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Introduction

- April 6, 2009 Mw6.3 earthquake in L’Aquila (309 people died).
- October 2012 all 7 experts (4> High Risk Commission-CGR-, 2>Civil Protection Directors, 1> Seismologist) were sentenced because of March 31, 2009 CGR meeting.

What happened in CGR meeting:

Neither alarmist nor reassuring:
- Earthquakes are not predictable.
- A strong earthquake in the next days is unlikely (but not impossible).
- The only activity of seismic risk reduction consists inducing the buildings vulnerability.

The understood message and released by press:
- The earthquake will not happen.
- The situation is normal (favorable).
Solutions

To which extend shall scientist held responsible for their mistakes and misinterpretations?

(A) **Prosecute the scientists!** They should have informed us about the earthquake.

(B) Open an **investigation** to answer what happened and how we can **prevent** a similar disaster.

- Laws
- which extend of damage
- threat of health and lifes
- how are science and other scientists affected

- transferability
- learn by mistakes
- how are science and other scientists affected
Affected Groups & Values

Affected Groups
- Government
- Public
- Involved scientists
- Scientific community

Values at stake
- Credibility of politicians
- Reputation of the scientists
- Trust in science
- Trust in government
- Fairness and justice
- Public Safety
- Economic costs
- Private lives
Consequences for solution A

- Culprits identified (trust in government, trust in science, justice, reputation of scientists).
- Increased amount of false alarms, “Call wolf” (costs, trust in science).
- Denouncement of scientists (trust in science).
- Increased motivation for scientists to deliver more accurate results (trust in science).
- Scare scientists away from research positions (trust in government).
- Disaster for the scientists’ careers and personal lives (private lives).
Consequences for solution B

- New policies could decrease the risk of a similar incident (public safety).
- The public sees that the government is looking into the problem (credibility of politicians, trust in government).
- The scientific community can work in peace (justice).
- Might result in nothing (credibility, reputation, trust).
- Investigation and possible needed measures cost money (financial cost).