



Guidelines on Advising
Policymakers and Society
&
Procedures for Quality Assurance
of Scientific Advice

SA  EA

Science Advice for Policy by European Academies

The SAPEA project is part of the European Commission Scientific Advice Mechanism and has received funding from the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 737432.

Spanning the disciplines of engineering, humanities, medicine, natural sciences and social sciences, SAPEA brings together the outstanding knowledge and expertise from over 100 academies, young academies and learned societies in over 40 countries across Europe.

The consortium consists of the five European Academy Networks: Academia Europaea, ALLEA (The European Federation of Academies of Sciences and Humanities), EASAC (European Academies Science Advisory Council), Euro-CASE (European Council of Academies of Applied Sciences, Technologies and Engineering) and FEAM (Federation of European Academies of Medicine).

This report reflects only the authors' views. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

In this document, SAPEA products mean written publications (for example reports or studies).

This report can be viewed online at www.sapea.info/QAguidelines

The text of this work is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence which permits unrestricted use, provided the original author and source are credited. The licence is available at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

ISBN: 978-3-9819415-2-4

DOI: 10.26356/guidelinesqualityassurance

SAPEA, Science Advice for Policy by European Academies. (2017). *Guidelines on Advising Policymakers and Society & Procedures for Quality Assurance of Scientific Advice*. Berlin: SAPEA.

DOI: 10.26356/guidelinesqualityassurance

PUBLISHER

SAPEA
c/o acatech
Pariser Platz 4a
10117 Berlin | Germany

CONTACT

SAPEA Communications Office
13 Rue d'Egmont
Brussels 1000 | Belgium
contact@sapea.info



Guidelines on Advising Policymakers and Society & Procedures for Quality Assurance of Scientific Advice

Berlin, December 2017

Table of Contents

05	1. INTRODUCTION
06	2. GUIDELINES ON ADVISING POLICY MAKERS AND SOCIETY
06	2.1 Principles of scientific advice
07	2.2 Providing scientific advice for policy options
08	3. QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) OF SCIENTIFIC ADVICE
08	3.1 Principles of QA in scientific advice
09	4. SCIENTIFIC ADVICE PROCESS
10	4.1 Definition of the scope of the topics, questions to be answered and project plan outline
10	4.2 Selection and approval of the Chair and the members of the Working Group
11	4.3 Declaration of Interests (DoI) and Conflict of Interests (CoI)
13	4.4 Information gathering and meetings
14	4.5 Drafting evidence review reports
14	4.6 Peer-Review Procedure
16	4.7 Publication and dissemination
16	4.8 Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM)
16	5. QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECK-LIST
17	6. ETHICAL ISSUES
17	6.1 Code of Conduct
19	6.2 Ad-hoc Ethics committee on scientific integrity
19	7. REVIEW OF QA PROCEDURES
19	APPENDIX 1 Bibliography
21	APPENDIX 2 SAPEA Declaration of Interests
31	APPENDIX 3 Questions for peer-reviewers
32	APPENDIX 4 Quality Assurance checklist
33	APPENDIX 5 List of Abbreviations
34	APPENDIX 6 Acknowledgments



1. Introduction

SAPEA provides scientific advice for policy within the context of the Scientific Advice Mechanism (SAM) of the European Commission.¹

This document sets out the SAPEA guidelines on advising policymakers and society, as well as internal procedures for quality assurance of scientific advice. The aim is to assure the excellence and independence of SAPEA's policy advice through the provision of clear guidelines. Scientific advice for policy provided by SAPEA will be done in the form of evidence review reports.

The procedures described in this document are a first version and might be revised in due time.

¹ Here science is understood in the sense of German "Wissenschaft" i.e. it includes ALL disciplines

2. Guidelines on advising policy makers and society

The following guidelines apply to SAPEA and to experts involved, and aim to inform stakeholders, including the individual member academies, policymakers and society.

