in Budapest, Hungary, highlighted the ethical dimension of the present-day development of science and technology. 


7. Bioethics, a field that covers both the ethical and legal and the social and cultural dimensions of the life sciences and the technologies which are associated with them, today plays a predominant role in ensuring respect for human dignity and the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the early 1970s such reflection developed as a general critique of the Hippocratic tradition. Notable during the early phase of bioethical discourse were a) the transformation of health care provider-patient relationship (critique of traditional paternalism and the emphasis on the principle of respect for personal autonomy and informed consent; b) the emergence of the issue of just allocation of health care resources; and c) the debates surrounding medically assisted human reproductive techniques. The focus has since broadened considerably. In addition to issues relating to the beginnings and the end of human life, it now covers issues raised by the donation of organs, tissues and cells, including gametes, research in embryology, the participation of human beings in research projects or in experimental treatments, equitable access to health services, the scientific, epidemiological, diagnostic and therapeutic use of genetics, embryonic stem cell (ESC) research, predictive medicine – with the problems raised by the fact that, for example, early diagnosis does not necessarily go hand in hand with available therapies that would be indispensable; human reproduction technology; the introduction into agriculture and stockbreeding of transgenic technology and genetically modified organisms (GMOs); palliative care and end-of-life care, etc.

8. It is a fact that the interrelations and sometimes interlinkage of the different areas of bioethics, and the dilemmas to which they give rise, are to varying degrees a source of confusion for many, if not all. For example, transgenic technology might open up new horizons in the field of transplant surgery by providing organs which would be compatible with the human body and so supplement the dwindling supply of donor organs. In addition, certain ethical problems – such as those raised by breakthroughs in procreation techniques or embryology – are set in the cultural, philosophical and religious bedrock of the various human communities. Others – such as those raised by advances in genomics and proteomics – have different implications depending on legal traditions, or even on the symbolic thinking that has governed the evolution of societies for thousands of years.

9. All these very varied problems are the subject of increasingly keen and keenly voiced concerns, both on the part of specialists and within civil society and the international community. To the already difficult question posed by the life sciences – How far can we go? –, another must be added – How far have we the right to go? – which constitutes the particularly vast field of bioethics.


---


1. See in particular paragraphs 19 to 22, 40 and 41 of the Declaration, and paragraphs 71 to 77 of the Agenda.


10. States do indeed have a special responsibility not only in respect of bioethical reflection but also in the drafting of any legislation that may stem therefrom. It is true that, in matters of bioethics, many States have framed laws and regulations aimed at protecting rights and freedoms. However, any denial of human dignity or infringement of liberty, wherever it occurs, constitutes an unacceptable violation of the rights of the human person , as such, concerns the entire international community.

#### IV. POSSIBLE FIELDS TO BE CONSIDERED

11. We cannot but observe the growing number of practices that extend beyond national borders, such as the import or export of embryos and embryonic stem cells, organs, tissues and cells, the transborder flow of tissue collections, DNA samples and genetic data, the conduct of biomedical research projects and experimentation simultaneously in several countries, to cite but these examples.

12. *Access to health care.* The inequality between the rich and the poor – at individual and country levels – is something that is becoming more deeply felt in the area of health care. As health care services and medicines become more and more expensive, access by poor populations becomes more severely compromised. While poor people have as much need for these medicines as everybody else, many do not have the resources to guarantee access. In the context of the dread diseases that currently confront the world, the obligation to find new and effective ways of dealing with the situation has truly acquired great ethical significance. Our global society must face up to the responsibility to use science and technology to promote public health and to increase poor people's access to life-saving drugs and treatments.  However, as important as the concern might be, some of the most promising efforts to provide solutions have been controversial. For instance, some governments have claimed that they should sometimes be allowed to infringe drug patents. Poor countries have also considered “parallel importation” to allow the purchase of cheap supplies from countries with weak patent laws without the patent-holder's permission and “compulsory licensing” to enable a government to license a local generic manufacturer to make a drug more cheaply or to buy a generic version from another country. A universal instrument on bioethics can start to address the ethical concerns by attempting a framework that would enable different countries to deal with the contradictions that arise.

