

**Report factual investigation
Department of Astronomy and
Theoretical Physics
Lund University**

Postadress:
LifeWise AB
Östra Mörtensgatan 15
223 51 Lund

Besöksadresser:
Östra Mörtensgatan 15, Lund
Ledebusgatan 3, Malmö
Trögårdsgatan 9, Helsingborg

Kontakt:
Tel: 046-184477
E-mail: info@lifewise.se
Web: www.lifewise.se

Client reference

Gunilla Thylander, Human Resources manager

Participants

Claimant: Florent Renaud

Accused: Sofia Feltzing

Witnesses: Oscar Agertz, Eric Andersson, Brian Thorsbro, Nils Ryde, Gregor Travis, Lena Magnusson, Rebecca Forsberg, Loke Lönnblad, Ross Church, Maxime Delorme, Anders Johansen

Time frame

Formal complaint registered with HR: 7th September, 2020

Contract of Mandate signed: 9th September, 2020

Interviews:

Florent Renaud: 18th September, 2020

Sofia Feltzing: 21st September, 2020

Oscar Agertz: 28th September, 2020

Nils Ryde: 28th September, 2020

Lena Magnusson: 29th September, 2020

Loke Lönnblad: 29th September, 2020, by phone

Rebecca Forsberg: 1st October, 2020

Gregor Travis: 1st October, 2020

Brian Thorsbro: 1st October, 2020

Eric Andersson: 9th October, 2020

Ross Church: 15th October, 2020

Maxime Delorme: 28th October, 2020, by email

Anders Johansen: 29th October, 2020, by phone and email

Analysis and report: 20th October- 5th November, 2020

Consultants:

Martina Johansson

Organisational consultant

Licensed psychotherapist, CQSW (socionom)

Tel: 0734-428277

E-mail: martina.johansson@lifewise.se

Mia Gruvstad

Organisational consultant

Licensed psychologist

Tel: 070-8710979

E-mail: mia.gruvstad@lifewise.se

Key Account Manager:

Kay Sanderson

Tel: 0739-135550

Email: kay.sanderson@lifewise.se

The assignment

Florent Renaud (FR), a researcher at the Department of Astronomy and Theoretical Physics, Lund University, placed a formal complaint September 7th, 2020 that he had been subject to harassment, bullying and victimisation. This was reported to Human Resources at the Department of Astronomy and Theoretical Physics, Lund University. LifeWise AB has been requested to conduct an investigation to assess whether the situations described in the report can be defined as harassment and/or victimisation, according to Swedish legislation concerning the work environment.

LifeWise conducted thirteen interviews, the first one with the claimant September 18th, 2020, the second interview with the accused September 21st, 2020 and further interviews with the witnesses September 28th and 29th and October 1st, 9th, 15th, 28th and 29th, 2020. E-mail conversations and phone calls were conducted with two witnesses. LifeWise has also had access to previous reports of victimisation dated May 23rd and June 5th 2018, an annual staff review talk December 11th, 2019, as well as a OSA work environment survey that was conducted at the department during the spring of 2020. Also an e-mail sent to Human Resources July 2nd, 2020.

The claim

In his claim FR addresses his experiences of harassment, victimisation and bullying. The formal complaint states that in several situations and over time FR has been subjected to different types of harassment. Professor Sofia Feltzing (SF), working at the faculty, is the accused party concerning these violations.

The purpose of this investigation is to investigate and determine whether the allegations in this report, of victimisation and harassment, can be defined as such according to Swedish legislation concerning victimisation and harassment and according to policies regarding the psychosocial working environment as well as Lunds University's internal policies.

The focus of the investigation

The focus of the factual investigation is to evaluate the complaints made by the claimant, FR, September 7th 2020 regarding the incidents that took place between the parties (the claimant and the accused) during a period of several years. The investigation will also report any type of risk factors that may have contributed to the occurrence of harassment or victimisation in the organisational och social work environment. The investigation does not take into account any other situations, nor does the investigation make any decisions or suggest any measures or legal action to be taken.

Method and theory

Factual investigation is a method that provides employers with an objective and reliable written evaluation concerning a claim of victimisation, harassment and discrimination in the workplace. The method has been developed by researchers, in collaboration with lawyers working within environmental law. The method factual investigation provides the employer with an objective

evaluation of the situations specified in the claim, in compliance with legislation as well as taking into account the organisation's internal policies.

The factual investigation is based upon the principle of defence: each party has the right to submit their version of the events and to respond to what the counter party or others express in defence of their case.

Factual investigation involves documenting the facts, by gathering and evaluating material collected through interviews with the involved parties, as well as witnesses, and also statements from interviews, e-mails, social media texts and other evidence. The principle purpose is to collect and report the facts only. These are documented in a report which specifies whether or not the situation can be regarded as a violation of the Swedish Work Environment Act (AML) and/or the Discrimination Act (DL (2008:567)).

The information gathered is evaluated according to the context in which the situations have occurred. The factual investigation is documented in a written report which provides a reliable evaluation of the facts and a conclusion upon which the organisation can make a decision about possible measures to be taken. The report also includes issues in the psychosocial work environment which may have increased the risk of victimisation, harassment, discrimination, such as leadership roles, organisational change processes, stress, unresolved conflict and/or unclear roles or tasks.

When the report is completed and handed over to the client it becomes the property of the client organisation.

There are always two investigators; experienced organisational consultants who collaborate throughout the investigation in order to ensure objectivity and reliability.

Contract of mandate

Prior to the factual investigation, a contract of mandate is signed by the client organisation, giving LifeWise AB the mandate to carry out the investigation according to the method "Faktaundersökning". The mandate defines the employer and employee's obligations when participating in the investigation, making sure that these are understood, accepted and agreed upon.

Disclaimer

LifeWise has a neutral position and does not represent the interests of any one party. LifeWise reserves the right to not be held accountable for any possible misunderstandings that may have occurred during the interviews. This report has been requested in English, therefore the legislation and quotes from Swedish are translated into English. LifeWise cannot be held accountable for any possible incorrect translation.

Legal and organisational policies

Below we define the laws, policies and legal definitions relevant to the investigation and referred to in this report.

The employers obligations

Work Environment Act (Arbetsmiljölagen AML)

The Swedish Work Environment Act aims to ensure that the individual employee has a work environment free of health risks and that they are protected against bullying and victimisation. Furthermore, it is an important principle that the employer should investigate whether conditions in the work environment can be a health risk to those involved or if they are more directly exposed to bullying and victimisation.

AML

Den svenska arbetsskallagen har som mål att säkra att den enskilda anställda har en arbetsmiljö fri från ohälsorisker och att man är skyddad mot mobbing och kränkande särbehandling. Vidare är det en viktig princip att arbetsgivaren ska utreda om förhållanden i arbetsmiljön kan utgöra en hälsorisk för personer berörda eller om de kan föra till ohälsa eller olycksfall för personer och kränkande särbehandling.

Chapter 3 further states:

1a§: "Employers and employees must work together to create a healthy working environment."
(Paragraph amended by 1994: 579)

2§: "The employer shall take all measures necessary to prevent the employee from being exposed to ill-health or accidents. A starting point should then be that all factors that can lead to ill-health or accidents should be changed or replaced so that the risk of ill-health or accidents is eliminated."

§ 2a: "The employer shall systematically plan, manage and control the business in a way that leads to the working environment fulfilling the prescribed requirements for a good working environment. He shall investigate work injuries, continuously investigate any risks at work and take measures to prevent and alleviate them. Measures that cannot be taken immediately should be scheduled."

Det här angår vidare av kapitel 3:

1a§. "Arbetsgivare och arbetstagare ska samverka för att åstadkomma en god arbetsmiljö." (Paragrafen ändrad genom 1994: 579)

2§. "Arbetsgivaren ska vidta alla åtgärder som behövs för att förebygga att arbetstagaren utsätts för ohälsa eller olycksfall. En utgångspunkt ska därvid vara att allt sådant som kan leda till ohälsa eller olycksfall ska ändras eller ersättas så att risken för ohälsa eller olycksfall undanröjs."

2a§. "Arbetsgivaren ska systematiskt planera, leda och kontrollera verksamheten på ett sätt som leder till att arbetsmiljön uppfyller föreskrivna krav på en god arbetsmiljö. Han ska utreda arbetsolyckor, fortloppande undersöka riskerna i verksamheten och vidta de åtgärder som föranleds av detta. Åtgärder som inte kan vidtas omedelbart ska utsplaneras."

The employees obligations

4§: "The employee shall participate in the work environment work and participate in the implementation of the measures needed to achieve a good work environment."

4§. "Arbetsstagaren ska medverka i arbetsmiljöarbetet och delta i genomförandet av de åtgärder som behövs för att åstadkomma en god arbetsmiljö."

AFS

The Swedish Work Environment Authority's regulations (AFS 2015:4) provide the following guidelines regarding situations where employees have reported a serious incident:

"The employer is always obliged to ensure that the work can be performed without risk of ill health or accident".

"The employer is always have responsible for investigating incidents"

"Regardless of whether the reported incident leads to us taking action or not, the employer is always obliged to investigate what happened and then take the necessary measures to prevent what happened from happening again."