1. SAPEA ensures that advice is based on the most up-to-date scientific and technical knowledge available, across all disciplines.
2. All those involved in the scientific advice process are required to disclose any interests that could compromise impartiality and independence. SAPEA will ensure that results are presented in a scientifically balanced way.
3. A rigorous peer-review process is part of SAPEA quality assurance before publication. This assures products are in line with best available evidence and consider all relevant scientific issues and knowledge.
4. Publications will detail the process by which results were obtained, the source of funding for the project, names and institutional ties of all those involved. SAPEA will publish information about its activities and products.

2.1 PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC ADVICE

The ultimate goal of scientific advice is to contribute to policy decisions. In respect of this, scientific advice should be **relevant, trustworthy and timely**.

Relevance can be achieved by shared understanding between policymakers and scientists of the policy issue and defined key questions that need to be answered. These issues form the basis for the quality of the product.

To be **trustworthy**, advice is to be provided by authoritative scientific experts. Collectively they will cover the range of pertinent disciplines and scientific opinions and take an objective view on the issue at stake.

To be useful, advice has to be generated in a **timely** fashion.

2.2 PROVIDING SCIENTIFIC ADVICE FOR POLICY OPTIONS

Sound scientific advice for policy questions provides information about the scientific and technological evidence relevant to feasible alternative policy options also indicating controversies, uncertainties and knowledge gaps. In such complex situations, scientific appraisal may lead to multiple policy options. A multidisciplinary approach is therefore indicated. The diversity of SAPEA scientific expertise enhances the consideration of such problems.

Furthermore, Evidence Review Reports will incorporate a critical appraisal of the literature and the input of the scientific experts.

3. Quality Assurance (QA) of scientific advice

The quality assurance procedures presented in this document are designed to ensure the scientific quality of SAPEA publications developed within the European Commission's Scientific Advice Mechanism (SAM). The quality of SAPEA evidence review reports is of utmost importance as they aim to provide independent, objective and impartial advice. Checks and balances are applied to each step of the scientific advice process to protect the integrity of the reports and to assure public confidence in them.

The QA procedures address all those involved in the production of SAPEA reports: the SAPEA Consortium, the Working Group (WG) members, including external scientific experts and peer-reviewers, and SAPEA staff.

Peer-review is the hallmark of SAPEA quality assurance. For projects conducted with the Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM), implementing quality assurance measures such as external peer review may be challenging. However, the SAPEA Board will endeavour to maintain QA procedures as detailed in section 4.8 even in short-term projects.

3.1 PRINCIPLES OF QA IN SCIENTIFIC ADVICE

The principles of quality of the scientific advice are **scientific excellence**, **independence**, and **transparency**.

The quality of the SAPEA products is inherently related to the **excellence** of scientific experts, as endorsed by the judgement of their peers. The advisory process actively takes into account all relevant evidence, different interpretations, and minority views on a particular scientific issue. This diversity may result from differences in scientific approach, types of expertise, background, or the fundamental assumptions underlying the issue.

Scientific experts will act in an **independent** manner, driven by science. They will base their recommendations on objective criteria, rather than on personal bias or prejudice. They will act impartially using the same standards consistently. They should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in their performance. In conclusion,

Working Group members should demonstrate both scientific and personal integrity.

The process of preparing advice is **transparent**: any relevant private interests of the participants are declared, the way issues are addressed, experts selected, and information handled. This requires a strategy for clear communication of the process and the advice itself to non-specialists. SAPEA commits itself to an optimal degree of transparency, such as disclosure of Working Group members, contributors, and reviewers in the final report, and aims to win a high level of trust in the public sphere.

4. Scientific advice process

The SAPEA scientific advice process has 7 steps, outlined below.