13. *Human Reproduction and the Beginning of Life.* The effort of human beings to control reproduction has been directed at opposite ends. While many have sought assisted reproductive techniques in order to have children, others have sought the use of medical technology to prevent pregnancies. At the same time, researchers have explored ways to enhance life through various methods, including those that involve genetic engineering and modification. These methodologies have accentuated the fact that human reproduction is a complex phenomenon that has been made more difficult to understand because of varying cultures, traditions and religious beliefs. The developments have also raised ethical concerns regarding the rights and welfare of women, children, and  ilies. A universal instrument on bioethics can attempt to provide a framework for addressing the issues in terms of general principles capable of commanding universal respect.

14. *End of Life.* Advances in medical science and technology have made it possible for many people to live longer today than at any other period in the history of humanity. However, longer lives are not always healthier or more productive  some people have to


suffer through old age. There are those whose lives are sustained through the use of machines even when they have no realistic chances of recovery. In addition to the difficult economic consequences, there are important ethical dilemmas that have acquired global significance. The meaning and significance of death are inextricably tied up with culture and tradition. The compatibility of clinical criteria of death with such meaning and significance has been a contemporary subject of disagreement and controversy. Some people have had to struggle with the tension between the sanctity and the quality of life. Others have had to deal with the practical issues relating to the possibility of using machines that prolong vegetative life indefinitely. Whatever the nature of the ethical dilemmas that they have to face, people tend to look for guidance that can ease the burden on their conscience. A universal instrument on bioethics can ease that burden and provide a direction for decision-making that highlights the need to respect human life even at its most vulnerable moments.

15. *Biomedical research involving human subjects.* The increasing globalization of biomedical research has brought to the forefront more ethical issues in the involvement of human subjects. While international collaboration has enabled sponsor countries to conduct research in resource poor communities with greater convenience, coordination and efficiency, the practice has also highlighted a need for greater vigilance to guard against evolving forms of exploitation. Although international collaborative research represents laudable efforts to address common health concerns, there is also a danger that the research design and methodology put unnecessary burdens on poor people, poor communities and poor countries. A universal instrument on bioethics can focus on such issues with provisions seeking to promote the recognition of researchers from developing countries as full and equal partners in biomedical studies. It can also underscore the need to raise the standard for benefits accruing to participant communities or countries, promote initiatives for ensuring broad and equitable access, and address approaches for building the capacity of developing country scientists to become full partners in international research. In view of the numerous guidelines that currently exist concerning the practice, a universal instrument on bioethics can provide unity while recognizing the special challenges posed by the unique histories, cultures, politics, judicial systems, and economic situations of the various countries involved especially in relation to ensuring the free and informed consent of research subjects.


16. *Human genetic data and other health care personal data.* Human genetic data and other health care personal data have a critical importance for the progress of science and medicine as well as for related non-medical and legal purposes. At the same time, the collection, processing, use and storage of such data present potential risks to the people that they pertain to. In particular, human genetic data are imbued with a level of specificity and sensitivity that provide lifelong medical and personal information, both present and future, concerning an individual, a family, an ethnic group, and their descendants. Thus, the disclosure of human genetic data may result in the violation of human rights, fundamental freedoms and human dignity. A universal instrument on bioethics can highlight the significance of protecting the privacy of persons and the confidentiality of their genetic and personal health care data while encouraging equitable access to the benefits that these data can give rise to.

