Implementation of the conflict-of-interest policy for the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

Note by the secretariat

By its decision IPBES-3/3, on procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) adopted the conflict-of-interest policy and implementation procedures set out in annex II to that decision. The annex to the present note provides information on the progress made in implementing the policy. The appendix to the annex sets out a report to the Plenary by the Committee on Conflicts of Interest on its activities, which the Committee submitted in accordance with rule 10 of the implementation procedures. The annex, including its appendix, is presented without formal editing.
Annex

Composition of the Committee on Conflicts of Interest

1. A Committee on conflicts of interest was established in 2015, following the third session of the Plenary, in accordance with Rule 10 of the conflict of interest policy (please see IPBES/4/INF/20). Following election of the new Bureau at the fourth session of the Plenary, Robert Watson (Chair, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Leonel Sierralta (Chile) stepped down from the Committee, and Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana, Bureau vice-chair for African Group) became chair of the Committee.

2. The Committee is composed of the following 9 members:
   (a) 3 Bureau members:
       Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), Chair.
       Diego Pacheco (Plurinational State of Bolivia)
       Rashad Allahverdiyev (Azerbaijan)
   (b) 5 members, one per UN region:
       Helena Nader (Brazil)
       Kevin Joseph Cash (Canada)
       Haigen Xu (China)
       Kaouthar Tliche Aloui (Tunisia)
       Nilay (Çabuk) Kaya (Turkey)
   (a) 1 legal counsel
       A legal adviser from the Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, UNEP, is serving as the “additional member with appropriate legal expertise from, and appointed by the organization hosting the secretariat” (Rule 10).

Actions taken

3. All relevant individuals (new Bureau members, technical support unit’s professional staff and all experts) were invited by the Secretariat to submit disclosure forms electronically through an online form (appendix to annex II to decision IPBES-3/3).

4. The following complements were included in the disclosure form, as in previous year:
   (i) Current employer (singular) was replaced with current employers (plural);
   (ii) A note on question 2 was provided to request experts to list all current sources of funding for research and consultancies in their response to question 2 of the form.

5. The secretariat compiled all responses received and submitted to Committee members a summary spreadsheet of all submissions asking whether any conflict was identified;

6. Experts were required to submit a disclosure form for each deliverable they are involved in, in situations where they contribute to several deliverables.

7. The Committee reviewed the compiled information, which on 25 January 2016 corresponded to about 77% of the expected disclosure forms. No teleconference was organised because no conflict was signalled either by an expert, or by a member of the Committee.

8. The secretariat will actively seek to receive the remainder of the forms.

9. The Committee sent to the Secretariat the letter set out in the appendix below for submission to the Plenary. The letter constitutes the Committee’s report on its activities and is being submitted to the Plenary for information, pursuant to rule 10, paragraph 5, of the conflict of interest policy, according to which the Committee will submit a report on its activities to the Plenary at least four weeks prior to each session of the Plenary.
Dear Governments and Observers

The Conflicts of interest Committee has reviewed all conflict of interest forms submitted to date (January 25, 2017), i.e., 1065 submissions.

When examining an individual’s Conflict of interest (COI) form, the Committee spent considerable time differentiating between “biases” and “conflict of interest”. The IPBES Plenary (Annex II of Decision IPBES-3/3) defined a conflict of interest as any current interest of an individual that could either: (i) significantly impair the individual’s objectivity in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the Platform, or (ii) create an unfair advantage for any person or organization. Whereas bias, as defined in the IPBES policy on COI, refers to a point of view or perspective that is strongly held by an individual regarding a particular issue or set of issues.

The strength of IPBES is to ensure that the experts involved in preparing the assessment reports (co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors) represent a wide range of experiences, views and perspectives. The Committee recognized that all experts, whether from academia, government, private sector or NGOs, have biases. This is part of human nature. As noted in the COI policy, bias is managed through the selection of experts with a balance of perspectives, and through the peer review process.

The Committee noted that as of January 25, 2017 the secretariat was missing 62 COI forms.

The Committee did not find any conflicts of interests as defined in Annex II of Decision IPBES-3/3.

The Committee noted that as of January 25, 2017 the secretariat was missing 62 COI forms. Given the fact that the COI policy requires senior leadership of the Platform and authors with responsibility for report content to submit a COI form, the Committee exhorts the secretariat to remind all relevant experts that a condition of being involved in an IPBES activity is submission of a COI form, otherwise their participation will not be permitted and their involvement terminated.

Alfred Oteng-Yeboah

Chair of the Committee on conflict of interest

On behalf of the Committee