AFS

A Arbetsgivarverkets föreskrifter (AFS 2015:4) utger följande riktlinjer gällande arbetsmiljö där anställda har anmält en allvarig händelse:

"Arbetsgivaren ska alltid se till att arbetet kan utföras utan risk för ohälsa eller olycksfall."

"Arbetsgivaren ska alltid ha ansvar för att undersöka händelsen."

"Oavsett om den anmälda händelsen leder till att arbetsgivaren eller inte är arbetsgivaren alltid skyldig att utföra en undersökning av vad som har hänt och vidta de åtgärder som behövs för att det inte ska hända igen."

14§: "The employer must ensure that there are routines for how victimisation should be dealt with.

The procedures must state

1. who should receive information that victimisation is occurring,
2. what happens to the information, what the recipient should do, and
3. how and where those who are exposed can quickly get help. "

The employer must make the procedures known to all employees.

14§: "Arbetsgivaren ska se till att det finns rutiner för hur vittnandes vårdbehandling ska hanteras. Av rutinerna ska det framgå

1. vem ska få muntlig information om att det finns vårdbehandling fördröjningar

2. vad som händer med informationen i vidareutredningarna och hur åtgärder ska vidtas

3. hur och var de som är utsatta snabbt kan få hjälp."

Arbetsgivaren ska göra rutinerna kända för alla anställda."

Lunds University's internal policies

According to Lund University's internal policy on equality, equal treatment and diversity, there is zero tolerance for abusive discrimination. Furthermore, it is clear in these internal policies regarding abusive discrimination and discrimination that the employer is obliged to initiate an investigation if one of the employees feels exposed. If abusive discrimination can be found, measures to stop and prevent repetition should be implemented as soon as possible. The study is done on the basis of the systematic work environment work and the regulation Organisational and social work environment, AFS 2015: 14.

All managers at Lund University must work preventively against victimisation. In order to be able to prevent victimisation, knowledge of the specific social work environment in the workplace is required. This means that you as a manager must have the knowledge to be able to detect and deal with collaboration problems and other sources of victimisation at an early stage. You must be able to identify signs that indicate that victimisation is occurring, and you need competence to assess which measures are appropriate to take.

...och att de som ansvarar för arbetsmiljöarbetet följer lagstiftningen och uppgiftsdelningar inom arbetsmiljöområdet. Medarbetare och studerande medverkar i arbetsmiljöarbetet genom att ta ansvar för egen betygande, följa instruktioner och påtala risker.

...och att de som ansvarar för arbetsmiljöarbetet följer lagstiftningen och uppgiftsdelningar inom arbetsmiljöområdet. Medarbetare och studerande medverkar i arbetsmiljöarbetet genom att ta ansvar för egen betygande, följa instruktioner och påtala risker.

Managers are responsible for ensuring that ongoing reviews and interventions concerning the working environment comply with the legislation and the division of tasks within the work environment area. Employees and students participate in these tasks by taking responsibility for their own behaviour, following instructions and pointing out risks.

...och att de som ansvarar för arbetsmiljöarbetet följer lagstiftningen och uppgiftsdelningar inom arbetsmiljöområdet. Medarbetare och studerande medverkar i arbetsmiljöarbetet genom att ta ansvar för egen betygande, följa instruktioner och påtala risker.

Legal definitions

Victimisation

Victimisation is defined in accordance with the Work Environment Act as "acts that are directed against one or more workers in an abusive manner and which may lead to ill health or to be placed outside the community of the workplace". Note that according to the current definition, it does not have to be about repetitive behaviours.

...och att de som ansvarar för arbetsmiljöarbetet följer lagstiftningen och uppgiftsdelningar inom arbetsmiljöområdet. Medarbetare och studerande medverkar i arbetsmiljöarbetet genom att ta ansvar för egen betygande, följa instruktioner och påtala risker.

Victimisation is a broader concept than discrimination and can, for example, be a rude response from one colleague to another. Examples of victimisation are: sexual harassment, derogatory or ridiculous comments about work, abusive comments on persons, opinions, appearance or privacy, aggressive outcomes, threats of violence or other violations, spread of rumours that undermine a person's dignity.

...och att de som ansvarar för arbetsmiljöarbetet följer lagstiftningen och uppgiftsdelningar inom arbetsmiljöområdet. Medarbetare och studerande medverkar i arbetsmiljöarbetet genom att ta ansvar för egen betygande, följa instruktioner och påtala risker.

Bullying

According to the Swedish Work Environment Authority, bullying is defined as recurring negative actions over a period of time (usually at least six months) directed at individuals or a group. The

definition also includes that there is an imbalance in power between perpetrator and victim and that the actions lead to the victim being excluded from the social community.

Mobbing definieras som återkommande negativa handlingar över en tillperad (oftast minst ett halvår) riktade mot enskilda eller en grupp. I definitionen ingår också att det råder en obalans i makt mellan förövare och offer och att handlingarna leder till att offer ställs utanför den sociala gemenskapen.

Discrimination

Discrimination is defined according to the Discrimination Act as anyone being disadvantaged or offended in connection with one of the seven grounds of discrimination, gender, gender identity or expression, ethnic affiliation, religion or other beliefs, disability, sexual orientation and age. Discrimination can be direct or indirect. Lack of access, harassment, sexual harassment and instructions to discriminate are also forms of discrimination.

Diskriminering definieras enligt Diskrimineringslagen som att någon missgynnas eller kränks i samband till någon av de sju diskrimineringsgrunderna kön, könsöverskridande identitet eller uttryck, etnisk tillhörighet, religion eller annan trosuppfattning, funktionsnedsättning, sexuell läggning och ålder. Diskriminering kan vara direkt eller indirekt. Även begränsad tillgänglighet, trakasserier, sexuella trakasserier och instruktioner att diskriminera är former av diskriminering.

Harassment

Harassment is a concept that occurs in the Discrimination Act and is defined there as an undesirable behaviour that violates someone's dignity with connection to the seven grounds of discrimination. It is the exposed person who decides what is undesirable and abusive. If an abusive behaviour contains any of the seven grounds for discrimination, it can be considered as harassment.

Trakasserier är ett begrepp som förekommer i Diskrimineringslagen och definieras där som ett oönskat beteende som kränker någons värdighet med koppling till de sju diskrimineringsgrunderna. Det är den som är utsatt som avgör vad som är oönskat och kränkande. Om ett kränkande beteende innehåller någon av de sju diskrimineringsgrunderna kan det betraktas som trakasserier.

The factual investigation of this report

The content of the formal claim and the interviews

We investigate the formal claim and evaluate the complaints made in the following interview statements. We also evaluate the responses of the accused and witnesses to these complaints in the interviews specified below. The report is structured according to themes of the claims, as following:

1. Victimisation
2. Exclusion
3. Persecution
4. Control
5. Minimization
6. Personal attacks

Allegations of victimisation stated by FR concerning SF

1. FR says that he is exposed to victimisation by SF at The GalForm-meeting October 15th, 10.30, 2019.

FR: "We organised the meeting, and I volunteered to show my work. Prepared a presentation on a screen. Both of them (Sofia and Melvyn) don't like that, they want it on the whiteboard. I wanted to show a movie and pictures. I decided how to do it. She arrives and sees the projector, and complains about the projector. She says do it on the white board. She's not my boss, it's my presentation and she can leave if she doesn't want to listen to it. So this put me in a poor state of mind. I showed my work. She interrupted the whole time. She talked more than I did. I teach for 3 year students and even the students know the answer to this. She wants to minimize the importance of my work. She's yelling, she doesn't want me to get to the end of the thing. Other people in the room are afraid to ask questions because if they do they are afraid that she will yell at them. I also had a guest from the UK. She knew I had a guest. She wanted to show that was am doing is minimize my work in front of my guest. Some of the students come to me and ask me questions after and tell me that they were afraid to ask questions...After that Anders Johansen asked me to come to his office, almost in tears. He asked me how the meeting went. I was scared of being called to the principal's office. I told him how she harassed me. He said "what am I supposed to do with them?". That's not my job. You have to do something. We didn't come to a conclusion."

SF: "The atmosphere was bad. I did not behave appropriately. I became even more angry because they wanted to have a presentation and not a discussion. I should have backed down. I was in a certain mood, completely unnecessary, completely unprovoked, this set a bad atmosphere from the beginning. I asked a couple of questions about the presentation. The idea is to be able to ask questions all the time. A lot of people think this is an exciting and fun format. It does not suit everyone and I don't think it suited Florent. It was wrong of me to go about it that way, it created a bad atmosphere. I asked a question about the colours, I did. Then I asked a technical question that he couldn't answer so I asked it twice. Yes, that was bad. He probably felt attacked. We have not talked about this afterwards, he has talked to the others afterwards. The prefect never brought it up with me. I had private problems. I worked a lot, I sit on some committees but not exceptionally many, as it

says here somewhere in the report. We deal with many matters and we have 5-6 meetings per term. I did not want to do that (it's 10% of my working hours). I simply think I was too busy. I was probably overworked and had a short fuse... No, I wanted to know what he showed. I wanted to understand what he was talking about. Florent wanted to present his results, but the purpose of the meeting is to understand how they get to the results. So no, I never intended to diminish or minimize his performance. Just to understand."