17. *Intellectual property protection.* The complex network of intellectual property laws throughout the world consists of many municipal, regional and international legal developments. In general, legal systems have been pressed to put these existing laws into service in respect of recent technological advances since the development of more appropriate legal regimes has been rather slow. The results have occasionally been

problematic. One of the fundamental issues involves the promotion of justice by securing the benefits of scientific and technological advances for the service of humanity as a whole. A universal instrument on bioethics can seek a response to the problem within the context of an accurate understanding of (1) the international, regional and municipal laws on intellectual property, and (2) the practical developments involving the invocation of such laws. This issue is particularly important in relation to the human genome, as there has been an explosion in the number and variety of applications for patents. While intellectual property protection can provide an incentive to scientific and technological research and ensure the disclosure of the outcomes of such research to the world at large, there is a concern that premature and excessively rapid growth of intellectual property protection will impede the flourishing of free and uninhibited research that should be encouraged at a time when it can maximize the advantages of dramatic breakthroughs in knowledge about human bio-sciences. There are also important concerns about the grant of patents in terms that are unnecessarily wide, the parameters for the use of 'novelty' as a basic criterion of patentability, the ideal duration for the protection of patents, the differential implications of intellectual property protection for developed and developing countries, and the possibility of conflicting international rights. A universal instrument on bioethics can provide a global framework for addressing these issues while promoting international cooperation and supporting the general idea of benefit sharing.

18. *Human organ and tissue transplantation.* Many developments in the field of human organ and tissue transplantation give rise to ethical concerns and issues requiring urgent examination and consensual action. As the advances in medical sciences and technology continue to improve the level of successful transplantation, the need for organ and tissue donors has also escalated. As a result, there has been immense pressure to develop new methods of recruiting donors and increasing the supply of transplantable organs. On the one hand, there exists a strong imperative to procure organs for the purpose of providing life-saving and life-enhancing medical treatments. On the other hand, there is an equally important need for the preservation of choice and personal liberty. The following practices give rise to ethical issues that need to be dealt with internationally and systematically: the use of prisoners and other individuals as sources of transplantable organs, the involvement of non-related human organ donors, the acquisition of organs for monetary and other valuable considerations, and the involvement of vendors and commercial agents in human organ sales. The movement of organs, donors, patients and transplant doctors across national boundaries for the purpose of circumventing domestic regulations deserves close attention. The definition and determination of death also give rise to significant ethical concerns. Altogether, these considerations provide enough reason to contemplate a transnational approach to policy-making and the development of practical guidelines to increase the beneficial effects of life-prolonging treatment while preserving the dignity of patients and ensuring free and informed decision-making. The successful experience in countries where organ donation has been enhanced by local policies and protocols can be replicated widely with the aid of a universal instrument on bioethics promoting the development of comprehensive, coordinated national strategies concerning organ and tissue procurement with the cooperation of all relevant stakeholders and in a manner that gives due consideration to human rights, medical ethics and cultural values. 

19. *The use of embryonic stem cells in therapeutic research.* As the IBC Report on the Use of Embryonic Stem Cells in Therapeutic Research observes, many scientists are convinced that embryonic stem cells bring great promise of treatment for problematic diseases. These scientists argue that research on embryonic stem cells could lead to the development of transplantable tissues as therapies for a wide range of human illnesses, which

are currently considered difficult or impossible to treat. The motivation for working with early human cells lies, broadly speaking, on the possibility that embryonic stem cells can be used to investigate features that are specific to early human development and that they generate somatic cell types — the variety of non-reproductive cells that make up the human body. The potential benefits to human health are huge, and range from generating new neurons for treating patients with Parkinson's disease to learning about the molecular processes that drive the development of tumours. However, the stem cells in which they are particularly interested are derived from the human embryo and this gives rise to the question concerning the ethical acceptability of deriving cells from a human embryo prior to its implantation *in utero* in order to cultivate and investigate these cells in the laboratory. Although it is possible that, at some future stage, these cells will be used to construct part of or even entire organs for grafting into human hosts whose organs are destroyed or impaired, such cells will have been derived in the first place from embryos, hence the ethical question: is it acceptable to use embryonic stem cell research for therapeutic purposes? A universal instrument of bioethics can take the lead in unifying different approaches for dealing with this question, while providing that in all aspects of research involving human embryos, particular importance should be given to respect of human dignity and the principles set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997). 