1. Definition of the scope of the topics, questions to be answered and project plan outline
2. Selection of the Chair and the members of the Working Group
3. Declaration of interests and conflict of interests
4. Information gathering, meetings and iterative process
5. Drafting reports
6. Review procedure
7. Publication and dissemination

In some SAPEA projects, a Coordination Group exists to facilitate the interactions between the HLG (High Level Group of Scientific Advisors), SAM Unit, and SAPEA. In such cases, a complementary document clarifies the flow of information and roles of all those involved in the production of an evidence review report. In this case, as always, avoiding a mismatch between the roles of each party is important to ensure efficient project management and the quality of the deliverables. For this reason, the following distribution of key responsibilities applies to every SAPEA project:

1. Membership of the Working Group is the responsibility of SAPEA Board.
2. Choice of people who are consulted by the Working Group is under the responsibility of the Chair of the Working Group.
3. Content of the report is the responsibility of SAPEA Board.

4.1 DEFINITION OF THE SCOPE OF THE TOPICS, QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED AND PROJECT PLAN OUTLINE

The starting point of a SAPEA work is a scoping paper, as published on the SAM website. This may be prepared by SAM Unit and/or by the SAPEA staff. It has to be approved by the SAPEA Board.

The scoping paper includes the definition and assessment of the topic and its relevance to policy and policies, questions to be answered by the Working Group and the deliverables expected.

Based on the scoping paper, a project plan outline is prepared as the basis for a decision by the SAPEA Board, which needs to make an assessment on the feasibility of the project.

4.2 SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE CHAIR AND THE MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP

Once the SAPEA Board has agreed on a topic, a Working Group is established.

Members of Working Group are appointed on the basis of their relevant expertise and scientific excellence. The Working Group needs to include the full range of viewpoints necessary to support the required scope of the advice, the required range of disciplines, sufficient geographical coverage and appropriate gender balance.

Depending on the expertise required it may be necessary to appoint scientists to Working Group who are not members of academies or external scientific experts. Care is taken in selecting these experts as the reputation of SAPEA rests on the quality and integrity of the Working Group as a whole.

4.2.1 *The Chair of the Working Group*

The Lead Academy Network, in consultation with the other Networks, proposes the Chair of the Working Group in conjunction with the SAPEA Board.

The Chair works closely with SAPEA staff on the agenda of meetings, distribution of work and other administrative tasks. S/he sees that all members of the Working Group contribute and participate actively in meetings. S/he stimulates the iterative process and strives to achieve consensus, but ensures that any significant diversity of opinion between members is fully explored and appropriately taken into account.

4.2.2 *Nominations, selection, and composition of the Working Group*

Working Group members are nominated through Academy Networks or individual academies. They are Fellows of an Academy or external scientific experts. Scientific/technical excellence relevant to the topic is the principal criterion for selection of members. The Working Group as a whole will have the full range of expertise required for the topic.

SAPEA will form a Selection Committee composed of the Chair of the Working Group, one Board Member from the Lead Network and a Board Member from another Network. The Selection Committee will work with the list of nominees from the Academy Networks and individual academies and complement it if necessary. It will propose the composition of the Working Group to the Board for approval.

The SAPEA Board should be able to take a well-informed decision. For this reason, it will screen the list of selected Working Group members against the list of nominees. The names and affiliations of Working Group members will be published in the report submitted to the High-Level Group of Scientific Advisors of the European Commission Scientific Advice Mechanism.

4.2.3 *External expert advisors*

External expert advisors may be consulted to bring significant additional expertise to a certain topic. The scope of their involvement is decided by the Chair, in consultation with the Working Group members.

4.3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (DOI) AND CONFLICT OF INTERESTS (COI)

A Conflict of Interest (COI) means any situation in which a person has an interest that may compromise or be reasonably perceived to compromise his/her capacity to act independently. SAPEA will use a Declaration of Interest (DOI) form, which in essence follows the one provided by the SAM Unit. The DOI template can be found in Appendix 2.

4.3.1 Procedure for handling the declaration of interests

SAPEA policy on Col is guided by three basic principles, namely transparency, proportionality and responsibility.

Transparency implies the systematic registration of the existing relationships and relevant interests of Working Group members.