SF: "Stämningen var dålig. Jag betedde mig inte lämpligt. Jag blev surare eftersom de skulle presentera och inte ha diskussion. Jag borde ha backat. Jag var i en sinnesstämning, helt onödigt, helt oprovocerat så satte det en dålig stämning från början. Jag ställde ett par frågor kring presentationen. Tanken är att man ska kunna ställa frågor hela tiden. Många tycker det är spännande format och att det är roligt. Det passar inte alla och jag kände inte att det passade Florent. Det var dåligt av mig att gå in på det sättet, det skapade en dålig stämning. Jag ställde en fråga om färgerna, det gjorde jag. Sen frågade jag en teknisk fråga som han inte kunde svara på och den ställde jag två gånger. Ja, det var inte bra. Han kände sig säkert påhoppad. Vi har inte pratat om detta efteråt, han har pratat med andra efteråt. Prefekten har aldrig tagit upp det med mig. Jag hade privata problem. Jag arbetade väldigt mycket, jag sitter i en del nämnder och kommittéer men inte ovanligt många, som det står här någonstans i anmälan. Vi hanterar många ärenden och vi har 5-6 möten per termin. Jag ville inte göra det (det är 10% av min arbetstid). Jag tror helt enkelt att jag hade för många saker att göra. Jag var antagligen utarbetad, överarbetad och hade för kort stubin... Nej jag ville veta vad han visade. Jag ville förstå vad han pratade om. Florent ville presentera sina resultat men meningen med mötet är ju att förstå hur man kommer till resultatet. Så nej, jag har aldrig haft för avsikt att förminska eller minimera hans prestation. Bara att förstå"

EA: "She had an aggressive way of questioning things that are not reasonable to question. To question and not to be constructive. Questions that interfere with the presentation, "I don't think you should use the projector because it is not educational". Florent has prepared something and she immediately sets rules to interfere with that, she controls the conversation and the presentation so you get confused. When you get confused, she pushes questions at you so hard that you don't get anywhere. You feel exposed and nervous. This happened at this meeting and at most of the meetings where she is present. I do not know exactly why Florent. She chooses people to have a go at, some more obviously than others."

EA: "Hon hade ett aggressivt sätt att ifrågasätta saker som inte är rimligt att ifrågasätta. Det var ute efter att ifrågasätta och inte för att vara konstruktiv. Frågor som stör presentationen. "Jag tycker inte du ska använda projektorn för det är inte pedagogiskt." Florent har förberett något och direkt sätter hon in regler för att störa det, hon styr konversationen och presentationen så man blir förvirrad. När man blir förvirrad kör hon hårt med frågor så att man sedan inte kommer någon vart. Man känner sig utsatt och nervös. Detta hände på detta möte och på de flesta möten där hon är med. Varför just Florent vet jag inte. Hon väljer personer att vara extra hård mot, vissa mer uppenbara än andra."

RF: "I was at this meeting. Normally at meetings we present on a white board. Florent wanted to have a power-point presentation. Sofia was clear that she did not want it that way. I felt sorry for Florent, I remember it was a difficult meeting. I also thought the questions were trivial and unscientific. No one else was allowed to speak, Sofia asked a lot of questions, we did not discuss the science. It didn't feel like she thought it was good. That was weird."

RF: "Jag var på mötet. Normalt på mötet brukar vi presentera på whiteboard. Florent ville ha en powerpoint-presentation. Sofia var tydlig med att hon inte ville ha det så.... Jag tyckte synd om Florent, jag minns att mötet var jobbigt. Jag tyckte också det var bagatellfrågor och ovetenskapligt. Ingen annan fick komma till tals, Sofia ställde många frågor, vi diskuterade inte vetenskapen. Det kändes inte som att hon tyckte det var bra. Det var konstigt."

Postadress:
LifeWise AB
Östra Mårtensgatan 15
223 61 Lund

Besöksadresser:
Östra Mårtensgatan 15, Lund
Lerdåbsgatan 3, Malmö
Trandårgatan 9, Helsingborg

Kontakt:
Tel 046-184477
E-mail info@lifewise.se
Webb www.lifewise.se

OA: "I was not at GalForm because I was on parental leave. I heard from others how much he was he put under pressure. From both messenger and email. It was not just him who said that. Erik Andersson told me, he was there. Rebecka Forsberg was probably there. I know from the prefect that someone reported this, it was so bad that they told the prefect. Some student researcher went to the prefect independently and said that it was completely unacceptable."

OA: "Jag var inte med på GalForm för jag var föräldraledig. Jag fick höra från andra hur hårt anställda han var då. Fick både på messenger och e-mail. Det var inte bara han som sa det. Erik Andersson sa det till mig, han var där. Rebecka Forsberg var nog där. Jag vet från prefekten att någon anmälde detta. Det var så illa att de sa till prefekten. Någon student/forskare gick oberoende och sa att det var helt oacceptabelt."

AJ: "In an annual development interview with Paul McMillan on October 15, he said that he personally was exposed to aggressive behavior from Sofia a few times a year. He also said something about what had happened at the GalForm meeting, that Sofia behaved badly towards Florent. I called Florent into my office and asked him what had happened. I told Florent that no employee should be treated like that. He seemed grateful for this. I contacted Sofia and talked to her about Paul and Florent's reporting her behavior. She became upset and sad and we talked about being more careful with her tone of voice in the future"

AJ: "I ett utvecklingsintervju med Paul McMillan 15 oktober berättade han att han själv blev utsatt för aggressivt beteende från Sofia några gånger per år. Han sa också något om vad som hade hänt på GalForm-mötet, att Sofia betett sig illa mot Florent. Jag kallade in Florent på mitt kontor och frågade vad som hänt. Jag berättade för Florent att så ska ingen anställd behandlas. Han verkade tacksam för detta. Jag kontaktade Sofia och pratade med henne om Pauls och Florents rapportering av hennes beteende. Hon blev upprörd och ledsen och vi pratade om att vara mera försiktig med tonläget i framtiden."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused confirms this statement made by the claimant. The witnesses confirm that the situations implying victimisation have occurred.

The alleged claim of victimisation can be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

2. FR describes feeling excluded in four different situations.

Excluded by SF from a project with OA and EA

FR: "Yes, after this presentation at GalForm I showed her what I was working on. We had an idea for a project together with Oscar, a phd student and the technical. After Anders or HR told her about this, I was not part of these discussions any more. I was surprised but i have pride and don't want to say anything. They said that "Florent should be here". I felt excluded, it was exactly what I was working on. At some point i said to my boss that i felt excluded, he said "yes i know but i don't know what to do about it". September this year he said that he is not being a part of these meetings any more because it's toxic. The phd student also left the collaboration."

SF: "After a while we included my new postdoc Diane but we didn't include Florent. We were still working on the observations and had not started with the simulations. Then Oscar and I wrote one application in the fall and one in the spring. We discussed many times who we would involve. I did not

want too many co-applicants, but based on how the application was to be formulated, it would have been strategically stupid to include too many."

OA: "Jag och min student Erik har gått med Sofia, hennes student och andra forskare. De mötena kallas av Sofia. De har varit väldigt relevanta för Florent. Han har inte blivit inkluderad av Sofia. Jag tycker att det vore högst naturligt om han var med på de mötena.... Jag har sagt "ska vi ta med Florent". Då sa hon "vi väntar lite, inte just nu". Det är märkligt när han jobbar så mycket med det här att han inte blir inkluderad. Det var tydligt att han arbetade med resultat som var intressanta för de här mötena. Florent har nog bara konstaterat att det blev så här. Han borde varit med tycker jag. Speciellt nu i efterhand när man ser hela bilden. Sofia bjud in sina forskare, Diane och Thomas Bensby, då blev det som att det bara var en som saknades. En plattform där han inte var med....Jag kommer ihåg att jag påtalat det för Sofia. Hon kallar in till mötena. Hon har sagt nej. Jag visste inte hur jag skulle komma åt det mer än att säga till henne. Många utanför samarbetet undrar också varför han inte är med."

OA: "Yes, me and my student Erik went with Sofia, her student and other researchers. Those meetings are called by Sofia. They were very relevant for Florent. He has not been included by Sofia. I think it would be obvious for him to be at those meetings... I have said "shall we include Florent". Then she said "let's wait a while, not at the moment". It's strange that he is not included considering that so much of his work is in this field. It was clear that he was working on results that were relevant for these meetings.

Florent just seemed to accept the situation as it was. I think that he should have been included. Especially now in retrospect when you understand it all more clearly. Sofia invited her researchers, Diane and Thomas Bensby, so it appeared as if only one person was missing. A forum where he wasn't included ...I remember pointing it out to Sofia. She is the one who calls these meetings. She said no. I did not know how to address it other than to bring it up with her. Many outside of the group also wonder why he is not included."

OA: "Ja jag och min student Erik har gått med Sofia, hennes student och andra forskare. De mötena kallas av Sofia. De har varit väldigt relevanta för Florent. Han har inte blivit inkluderad av Sofia. Jag tycker att det vore högst naturligt om han var med på de mötena.... Jag har sagt "ska vi ta med Florent". Då sa hon "vi väntar lite, inte just nu". Det är märkligt när han jobbar så mycket med det här att han inte blir inkluderad. Det var tydligt att han arbetade med resultat som var intressanta för de här mötena. Florent har nog bara konstaterat att det blev så här. Han borde varit med tycker jag. Speciellt nu i efterhand när man ser hela bilden. Sofia bjud in sina forskare, Diane och Thomas Bensby, då blev det som att det bara var en som saknades. En plattform där han inte var med....Jag kommer ihåg att jag påtalat det för Sofia. Hon kallar in till mötena. Hon har sagt nej. Jag visste inte hur jag skulle komma åt det mer än att säga till henne. Många utanför samarbetet undrar också varför han inte är med."