20. *Genetically modified organisms.* The use of genetic modification to address agricultural concerns has accelerated in recent years. Advocates of the technology have endeavoured to show how it can be applied to some of the specific problems of agriculture in order to expand the potential to combat pest resistance, get bigger yield, develop tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses, enable the use of marginalized land, increase nutritional benefits, avoid negative environmental impact, derive pharmaceuticals and vaccines from transgenics, and reduce production costs. On the other hand, some of these claims have been challenged by opponents who have chosen to highlight the danger posed by unproven procedures for consumers as well as for the environment. Some have also argued for the unacceptability of transgenic procedures that they see as a challenge to the integrity of nature or, occasionally, as an intrusion into exclusively divine prerogatives. The responses of different governments has been variable, and tensions exist as a result of policies that, regardless of direction, do not fail to generate controversy. The resulting situation is one that requires a global response, if only to ensure the observance of safe standards for research and consumption, as well as the promotion of equitable access to the technologies that are developed and the benefits that these generate. A universal instrument of bioethics can serve to facilitate this response by providing an acceptable framework for understanding the various ethical positions and deliberating on a possible resolution of the concomitant conflicts.

## V. FORM AND SCOPE OF A TEXT ON BIOETHICS

21. Lawmakers are increasingly confronted with issues relating to bioethics. In this domain, the debate often revolves around the level at which the legislative and regulatory framework should be placed. If the framework is too general, it may be less useful in terms of its application to specific practices. Conversely, if it is very detailed, it may be rendered obsolete by rapid advances in practices and techniques. What is needed, therefore, is to strike a balance so as to forge norms and introduce institutional mechanisms that can stand the test of time.

22. Does the international community feel the need to set guiding principles, or indeed legislate, in so rapidly advancing an area with such wide ramifications? If so, what would be the limits of such norms and of such an institutional and regulatory framework and to what extent would the international community be able to ensure compliance with them? What would be the role not only of specialists but also of decision-makers and civil society? What role would devolve upon international organizations both within and outside the United Nations system?

23. The term “international instrument” does not have a legally precise meaning and, for the purposes of this report, it is used as a generic term that may not *a priori* anticipate the legal nature or the form of a future international text. However, given that the aim of such an instrument will, by its nature, be *broad* and will receive *the broadest acceptance possible* by public authorities, the scientific community and the general public, the Working Group considered it preferable, in a first stage, to settle on *a non binding instrument*. The instrument should not be binding, all the more so because it will cover fields much larger than the human genome. The tradition of international instruments on human rights and the two International Covenants of 1966 on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965), the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979) and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) is that treaties are all preceded by Declarations which contain guidelines and an invitation to States to follow them.


24. But, as far as bioethics is concerned, we are experiencing at the present time an extraordinary and rapid development in science and technology and this must be taken into account when establishing an international instrument of such scope. Moreover, *the vulgarisation of the term “universal”* should be avoided. But, in any event, the instrument will need to be re-examined and eventually revised at regular intervals.

25. The form of the instrument does not prevent its content from contributing to a sort of coding of universally recognized general principles (human dignity, solidarity, freedom of research, respect of privacy, non-discrimination, informed consent) in the framework of a symbiosis between human rights, medical protection, scientific research, the protection of the products of this research and the promotion of health in the world.

26. On the occasion of the preparation of this instrument, the IBC should enter into *a deeper discussion on the scope and context of internal law* in synergy with existing international instruments. This will be an occasion to clarify the argumentation presented at the present time in the shape of opposing ideas – for some there are certain fields of bioethics which cannot be governed by internal law, for others, all bioethical matters should be internationally regulated.


27. Such a discussion will no doubt contribute to a strengthening of the role and the degree of participation of various national ethics committees (in certain cases two degrees of control) and of their international cooperation. The authorization for medical interventions as well as scientific research and particularly the evaluation of results achieved by bodies designated by law will be highlighted.


## VI. EDUCATION, INFORMATION, AWARENESS-RAISING AND PUBLIC DEBATE


28. A universal instrument on bioethics has to call strong attention to the importance of awareness-raising, information, education, consultation, and public debate. These actions are essential and fundamental to the pursuit of all research in this field in a spirit of solidarity, humanity, reason and harmony. And harmony can only exist if fears and questions are taken into account in the drafting of public policies, laws and regulations. This means that the processes of elaboration and implementation of biotechnologies must be accompanied by an ongoing and transparent public debate covering both the potential benefits and the hazards of scientific applications. 