Proportionality implies that prevention of improper influence must be proportionate to the degree of the potential conflict of interest.

Responsibility refers to the situation that the Chair of the Working Group will be responsible for taking action in the event of a potential Col.

SAPEA will follow the procedure below on handling the Dol forms:

1. Once the Working Group members are approved by the Board, the SAPEA staff members will send them the SAPEA Dol template.
2. All Working Group members sign the Dol before their first meeting.
3. The signed Dols are collected before the first meeting of the Working Group by SAPEA staff members involved in the project, who scan them for possible Cols.
4. Potential Cols are flagged and reported to the Chair of the Working Group and to the Board.
5. The Dols of all Working Group members are shared among the Working Group prior to and openly discussed at the first meeting.
6. The Chair of the Working Group decides on any potential action according to the principle of proportionality as described in section 4.3.3.
7. The Board will be informed without delay of any Col and any measure undertaken by the Chair.
8. SAPEA will formally notify the legal officer of the SAM Unit in the Commission without delay of any situation constituting or likely to constitute a Col and the measures undertaken.
9. The Dols of the Working Group members will not be published but kept on record by the SAPEA staff for the duration of the SAPEA grant, unless exceptionally decided by the SAPEA Board, in which case the Working Group members will be notified of such disclosure.

4.3.2 Vested interests versus point of views

A point of view is not necessarily a Col and thus does not constitute a ground for disqualification from the working group. Working Group members are asked to consider respectfully the viewpoints of other members, to reflect their own views rather than be a representative of any organisation, and to base their scientific findings and conclusions on the evidence. Each Working Group member has the right to issue a dissenting opinion to the report if s/he disagrees with the consensus of other members.

4.3.3 Partial or total exclusion of Working-Group members

Based on the Dols there are four scenarios for an expert's participation in a Working Group:

1. There are no circumstances precluding membership of the SAPEA working group.
2. Membership of the SAPEA Working Group will be allowed under the condition that the member is not involved in the discussion and drafting of conclusions in the specific sub-area where a Col has been identified.
3. Although membership of the Working Group cannot be permitted, s/he can become an external expert advisor who may provide the required expertise by means of a hearing procedure.
4. Participation in the Working Group cannot be permitted due to an excessive potential risk of inappropriate influence.

4.4 INFORMATION GATHERING AND MEETINGS

Gathering of information is done in conjunction with Working Group members via:

1. Review of the scientific literature, performed in particular by SAPEA staff (or by a subcontractor) according to the scoping paper.
2. Experts and individuals who have specific knowledge of the problem under consideration.
3. Hearings (including workshops), to which relevant stakeholders are invited.

The information gathered is maintained in a repository that is available for examination on request after publication of the report.

The Working Group holds its meetings closed to the public in order to work and to attempt to reach a consensus free from outside influence. The analysis and drafts of the reports remain confidential. SAPEA staff will ensure the proceedings of the Working

Group are well documented so that there is a clear audit trail showing how the group reached its decisions. These include agendas, minutes, background information, literature sources, and interim papers.

SAM unit representatives and/or HLG members may attend the working group meetings as observers or standing invitees after informing the Chair and the Working Group.

4.5 DRAFTING EVIDENCE REVIEW REPORTS

Evidence Review Reports are guided by the scoping paper. They describe, summarise, evaluate and document the evidence in a systematic way and indicate the uncertainties associated with findings. This principle applies as a general rule where judgements about scientific evidence are being made. Depending on the topic and the questions posed, the methods as well as the scale will vary.

Sources of data are precisely cited and a method statement is part of every report. When a report reaches the final draft, it is the responsibility of the Working Group Chair, to the best of his/her knowledge, to ensure that all facts have been checked and referenced. Open and frank discussion is encouraged. Eventual differences of opinions are impartially mentioned without the name of their author(s) within the text.