EA: "Over time, more people became involved from Sofia's side. Oscar was on parental leave. She brought in Thomas and Diane and also involved other people from outside. Florent should have been invited because that's exactly what he does. Suddenly, the project changed course over to Sofia's area of research."

EA: "Med tiden blev fler involverade från Sofias sida. Oscar var föräldraledig. Hon tog in Thomas och Diane och involverade folk utifrån. Florent borde ha blivit inbjuden för det är precis det han gör. Plötsligt bytte projektet inriktning mot Sofias område."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused confirms this situation but not the statement made by the claimant about exclusion.

Witnesses confirm that the situations implying victimisation have occurred.

The alleged claim of victimisation can be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

FR claims to be excluded from evaluation committees

FR: "The first time was in may 2018 it was Maria Lomaeva. She was the master coordinator, making sure everything is working correctly. I said it was a VG, he said it was a G. It was not aggressive. It was my first experience. I wasn't pushing, I just asked why not a VG. We discussed it for a while. Sofia was smiling and said to Tomas maybe you can consider a VG. And then it was a VG. I went back to my office. Nils, the student supervisor, came in and said to me "thank you for doing that". Since then I haven't been asked to be in the committee again. You have to be fair. That was my fault. Again excluding me, and stopping me from getting a job...maybe. That's how I perceive it."

SF: "As a master coordinator, I have aimed for the examiner to be a professor or docent. Florent is neither of these. Then there is a committee member too for each student as well. In the specific case in 2018, Thomas Bensby was the examiner. I was present as chairman. The aim is a grading. Everyone can get a VG but it is grading. I was on sick leave the next day so I don't remember anything about that meeting. When you are a postdoc like Florent, you don't want to burden them with too much, he should focus on his own research...He was not included last year nor this year either. We had an unusual number of postdocs last year and there were many to choose from. He has not been involved but he has not been excluded either."

SF: "Jag har som koordinator eftersträvat att examinatorn ska vara lärare eller docent. Florent är varken eller. Sen finns det en kommittéledamot också för varje student. I det specifika fallet 2018 var Thomas Bensby examinator. Jag var med som ordförande. Tanken är att det ska graderas. Alla kan få VG men det är betygsättning. Jag sjukskrev mig dagen efter så jag minns inget av det mötet. När man själv är postdocs som Florent är vill man inte belasta dem för mycket, han ska tänka på sin egen forskning...Han var inte med förra året och inte detta heller. Vi hade ovanligt mycket postdocs förra året och det fanns många att välja mellan. Han har inte varit med men han har heller inte exkluderas."

BT: "Finally Sofia said "Thomas, are you ok with her getting a VG?" Then he turned abruptly and said yes of course and then she got a VG. Since then, Florent has been excluded from working on his masters with Sofia. Florent was in and helped Nils's student, again a trigger, he then ended up on her blacklist."

BT: "Till sist sa Sofia "Thomas är du ok med att hon får VG?" Då vände han tvärt och sa javisst och så fick hon VG. Sedan dess har Florent blivit utfrysad från master-arbete med Sofia. Florent var inne och hjälpte Nils student och igen är det en trigger, sen blev han på black-listen."

NR: "Florent said only "I can't agree with this, it's not correct'. He didn't listen to Sofia. I went to him afterwards and said "thank you for speaking your mind."

NR: "Florent sa bara "jag går inte med på det här, det stämmer ju inte". Han lyssnade inte på Sofia. Jag gick till honom efteråt och sa "tack för att du sa ifrån."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies the statement made by the claimant. The witnesses confirm the subjective feeling of victimisation but cannot confirm the exclusion of the claimant.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

FR claims he is being excluded by not being introduced to important visitors

FR: "It's subtle. When we have visitors they (Sofia and Melvyn) will not introduce me to the guests. Several times."

SF: "I do not know what he means. I do not have many visitors. When someone visits I try to introduce them to the other employees but it probably will not be to everyone. It is hard to present everyone when we are 40 people"

SF: "Jag vet inte vad han syftar på. Jag har inte så många som besöker mig. Jag försöker när jag har någon på besök att presentera dem för de andra anställda men det blir säkert inte komplett. Det är svårt när vi är 40 st att introducera alla."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. There are no witnesses.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

FR claims he is being excluded from a conversation with EA

FR: "We were talking by the lunch table. Me and Eric. She sits in between us in the middle of the discussion and talks Swedish with him...She showed me her back and ignored me."

SF: "I don't know what situations he is relating to. It can happen that I speak Swedish with other Swedish speakers because there may be a question with a solution that is best solved in Swedish where the English is good but not as good. That I would sit down between them and turn my back on them would be totally out of the question. I usually apologize and say "I'm sorry it's better to do this in Swedish". Anyway, Florent likes to speak French with other French speakers."

SF: "Jag vet inte vad det är för situationer han relaterar till. Det kan hända att jag pratar svenska med andra svensktalande för att det kanske finns en fråga för att personen har som bäst läses på svenska när engelskan är god men inte lika god. Att jag skulle sätta mig ner mellan dem och vända ryggen till skulle vara totalt uteslutet. Jag ursäktar mig ofta och säger "I'm sorry it's better to do this in Swedish". Däremot pratar Florent gärna på franska med andra fransktalande."

EA: "I can't say that I remember this. But I wouldn't be surprised if this has happened."

EA: "Jag kan inte säga att jag minns det här. Men jag är inte förvånad om det skulle ha hänt."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witness cannot confirm that the situations implying victimisation have occurred.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

3. FR feels persecuted by SF.

2nd of July 2020

GE: "I was trying to avoid her. I am afraid that i will make a mistake. I was in the break room, she was waiting for me in the corridor. She was holding the door handle. Then I went to the break room and

she followed me. I know she did that on purpose. I know she was following me. I think it was to intimidate me. She has seen the report. I am not talking to her anymore. I go around the building, I am scared and it's probably emotional. It's not a rational reaction. I passed by some colleagues. The only place I can think of is the toilet. I am terrified. It's irrational. I am stronger than her but i can not control it. I can hear that she is outside. I calm myself down. This was in July, the department was empty. I am really scared, and i think that if i open the door she will yell at me, punch me in the face or something. I was so terrified, I was shaking and crying. I could not do anything. After 10 minutes I splashed fresh water on my face. I went back, and passed Brian and Eric, closed the door behind me. Told them, I was crying. Brian reported that but it has been ignored by the HR. Other people have seen this. Brian and Eric, David Hobbs have been spied on. In 10 minutes she passed by 6 times. Some people said that if you need a witness they will help me."

SF: "I might have walked behind him, but not in order to follow him. No, I did not do that.... That would be awful. In his text, he describes that he is afraid of me and that I would scare and persecute him. I do not know where he got that idea from. I do not understand it."

SF: "Jag blev mycket väl ha gått efter honom, men inte för att följa efter honom. Nej det var jag inte g, ni... Det är ju hänskt. I hans text beskriver han ju att han är rädd och att jag ska skrämma och följa honom. Jag vet inte var han fått den tanken ifrån. Jag förstår inte det."

BT: "We were in the yard drinking coffee in the afternoon. There was a bad atmosphere. F tries to avoid S. When she arrives, he leaves. Sofia asks about Florent and I do not dare answer. We talk about something else, small talk. Then we go to our offices. Then I see Florent coming in and then Sofia. Then Sofia walks past at a fast pace. Then F comes into my office and tells me that he was scared and that he locked himself in the bathroom. He was not feeling well, we told him he shouldn't come to work the next day. He took that as a huge defeat, then he broke down, which he of course did not want to do in front of students. When I got home in the evening, I sent that e-mail. Maybe she went after him to start a conversation, I do not know. He has a problem with her, so when she goes after him, he gets anxious. She keeps track of who attends meetings, maybe she wants to keep a check on what he is doing."

BT: "Vi sitter nere på gården på eftermiddagen och dricker kaffe. Det är tryckt stämning. F försöker undvika S. När hon kommer går han. Sofia frågar om Florent och jag vågar inte svara. Vi pratar om något annat, snäll talk. Sen går vi till våra kontor. Sen ser jag Florent komma gående och sen kommer Sofia. Sen kommer Sofia tillbaka i raskt tempo. Sen kommer F in och berättar att han var rädd och att han låst in sig på toaletten. Han mådde inte bra, vi sa till honom att han kunde vara ledig nästa dag. Det tog han som ett förtänerderlag, de bröt han ihop och det gillade han säkert inte att göra framför studenterna. När jag kom hem på kvällen skickade jag det mailet... Han kanske följde efter honom för att starta ett samtal, jag vet inte. Han har ett problem med henne så när hon följer efter får han ju ångest. Han har koll på vem som är med på möten så det kanske är så att han vill ha koll på vad han gör."

EA: "It was traumatic. It was after the work environment report had been presented to us. Florent was worried but did not want to stay at home. We had lunch out in the courtyard. It was me, Florent and Brian. Sofia came out and sat down with us. Florent became uncomfortable and went inside. Sofia asked me how Florent was, she thought he was behaving strangely. I didn't really want to answer that. A moment later Brian and I were sitting in the office working and Florent came in to us, broke down and felt terrible.