29. These concerns form part of the fundamental mission of UNESCO, one of whose features is to promote the dissemination of, and access to, knowledge and to serve as an intellectual forum for reflection and dialogue. Articles of the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights deal with this subject and appeals to Member States - more particularly in Articles 20, 21, 22 and 23 - to promote education and training. The same appeal is made in the Guidelines for the Implementation of the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights endorsed in 1999 by the General Conference of UNESCO<sup>(2)</sup>.

30. The statements and ideas put forward to the Round Table of Ministers of Science on “Bioethics: International Implications” (Paris, 22-23 October 2001) at the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the General Conference point in the same direction. Reference was made consistently to the importance of education; the provision of adequate information to health care professionals, schoolchildren and students, politicians and civil servants; the training of specialists in genetic counselling and bioethics; and the ongoing training of ethical committees in hospitals, research centres and other institutions.

31. When the Communiqué adopted by the participants at the Round Table of Ministers of Science on “Bioethics: International Implications” provided that “governments of Member States and legislators ... must see to it that citizens have an opportunity for informed, pluralistic public debate, and must take into account the various schools of thought, value systems, historical and cultural backgrounds, and philosophical and religious convictions that make up our various societies,” they clearly meant that “bioethics must be based on the practice of democracy and the active participation of all citizens”<sup>(3)</sup>. 

32. In the area of genomics research, prenatal diagnosis and population genetic studies, it is becoming increasingly important for ethical, legal, psychological and social reasons, for all the individuals and groups concerned, including health care professionals, to be kept informed and given training. 

33. In light of all these considerations, UNESCO can take advantage of the opportunity provided by a universal instrument of bioethics to encourage Member States to set up national and regional bodies designed to encourage the population to take part in an informed  debate on the development of genomics, proteomics and any other scientific fields that are liable to affect them. UNESCO can also take the opportunity to encourage Member States to involve


---

2. “Guidelines for the Implementation of the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights” endorsed on 16 November 1999 at the 30th session of the General Conference.

3. Round table of Ministers of Science on “Bioethics: International Implications”, Communiqué, Paris, UNESCO, 22-23 October 2001.

their scientific community, universities and other academic centres, the media, non-governmental organizations, politicians and civil servants in this dialogue which must include the active participation of everyone affected by these issues; to provide the means for all their citizens to receive clear and precise information on the impacts of the procedures available to them so that their populations can give truly free and informed consent in every circumstance or, if they so wish, decline such procedures; and to publish reports on the agencies and activities put in place to promote bioethics education in their countries.

**VII. CONCLUSIONS** *(Note: The Working Group considered that it would be premature to include a conclusion as part of the report at this time. Nevertheless the following portion is tentatively included in this draft as one possible version of a conclusion based on comments earlier submitted by members of the IBC.)*

34. The initiative of the Director-General of UNESCO for a universal instrument on bioethics deserves support. The UNESCO IBC should accept the challenge of elaborating a universal instrument on bioethics. The interests of the international community as a whole, and of disadvantaged people in particular, should be served. 

35. UNESCO should assume a leadership role in the preparation and negotiation of such an instrument. For this purpose, it will be useful for UNESCO to obtain a clear mandate from the UNESCO General Conference. Moreover, UNESCO should work in conjunction with other bodies of the United Nations such as the World Health Organization, the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labour Organization, the World Trade Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization. It should also consult national bioethics bodies, stakeholders and civil society.

36. The Instrument could be of limited scope, confined to giving teeth to the basic principles of bioethics. The Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights is itself limited in scope, applying as it does, only to the human genome.

37. For the purposes of this report, “international instrument” is used as a generic term that may not a priori anticipate the legal nature or the form of a future international text. It can be a convention or a declaration and the form will determine the appropriate method for its approval. This report does not and cannot be used for finally deciding what kind of international instrument will have to be adopted.