Out in the yard there was a strange atmosphere. When Florent came into our office, there was no doubt that he was scared. He was afraid of Sofia. ... He felt monitored. He said he was afraid of her

although there was no direct reason to be afraid, as he is physically bigger, but that he was afraid she would harm him. The fear was not rational, he said. ... Sofia is extremely good at using master suppression techniques as a way of making others feel inferior. She's done that to me as well. If you look at what has happened previously, people have left the department but several months later they are still afraid of Sofia and keep looking over their shoulder making sure that she is not there. She is very calculating in her use of master suppression techniques."

EA: "Det var traumatiserande. Det var efter att vi fått arbetsmiljörapporten presenterad för oss. Florent var orolig över att han skulle inte vara hemma. Vi hade ätit lunch ut på innergården. Det var jag, Florent och Brian. Sofia kom ut och satte sig hos oss. Florent blev obekvämt och gick in. Sofia frågade mig hur det var med Florent, han lyckas att han betedde sig konstigt. Jag ville inte riktigt svara på det. En stund senare satt jag och Brian på kontoret och jobbade och Florent kom in till oss, bröt ihop och mådde skräckligt. Lite på gården var det konstig stämning. När Florent kom in till vårt kontor var det ingen tvekan om att han var rädd. Han var rädd för Sofia. ... Han kände sig besviken. Han sa att han var rädd för henne men det finns ingen direkt anledning att vara rädd för att han är fysiskt större men han var rädd att han skulle slås honom. Russian var inte rationell så han själv. ... Sofia är extremt duktig på härskarteknik och att få andra att känna sig underlägsna. Hon har gjort det med mig också. Om man tilltar på vad som hänt tidigare har folk lämnat avdelningen men är flera månader efter detta fortfarande rädda för Sofia och det över tiden så hon inte är död. Hon har en berömd härskarteknik."

OA: "Yes, I know that Florent contacted me when he had locked himself in the bathroom. Brian and Erik said that they reported it to HR. They all reported the situation identically. I was at home but was told about it. "I am in the bathroom and I am terrified". I didn't witness this incident myself."

OA: "Ja jag vet att Florent hörde av sig när han låste in sig på toaletten. Brian och Erik sa även att de anmält det till HR. Alla tre beskrev det identiskt. Då var jag hemma men fick det rapporterat. "Jag sitter på toaletten och jag är livrädd". Jag har inte iakttagit det själv."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witnesses confirm the subjective experience of victimisation but cannot confirm the persecution of the claimant.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

August 27th, 2020

FR: "We have glass doors and glass walls which is nice. Every time they pass they will look at your screen. Sometimes she will open the door and comment on what I am doing. She will invite herself....Sofia is less intrusive, she doesn't interrupt the tele-con. She will look and she will say this is not the right paper you should read, this is ugly. Maybe she is paranoid or I don't know but when I was talking to Leif, she passed by 6 times. When I was talking to Nils, minutes after she talked to the dean about not coming back to the department. When they come to the office we don't. She passed by at least 5 times and Nils said, "oh she's here again". She sometimes stood with a piece of paper by the printer for 10 minutes. Nobody else does that frequently. You can go get a coffee but not 6 or 20 times. Keep looking in and it's obvious. There are people thinking of recording this by video and also on the phone if she calls"

GE: "I had a meeting with HR, the prefect, etc. that day. 5 pm is about when I go home, Nils Ryde's office is right by the toilet. It is impossible to walk past without seeing a human being sitting there. I know I passed by to go to the toilet and it's quite unusual for Florent to sit in Nils Ryd's office, I noticed that. When I went home I pushed open the door to the stairwell with my back then you look

straight into Nils' office. Florent and Nils were standing and Nils looked at me and then I waved goodbye before I left. I was just being polite."

GE: "Jag hade möte med Hå, prefekten osv den dagen. Kl. 17 är ungefär när jag går hem, Nils Rydö kontor är precis vid toaletten. Det är omöjligt att gå förbi utan att se att det sitter en människa där. Jag vet att jag gick förbi för att gå på toaletten och det är ganska ovanligt att Florent sitter på Nils Rydös kontor, jag uppmärksammade det. När jag gick hem så sköt jag upp dörren till trapphuset med ryggen då ser man rakt in i Nils kontor. Florent och Nils stod upp och Nils tittade på mig och då vinkade jag höjda handen jag gick. Jag var bara vänligt nöjd."

NR: "This is something she does very often. I've been subject to it too. It is demonstrative. She shows that "I see you both". We looked at each other, she waved and I saw it as "I see you both". She never waves. Florent is an enemy and this was a day she would come by. Florent was terrified."

NR: "Det är något hon gör väldigt ofta. Jag har varit utsatt för det också. Det är demonstrativt. Hon visar att "jag ser er" ..Vi tittade på varandra, hon vinkade och jag såg det som "jag ser er". Hon vinkar alltid. Florent är en fiende och det när var en dag han skulle komma. Florent är ju livrädd."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witnesses confirm the subjective experience of victimisation but cannot confirm the persecution of the claimant.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

4. FR experiences that SF tries to control, monitor and influence him through various statements and behaviors

Comment, spring of 2018

FR: "I had a guest when we had a department meeting. She (Sofia) passed by, we were discussing in the kitchen. She says, "you should be at the department meeting. How do you think you can be a professor if you don't go to meetings". In front of my guest. This was spring 2018. She makes "jokes" about things all the time, she knows where it hurts. I didn't go to the meeting."

SF: "I have no memory of this but it is totally possible that I knocked on his open door and said "Florent, there is a meeting now. It's probably good if you attend."

SF: "Jag har inget minne av det men det är fullt möjligt att jag knackade på hans öppna dörr och sa att "Florent, vi har ett möte nu. Det är nog bra om du är med på det."

LL: "I can't say outright that I experienced such a situation. I recognise the situation. The four of us were in the kitchen, in the spring of 2018, sounds reasonable time-wise. What Sofia said I cannot remember."

LL: "Jag kan inte på rak arm säga att jag upplevde en sådan situation. Jag känner igen situationen. Vi fyra var i köket våren 2018, talar rimligt i tid. Vad Sofia sa kan jag inte minnas."

MD: "I can tell you about this since I was present at the time. I was at the time working for University of Surrey in the UK. Florent invited me over to work on a scientific project we have been developing for a few years. There was a department meeting that Florent did not attend considering I was there and we had a lot of work to do. I think it was a little while after the meeting that we were having a

coffee/tea in the break room...Sofia started talking to Florent and asked him why he was not at the department meeting. She indeed added that he would never get a professorship with "such an attitude". I remember clearly the scene because the tone of Sofia clearly implied some kind of threat.."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witness confirms that the situations implying victimisation have occurred.

The alleged claim of victimisation can be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

Time planning 11th of October 201

FR: "It was to prepare for October 14th... I received an email from her. One hour later I got an email from Davies about times when I should meet the students. Not if I had time or anything, just telling me. I have 11 of them to talk to and Sofia said you should talk to them in groups. No, you should respect the schedule from Davies. I tell them "you can't decide my schedule". I wanted to organize it myself. She said no, please don't talk to the students before. I agreed to meet the students in groups. They took the decision on my schedule, that is what upset me. They want to control everything, no they want you to know that they are in charge although they are not."

SF: "I perceived that he organized it in an inappropriate way. We had 11 new students, they were supposed to choose 8. All 11 wanted to talk to Florent. We had sent out an e-mail with plenty of notice. In the past, some have chosen to have them in groups and some have talked to them one by one. That was all we asked Florent to do. I said we need to sit down and talk about this, we can't e-mail any more. We had a 1.5 hour discussion about this, we understood each other's points of view, how he thought, that he understood what I meant and in the end he said "I understand what you mean and we can do it that way".

I do not understand why this is brought up again."

SF: "Jag uppfattade att han organiserat det på ett olämpligt sätt. Vi hade 11 nya studenter, de skulle välja 8 st. Alla 11 ville prata med Florent. Vi hade skickat ut email i god tid. Tidigare har en del valt att ta dem i grupp och andra gånger har de funkat att de ska prata med dem en och en. Det var det enda vi bad Florent att göra. Jag sa vi får sätta oss ner och prata om detta, vi kan inte e maila längre. Jag upplevde att vi hade 1,5 timmars diskussion allt vi förstod varandras utgångspunkter, hur han tänkte, att han förstod vad jag sa och i slutändan sa han "jag förstår vad du tänker och vi kan göra på det sättet". Jag förstod inte att det kommer upp igen."

OA: "It was when the students doing a masters were to discuss their projects... Sofia is the coordinator, Melvyn was going to coordinate those concerning theory. They gave us the optimal solution, I was on parental leave so I just said "I don't have time to get involved with this, it will be fine". Florent said he did not want to, he wanted to meet them individually. There was then an exchange of words that became heated. It was very strange that they didn't agree for him to do so. I don't think it really matters. Why can't we be flexible about certain things? I know that it then led to him having a marathon-long meeting with Sofia where he was told that it was inappropriate. How can such small matters turn into such a heated discussion so quickly?"

OA: "Det var att nu ska master studenterna diskutera projekt...Sofia är ju koordinator de skulle Melvyn koordinera de som har med teori att göra. De förmedlade den optimala lösningen, jag var föräldraledig så jag sa bara "jag orkar inte dra i det där, det blir jättebra". Florent sa att han ville inte, han ville träffa dem individuellt. Sen blev det en ordväxling som blev hätsk. Det var

mycket märkligt att de inte gick med på att han fick göra det. Det spelar ingen roll tycker jag. Varför kan vi inte vara flexibla för vissa saker. Sen vet jag att det ledde till att han hade ett möte med Sofia där han fick förklarat för sig att det var olämpligt. Hur kan såna små saker lyfta till ett något tonläge så snabbt?"

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witness confirm the subjective experience of victimisation but cannot confirm the victimisation of the claimant. The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

Comment on not being able to get a permanent position, autumn of 2019.

FR: "Last autumn in the coffee room, 4-6 times she told me, "the department will never give you a permanent job and that you wouldn't get one elsewhere either". Sometimes it's in general that the department is too big and we shouldn't hire. She said it to me directly in a group making sure I would understand. Some people witnessed."

SF: "I have no idea where he got this from. I know last year we discussed, once or twice with colleagues, how we wanted things to be in academics. There are very few positions and it is difficult to get a job. It is completely out of the question that I would have said that. No never. Why would I say that in public? I can't predict that with our system of fundings. He might be lucky/unlucky. It is completely unlikely that I would have said that in a closed room and even less unlikely in the break room... We have talked about how difficult in general it is to get a job."

SF: "Jag har ingen förståelse för var han fått det ifrån. Jag vet under förra året, 1-2 gåor tillsammans med andra personer diskuterade vi, hur ser det ut inom akademien. Det finns väldigt få jobb, det är svårt att få jobb. Fullständigt uteslutet att jag skulle ha sagt så. Nej aldrig. Varför skulle jag säga det i ett offentligt rum. Det kan jag inte förutsäga med den typen av finansierat system vi har. Han kan ha turistat. Det är helt omöjligt att jag skulle säga det i ett slutet rum och ännu mindre i fikorummet... Vi har pratat generellt om att det är svårt att få arbete."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. There are no witnesses. The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

Control concerning who and who not attends meetings and reprimands if non-attendance

GE: "Sofia and Melvyn keep track of who enters meetings and who doesn't. And not being present makes it ok to give reprimands. They always sit at the same seats furthest from the door. They sit with nobody behind them and they will see if someone arrives late. I would not be surprised if they take notes."

SF: "As a masters student, you are supposed to attend seminars and certain research meetings. In my role as coordinator, I wanted to make sure that these students came to the meetings. Yes, I often sit up front on one of the sides so that I can see who attends. I check that the examination students are present. There have been periods when attendance has dropped, when they did not attend at all. When that happens, I send an e-mail to all the masters students that this is part of their education. My intent has to check the students, not whether Florent, Thomas or any of the others are present or

not. I can understand that and maybe it was a stupid way to do it and that it may have been misinterpreted."

SF: "Som master student skulle man tidigare gå på seminarier och på vissa forskningsmöte. I min roll som koordinator tittade jag efter så att examensarbetarna kom till mötena. Ja jag sitter ofta långt fram på ena sidan så jag kan vända mig om och se vilka som är där. Jag kollar så att examensarbetarna är där. Det har varit perioder där det dippat och de inte varit där alls. Om det varit en stor dipp skickar email jag till alla masters arbetarna att det ingår i deras utbildning. Det har varit mitt syfte att kolla studenterna, inte om Florent, Thomas eller andra är där eller inte. Jag kan förstå det och det kanske var ett dumt sätt att göra det på och allt det kan ha miss tolkats."

Regarding the questions of getting reprimanded if not going to meetings Sofia says:

SF: "I don't understand. Who would be reprimanded by whom? Yes, I send out e-mails to my masters students or my doctoral student maybe. I have never discussed with him, I know he does not attend all meetings but I have never said anything to him."

SF: "Det förstår jag inte. Vem skulle bli reprimerad av vem? Ja jag skickar ut mail till mina masterstudenter eller min doktorand kanske. Jag har aldrig diskuterat med honom, jag vet att han inte deltar i alla möten men jag har aldrig sagt något till honom."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. There are no witnesses.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

Control of FRs interactions with his students

FR: "Yes, if they are talking about research English should be the working language...It's pretty obvious. She came here 2 years ago and she spoke English but wasn't fluent...I am beginning to think that if you have 18 months left and not being able to handle the language must be very disabling"

SF: "Why would I tell him not to eat or have coffee with the students. I would never say that. I eat lunch with my students. Of course there is a teacher-student role. Some do not understand that they have a role. They think you are friends, that you are students together. It can get bad. We may have had such a discussion, I know I have told this to others."

SF: "Varför skulle jag säga det till honom att inte äta eller fika med studenterna. Det skulle jag aldrig säga. Jag äter ju själv lunch med mina studenter. De klart att finns en lärar-student-roll. Vissa förstår inte att de befinner sig i en roll. Att man är kompis, att man är studenter ihop. Det kan bli ganska dåligt. Vi kan möjligtvis haft en sån diskussion, jag vet att jag sagt det till andra."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. There are no witnesses.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to the evaluation of the facts.

5. FR feels in different ways minimized by SF.

Use of water kettle in the break room

FR: "More than once. Water kettle. I drink a lot of tea. It's not big so we need to refill it several times. Without planning I happened to want tea at the same time as she. I took the kettle, she said "no no, this is for the professor. You are not busy, you can wait". One time when I confronted her she was upset and after I confronted her she left."

SF: "We have one single water kettle and many want to use it. What I may have said is that sometimes you put on some water and then someone else takes it. "Can I have water before you, because I'm in a hurry," I may have said. I did not say that I would say that I am more busy than him. Maybe he didn't understand what I said. I can imagine that there might be a linguistic misunderstanding."

SF: "Vi har en enda vattenkokare, det är stort tryck på den. Vad jag kan ha sagt är att ibland väntar man på vatten och så tar någon annan det. "Kan jag få ta vatten före dig för jag har bråttom" kan jag ha sagt. Att jag skulle sagt att jag är mer upptagen än honom har jag inte sagt. Han kanske inte förstår vad jag sa. Jag kan tänka mig att det kan finnas ett språkligt missförstånd."

OA: "There are times when I have been with Sofia when she has been angry about the tea water with we have stood there. She is "stressed", unpleasant. Like "I'm the one putting on the water", very strange. "I should be first" and Florent has said "I'm sorry". At first we thought she was joking or playing a game. But she exploded, I stood next to him."

OA: "Det finns tillfällen då jag har varit med när Sofia varit ilsknen över tevattnen när vi har stått där. Hon är "på" och är obehagligt. Att "det är jag som sätter på vattnet", väldigt konstigt. "Jag ska vara först" och Florent har sagt förlåt. Vi trodde först hon skojade eller om det var ett spel. Men hon exploderade, då stod jag bredvid honom."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witness confirms that the situations implying victimisation have occurred.

The alleged claim of victimisation can be proven according to the evaluation of the facts.

When FR asks SF to order a white board

FR: "Early in the morning, she was preparing coffee for a meeting. I passed by and I knew she was in the process of ordering new chairs and white boards. I wanted a bigger one. I asked her politely "are you in charge of the white board, I heard you are ordering that. Can I get a big one". She exploded immediately. She said you have no right to demand that. I left the room. I came back and she was still there. She was calmer but she said again "you should not demand things like that."

SF: "I remember that he asked me. We had been working extra with that order, just getting it done was difficult. We said that from the beginning, sent out an email asking who wanted an office chair, an elevating desk, etc ... It was for the teachers, it was not for anyone to come and ask for as many white boards as they wanted. Florent already had a white board. I stood and made tea and then he showed up and he didn't make a request instead he said "I should have a white board". My initial

reaction was that I didn't want to have anything else to do with the order. "No, there is not going to be any more". His experience can be confirmed. This led to him getting a white board and we discussed communication. We talked about it and I understood that he did not mean what he said. I thought he understood that I did not mean what I said. A miss in the communication. I was annoyed.."

SF: "Jag kommer ihåg att han frågade mig. Vi hade hållit på extra om beställningen, bara att jag vill det var svårt. Vi hade sagt från början, klicka ut så här om vi vill ha på kanten igen, hörsamtligt skrikt ord osv... Det var till honom, det var inte fört fram och jag var och han var inte. Många white boards som helst. Florent hade ju en annan board. Jag stod och gjorde så och så. Det var upp och det var ingen förstågan utan "jag ska ha en white board". Annan heta reaktion var att jag inte ska ha med mig beställningen att göra. "Nej, det ska inte vara något mer". Hans uppförande kan beskrivas. Det vadd. Till att han fick en white board och vi skulle ha det och kommunikation. Vi pratade om det och jag förstod att han ville ha en så som han sa. Jag berättade att han förstod att jag inte menade det jag sa. Kommunikationen. Jag var tillfred."

OA: "I have heard raised voices in the corridor. About a year ago he asked for a white board. Many people report that it often gets awkward when you ask for things. Then F was very upset, came in to me with a red face and said that he had been scolded by Sofia."