United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization  
Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture



*International Bioethics  
Committee (IBC)*

*Comité international  
de bioéthique (CIB)*

Distribution: limited

## COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE POSSIBILITY OF ELABORATING A UNIVERSAL INSTRUMENT ON BIOETHICS

---

### Chairperson

**HAMADE (MR) Marwan** (Lebanon)  
Minister for Displaced Persons  
Member of Parliament  
Chairperson of the National Bioethics Committee  
Member of the Higher Council of the Lebanese Press  
Former Minister of Health

### Rapporteur

**BERLINGUER Prof. (Mr) Giovanni** (Italy)  
Professor of Medicine  
Honorary Chairperson of the National Bioethics Committee  
Former Member of Parliament  
Former Director of the Department of Human and Animal Biology and of  
the post-graduate course in Bioethics, University of Rome

**DE CASTRO Dr (Mr) Leonardo** (Philippines)  
Professor of Philosophy  
President of the Philippine Health Social Science Association  
Vice-Chairman of the Forum for Ethics Review Committees in Asia and the Pacific  
Member of the National Ethics Committee

### Members

**GEFENAS Prof. (Mr) Eugenijus** (Lithuania)  
Associate Professor of Biomedical Ethics  
Chairperson of the National Bioethics Committee of Lithuania  
Founding member of the Central and Eastern European Association of Bioethics

**GROS ESPIELL Prof. (Mr) Héctor** (Uruguay)

Professor of International Law  
Chairperson of the UNESCO Consultative Committee on the Teaching of Human Rights,  
Culture of Peace, Tolerance and Democracy  
Former Ambassador of Uruguay in France and to UNESCO  
Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay  
Former President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

**IDA Prof. (Mr) Ryuichi** (Japan)

Professor of International Law  
Rapporteur of the Committee of Regional Economic Development Law  
of the International Law Association

**JEAN (Mrs) Michèle** (Canada)

Adviser in programme development, Faculty of Higher Education, University of Montreal  
Member of the Commission of Ethics of Science and Technology  
Former Special Adviser to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada  
to the European Commission  
Former Vice-Minister of Health

**KIRBY Justice (Mr) Michael** (Australia)

Justice of the High Court of Australia  
Member of the Ethics Committee, the Human Genome Organization (HUGO)  
Former President of the Courts of Appeal of New South Wales and Solomon Islands  
Former President of the International Commission of Jurists

**MARTÍNEZ-PALOMO Dr (Mr) Adolfo** (Mexico)

Professor of Cellular Biology  
Director-General of the Centre for Research and Advanced Studies (CINVESTAV)  
Member of the Third World Academy of Science  
Former Chairperson of the Academy of Science of Mexico

**MCCALL SMITH Prof. (Mr) Alexander** (United Kingdom)

Professor of Medical Law  
Vice-Chairman of the Human Genetics Commission of the United Kingdom  
Chairman, Ethics Committee, *British Medical Journal*

**REVEL Prof. (Mr) Michel** (Israel)

Professor of Molecular Genetics, Weizmann Institute of Science  
Israeli Prize for Medicine (1999)  
Chief Scientist, *Interpharm*  
President of the National Committee for Biotechnology

**ROUCOUNAS Prof. (Mr) Emmanuel** (Greece)

Professor of International Law  
Chairman, National Commission of Patients' Rights  
Member of the Academy of Athens  
Member of the Institute of International Law, Geneva  
Former member of the United Nations International Law Commission

**RUMBALL Prof. (Mrs) Sylvia** (New Zealand)

Professor of Chemistry  
Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor (Equity and Ethics), Massey University  
Chair of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee  
Chairperson of the National Ethics Committee on Assisted Human Reproduction  
Member of the Health Research Council Ethics Committee  
Former Dean, Faculty of Science, Massey University

**RWEGERA (Mr) Damien** (Rwanda)

Anthropologist  
Technical Adviser UNAIDS  
Former Director of the Pan-African Organization Against AIDS (OPALS)  
Former Professor of Anthropology and Sociology, National University of Rwanda