OA: "Jag har hört i korridoren höga ljudnivåer. Typ ett år sedan bad han om en white board. Många rapporterar att det ofta blir så bökigt när man ber om saker. Då var Florent väldigt upprörd, kom in till mig röd i ansiktet och sa att han blivit utskäld av Sofia."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused confirms the incident. The witness confirm that the situations implying victimisation have occurred. The alleged experience of victimisation can be proven according to the evaluation of the facts.

Scientific results posted on the glass door

FR: "You should not put things here, she said. I said, look around, everybody has that. Toys, souvenirs, license plates. She said "they shouldn't do that and they don't know how to behave. I took it down and didn't dare to put it back up."

SF: "Again the same thing as the issue with the window. You shouldn't put things on the window because it will get dirty and because we need light in the corridor. Some put things up, but very few. I told him for sure, there's a bulletin board by his door. There is plenty of room to set up your result."

SF: "Återigen samma sak som fönstret. Man ska inte sätta saker på fönstret för det blir smutsigt och för det ska vara ljus i korridoren. Några har saker uppsatt, det är väldigt få. Jag sa säkert till honom, det finns en anslagstavla vid hans dörr. Där finns gott om plats att sätta upp sitt resultat."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused confirms this statement made by the claimant. There are no witnesses.

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to the evaluation of the facts.

Comment from SF: "You are not busy"

FR: "It's a part of minimizing my work. My work is not important. My time is not valuable. I feel like I am not considered as a scientist or collaborator. Rebecca Forberg has been told the same. They could say that during the coffee break."

SF: "There are a lot of discussions at the coffee table among those sitting there that they have a lot to do. I wouldn't say that they don't know what it is to have a lot to do. I don't really understand. With a student, one might say that there will be more and more things later in their career. You feel busy with what you have. Many times as a student, I experience that they have a poor awareness of what you do as a professor in academia. Research is just one of the tasks."

SF: "Det finns ofta diskussioner vid fikabordet bland de som sitter där att de har mycket att göra. Jag skulle inte säga att de inte vet vad det är att vara upptagen. Jag förstår inte riktigt. Med en doktorand kanske man kan säga att det blir mer och mer saker senare i karriären. Man känner sig upptagen med det man har. Många gånger som student upplever jag att de har dålig medvetenhet kring vad man gör som lärare i akademien. Forskning är ju bara en av arbetsuppgifterna."

RF: "Both (Sofia and Melvyn) have said "You are not busy, wait until you are at my level". This is said in the corridor, the lunch room when they ask how things are. I wouldn't be surprised if they said that to Florent."

RF: "Både (Sofia och Melvyn) har sagt "Du har inte mycket att göra vänta tills du är på min nivå". Detta säga i korridorerna, lunchrummet när de frågar hur det är. Det hade inte förvånat mig om de sagt så till Florent."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. The witness confirms the subjective experience of victimisation but cannot confirm the minimization of the claimant. The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

6. Personal attacks

Comment from SF that FR has an odour

FR: "One of the first days in my office. Nobody was there, I opened the window. She passed by and said "you should close the window, we don't do that here". And I said "why?" She didn't give me a reason. She pointed at her nose and said "yes i understand that the smell could be a problem"

SF: "The ventilation system is very good, there is a good airflow. If you open a window, you destroy the airflow. Someone told me this as well, more than once. I do not remember this specific occasion, but I probably knocked on his door and told him not to open the windows. Me telling him that he had a problem with his body odour is a truly insulting statement from him."

SF: "Ventilationssystemet är väldigt bra, det är bra luftväxling. Öppnar man ett fönster såddar man luftväxlingen. Jag har själv blivit tillhållen, mer än en gång. Jag kommer inte ihåg det specifika tillfället men jag har nog knackat på och sagt till honom att vi ska inte öppna fönstren. Att jag skulle ha sagt att han hade problem med kroppslukt är rent kränkande påstående från honom."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused denies this statement made by the claimant. There are no witnesses.

Postadress:
LifeWise AB
Osby Möbelslager 5
223 51 Lund

Besöksadressen:
Osby Möbelslager 15, 1:1:10
Osby Möbelslager 3, Malmö
Fridhamnsgränd 1, Helsingborg

Kontakt:
Tel: 046 194477
E-mail: info@lifewise.se
Webb: www.lifewise.se

The alleged claim of victimisation cannot be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

Comment from SF that FR has an heavy french accent

FR: "We have all these different backgrounds. We joke a lot about it. But with them (Sofia and Melvyn) it's a hurting joke. If someone jokes about I like cheese it's fun. But she says I am lazy, mocks my french, does an impression of the accent. It could be seen as a joke if it was about "oh, you love food". It upsets me but it doesn't hurt me. It's not funny. Three other people are french and I never heard that she said anything to them."

SF: "Yes, I did that. The second it left my mouth I thought "hell, what did I say now". I was incredibly ashamed and immediately apologized. You just can't say that. I imitated a French accent in English. We were in the coffee room, just a few of us. I have done that once as far as I know. How many "dumstrutar" ("stupid me") and "skämskoftor", ("shame on me") should I say?"

SF: "Ja, jag gjorde det. Samma sekund det lämnade min mun tänkte jag "helvete, vad sa jag nu". Jag blev otroligt skamsen och bad direkt om ursäkt. Man får bara inte säga så. Jag härmodade en fransk accent på engelska. Vi var i fikarummet, vi var bara några stycken. Jag har gjort det en gång nog väldigt ofta. har många dumstrutar och skämskoftor kan jag ta på mig?"

RF: "I have noticed that Sofia in particular uses a harsh tone towards him. Sometimes tried to joke but it is not funny. Sometimes commented that he has a heavy French accent."

RF: "Jag har lagt märke till att framför allt Sofia haft en hård jargong mot honom. Ibland kanske försökt skämta men inte såklart. Ibland kommenterat att han har tung fransk accent."

OA: "She has talked about his frenchness in the coffee room but it felt like we were joking with each other. But in that environment you can't joke about that. Cultural differences"

OA: "Hon har sagt om hans franskheter i fikarummet men det har känts som att vi skojat med varandra. Men i den miljön kan man inte skoja om det. Kulturella skillnader."

Evaluation of the facts

The accused confirms the incident. The witnesses confirms that the situations implying victimisation have occurred. The alleged experience of victimisation can be proven according to an evaluation of the facts.

Other relevant quotes

Below are relevant quotes from the interviews that confirm FR's vulnerability and that have contributed to the report's conclusion. It appears that SF talks negatively about/spreads unfavourable rumours about FR, that SF has urged a colleague to exclude FR from work and that FR due to fear of SF, has avoided social situations. This confirms the vulnerable position of FR's in relation to SF and her behaviour.

RC: "Sofia - she said recently. Look Ross, you need to forget about what has happened to you. That was then and this is now. If we give teaching to someone like Florent... it sends a signal. She was making sure that he couldn't get the opportunity to do what he needed for his career development. I should push him out...I took it onboard. If you don't do what she says, it's very unpleasant. So I started changing the course for him to be as little a part as possible."

OA: "I am at these meetings. Florent stopped going eventually. I have heard from both Sofia and Melvyn that he isn't present and that he "refuses to go to meetings". The meetings, no one appreciates them ... When I have seen presentations they are interrupted a lot by Melvyn and Sofia, people are put in their place... When Florent said "I do not want to go to that meeting" then people started telling me that Sofia and Melvyn stopped being friendly."

OA: "Jag är med på dessa möten. Florent slutade gå på dem till slut. Det har jag fått höra både från Sofia och Melvyn att han inte är där och att han är en "mötesvägrare". Mötena i sig, det finns ingen som uppskattar dem... När jag har sett presentationer avbryts dem mycket av Melvyn och Sofia, de satts på plats... När Florent sagt att "jag vill inte gå på det mötet" då hörjade det komma anmärkningar att Sofia och Melvyn slutade vara vänliga."

OA: "Both Sofia and Melvyn aren't particularly friendly towards Florent, it was different from the beginning but after that I have noticed that they don't appreciate him. Sofia thinks that Florent is very determined, that he is stubborn in a bad way, a bit "difficult" ("bökig") she said. That he is hard to deal with."

OA: "Både Sofia och Melvyn är inte speciellt vänliga mot Florent, från början var det annorlunda men sen har jag märkt att de inte uppskattar honom. Sofia tycker att Florent är väldigt bestämd, han är envis på ett dåligt sätt, lite bökig har hon sagt. Att han är obehövligt hanterat."

RF: "I have noticed that Sofia uses a harsh language with him...Asked critical questions At GalForm, and uses harsh jargon towards Florent that I haven't noticed she uses towards others..Sofia has ignored him, if one of them has entered a room, the coffee room, the other one left, since the autumn/end of the year. They have avoided each other. I think it's because Florent can't bear to hear her harsh tone...It's like Sofia has something against Florent, don't know why."

RF: "Jag har lagt märke till att Sofia haft en hård jargong mot honom...På GalForm ställt kritiska frågor, hård jargong mot Florent som jag inte upplevt hon haft mot andra... Sofia har ignorerat honom, om en av dem kommit in i ett rum, fikarummet så har en gått ut, sedan hösten/årsskiftet. De har undvikit varandra. Jag tror det är för att Florent inte orkar höra hennes hårda ton...Det är som om Sofia har något emot Florent, vet inte varför."

GT: "Once me and Florent were going to the grocery store to buy things to a barbecue. Sofia told me to maybe mention to him to come to one of the group meetings more often. Outside of Florents close

group, he was not so present at these meetings. It was a good suggestion from Sofia to include him more in the group."

BT: "She cant talk to Florent normally, she doesn't have the social skills."

BT: "Hon kan inte prata med Florent på ett vanligt sätt, hon har inte de sociala skilla."

LM: "I get affected by her once a year...It was difficult for me then, back when I was new. The head of the department at the time and Eva heard this and came to talk to me right afterwards and said that it is just the way she is. Then it was easier for me. I have had a ok relationship with her. The tone has been that you deal with it...I have been told that Florent has been subject to her ways, intimidated by Sofia."

LM: "Jag drabbas av henne en gång om året...Det var svårt för mig då när jag var ny. Den dåvarande prefekten och Eva hörde detta och kom och pratade med mig med en gång och sa att hon är sådan. Då blev det lättare för mig. Jag har haft en hyfsad relation med henne. Järgangen har varit att man tar det... Jag har fått berätta för mig om att Florent blivit utsatt, nedtryckt av Sofia."

Psychological stress

Below are extracts from the claim, from annual review talks December 11th, quotes from interviews and quotes from e-mails concerning how the claimant has been affected by the reported events.

From the claim:

FR: "These events and others have caused the highest levels of stress and anxiety I have ever experienced..."

Below are from AJs notes from FRs annual review meeting december 11th 2019:

AJ: "Then I had my review meeting with Florent and Oscar (his line manager) on December 11th, 2019. It turned out that Florent felt unwell and that there had been many more incidents of aggressive behaviour from Sofia than he had previously reported."

AJ: "Sådan hade jag utvecklingsamtal med Florent och Oscar (hans linje manager) 11 december, 2019. Det kom fram att Florent mätte illa och att det hade varit många flera incidenter med aggressiv beteende från Sofia än han hade berättat tidigare."

- * Florent feels subjected to repeated (but unpredictable) aggressive behaviour by Sofia
- * Florent feels afraid about whether Sofia will act psychologically aggressively towards him or shout at him when he meets her
- * Florent feels nervous when interacting with Sofia, he prefers to avoid her
- * Conflicts can be about small things such as taking hot water from a kettle or large things such as scientific disagreements in public at group meetings

Quotes from the interviews:

OA: "I have seen the decline. I have not seen anyone feel so bad and be so affected. He is strong, individual and stands for what he thinks. He has been extremely affected [redacted] feeling as bad as he does is very unusual. "He has not been able to work for a long time, he is very inefficient at the moment and he does not see how he can get help."

OA: "Jag har ju sett förslaget. Jag har inte sett någon må så dåligt och bli så påverkad. Han är ju stark, individuell och står för vad han tycker. Han har blivit extremt påverkad [redacted] att må så dåligt är väldigt ovanligt. "Han har inte kunnat jobba på länge, han är väldigt ineffektiv just nu och att han känner att det inte finns verktyg för att få hjälp."

OA: "Yes, I know that Florent contacted me when he locked himself in the bathroom. Brian and Erik said that they reported it to HR. They all reported the situation identically. I was at home but he reported to me. "I am in the bathroom and I am terrified". I did not witness this incident myself."

OA: "Ja jag vet att Florent hörde av sig när han låste in sig på toaletten. Brian och Erik sa även att de anmält det till HR. Alla tre beskrev det identiskt. Då var jag hemma men fick det rapporterat. "Jag sitter på toaletten och jag är livrädd". Jag har inte iakttagit det själv."

EA: "He was afraid of Sofia. ... He felt controlled/monitored by her. He said he was afraid of her but there is no direct reason to be afraid, that he is physically bigger but he was afraid she would hurt him. The fear was not rational, he said."

EA: "Han var rädd för Sofia. ... Han kände sig bevakad. Han sa att han var rädd för henne men det fanns ingen direkt anledning att vara rädd för att han är fysiskt större men han var rädd att hon skulle skada honom. Rädslan var inte rationell så han själv."

BT: "He has a problem with her, so when she follows him, he feels anxiety."

BT: "Han har ett problem med henne så när hon följer efter får han ju ångest."

NR: "Florent is actually scared. He says at our meetings "I need to know when she is there."

NR: "Florent är ju rädd. Han säger på våra möten "jag måste veta när hon är där."

Quote from BT's e-mail to HR July 2nd 2020:

BT: "It is a tragedy that something like this is going on. Can I report this to you as a witness?" [redacted]

BT: "Det är ju en tragedie at sådan något har föregår. Kan jag melde det här till jer som vittne?" [redacted]

BT: "Eric and I asked Florent to take the Friday off, after which he breaks down in tears...Being bullied out of the department means that he is unable to look after the students, [redacted]"

BT: "Eric og jeg foreslår til Florent at han skal tage fredagen fri, hvorefter han bryder sammen i gråd. ... At blive mobbet ud af afdelingen gør at han ikke kan passe de studerende, [redacted]"

A summary of the evaluation of the facts in this investigation

The incident regarding the GalForm-meeting on October 15, 2019 is confirmed by the accused and witnesses and can be defined as victimisation according to the Swedish law (AML)

The situation regarding exclusion in the project is denied by the accused. Witnesses confirm the claimant's description and the situation can be defined as victimisation according to Swedish law (AML).

The comment in the spring of 2018 is denied by the accused. A witness confirm the claimant's description and the situation can be defined as victimisation according to the law (AML).

The incident regarding the water kettle is denied by the accused. A witness confirm the claimants description and the situation can be defined as victimisation according to the law (AML).

The incident regarding the whiteboard is confirmed by the accused and a witness and can be defined as victimisation according to the law (AML).

The incident regarding the statement on his French accent is confirmed by the accused and witnesses and can be defined as victimisation according to the law (AML).

The remaining twelve accusations cannot be substantiated as the accused denies the situations, the accused has a different view of the situation, there are no witnesses, the witness cannot substantiate the claimant's description or an objective assessment can not be confirmed. The factual investigation concludes that regarding these twelve charges no violations have occurred according to the Swedish Discrimination Act or AML.

Conclusion

The factual investigation concludes that the accused has committed violations of the Work Environment Act regarding six accusations.

The six accusations concerning victimisation have been individually assessed. They are each and every one defined as victimisation according to an evaluation of the facts.

The six accusations concerning victimisation are also accumulatively assessed. As such they are thus defined as workplace bullying. All the criteria for workplace bullying are met, with the possible exception being the criteria of frequency, this is a matter of definition as it is not specified in Swedish legislation.

There is an imbalance of power between the parties. The imbalance lies in the academic structure but it has also been confirmed by the (OSA) work environmental survey conducted at the department during the spring of 2020. In the (OSA) work environment survey it is apparent that the accused has a prelevant informal leadership role.

The victimisation has led to unreasonable psychological strain, stress and fear for the claimant, generally in connection with the workplace, specifically in contact with the accused.

For the claimant the repeated victimisation has partly meant exclusion from work and exclusion from the social community within the workplace.

When a violation of the Work Environment Act has occurred, "employers must take the necessary measures to ensure that what has happened does not happen again". The employee also has a responsibility to contribute to a good organisational and social work environment (OSA).

It has for a long time been known to management that the claimant experienced intimidation in contact with the accused.

In this case management has not prevented informal leadership roles and/or clarified the roles of each employee which may have contributed to an escalation of the situation and increased the risk of victimisation.

The employer has, according to The Swedish Work Environment Act (AML) and Lund University's polycys regarding prevention of victimisation, neither been able to prevent or put a stop to the alleged victimisation for the claimant, nor get the accused to change her behaviour. The situation and the working relationship between the accused and the claimant worsened, and the claimant's experience of workplace bullying by the accused increased.

The factual investigation report

This report provides an independent, objective analysis of the specified situations that have occurred and evaluates the facts in these situations according to legislation and policies.

The organisation is responsible for any subsequent decisions and/or interventions based upon this report. This report becomes the property of the client organisation after completion.

Abbreviations and definitions

FR	Florent Renaud
SF	Sofia Feltzing
OA	Oscar Agertz
EA	Eric Andersson
BT	Brian Thorsbro
NR	Nils Ryde
GT	Gregor Travis
LM	Lena Magnusson
RF	Rebecca Forsberg
LL	Loke Lönnblad
RC	Ross Church
MD	Maxime Delorme
AJ	Anders Johansen
AML	Work Environment Act
AFS	The Swedish Work Environment Authority's regulations
LU	Lunds University

Lund 5th November 2020

Postadress:
LifeWise AB
Östra Markensgatan 15
223 65 Lund

Besöksadresser:
Östra Markensgatan 15, L104
Lecheorgsgatan 3, Malmö
Friedrichsgatan 11, Borås stad

Kontakt:
Tel: 045-494177
E-mail: info@lifewise.se
Webb: www.lifewise.se

Consultants:

Martina Johansson
Organisational consultant
Licensed psychotherapist, CQSW (socioonom)
Tel: 0734-428277
E-mail: martina.johansson@lifewise.se

Mia Gruvstad
Organisational consultant
Licensed psychologist
Tel: 070-8710979
E-mail: mia.gruvstad@lifewise.se

Key Account Manager:

Kay Sanderson
Tel: 0739-135550
Email: kay.sanderson@lifewise.se