4.5.1 *Dissenting views, reporting controversies and uncertainties*

Whenever possible, Working Groups will achieve consensus. Where this is not achievable, it is important that diversity of opinions is recognised in the final report and the report mentions uncertainties and scientific controversies (see section 2.2).

4.6 PEER-REVIEW PROCEDURE

All SAPEA publications are subject to peer review, unless the SAPEA Board *exceptionally* decides otherwise.²

As a general rule, the peer review will cover:

1. Review of the scientific/technical quality of the work.
2. Review of the completeness of the analysis (does it cover the full range of information and opinions?).
3. Whether the report is impartial and objective.
4. When appropriate, examines whether the advice addresses the questions of policymakers.

² It is acknowledged that peer review can have different forms.

The review is conducted by experts not involved in drafting the report; their comments are provided anonymously to the Working Group members, but the names and affiliations of the reviewers are included in the final report.

4.6.1 *Peer-reviewers' nomination and selection*

Members of the Working Group will not select reviewers. The names of possible reviewers are proposed by the individual academies or the Academy Networks. Based on this, the SAPEA staff submit names of suitable reviewers to the SAPEA Board for approval, independently of the Working Group. The number of peer reviewers is set at a minimum of three, unless the Board decides otherwise. If a nominated reviewer indicates a CoI, this person will be disqualified from taking part in the review procedure. A list of questions for peer-reviewers is provided in Appendix 3.

4.6.2 *Peer-reviewers' comments and revision of documents*

Peer-reviewers' comments are handed over to the Working Group members who are asked (if applicable) to revise the report to reflect the feedback of the reviewers. The Working Group responds, but need not agree with, the reviewers' comments, outlining how the remarks made by the reviewers have been accommodated. After Working Group members have agreed to the final (revised) report, it is submitted together with the reviewers' comments and the Working Group's response to the review for final approval to the SAPEA Board.

4.6.3 *Endorsement and approval of reports*

Endorsement and approval of the SAPEA Report is sequential:

1. The SAPEA Board validates that report review criteria have been met.
2. The SAPEA Board decides to proceed to endorsement.
3. Each SAPEA Board member endorses the report on behalf of his/her Network (according to its own endorsement procedure).
4. The SAPEA Board approves publication of the report by a majority vote.

In the exceptional case where a Network does not endorse the final report, there will be a disclaimer outlining the reasons for this decision.

4.7 PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION

SAPEA reports are published under a Creative Commons license, specifically, the CC-BY 4.0, which allows information to be used as long as SAPEA is acknowledged.

SAPEA has full responsibility for the dissemination of SAPEA reports. Working group members are aware of the importance of an effective dissemination plan.

SAPEA will publish its output independently but not prior to the publication of the SAM HLG advice.

The final report will include the names and affiliations of the Working Group members and reviewers.

4.8 RAPID RESPONSE MECHANISM (RRM)

The Rapid Response Mechanism provides fast access to knowledge existing within the Academy Networks. In general, the RRM will follow the same QA procedures as outlined above, but depending on the timeline this may be done in a more condensed way.

The SAPEA Board assesses the feasibility of the topic by the RRM. The Board will supervise the RRM process and assure themselves the selection of scientific experts in the absence of selection committee. It will ensure and make explicit the quality assurance procedures adopted in each case of use of the RRM. The level of review will be explicitly described in the report documents.

5. Quality Assurance check-list

The Chair, Member of the Working Group and the SAPEA staff are responsible for adhering to the procedures set out in this document. A quality checklist (Appendix 4) can be used to aid the SAPEA project team. It needs to be filled in by the SAPEA staff member acting as project quality manager and submitted to the SAPEA Board on completion of the project.

6. Ethical issues

6.1 CODE OF CONDUCT

Working Group members and Chair are encouraged to adopt and promote a number of broad principles as follows:

- **Integrity**
 - Act with skill and care in all scientific work. Maintain up to date skills and assist their development in others.
 - Take steps to prevent corrupt practices and professional misconduct. Declare conflicts of interest.
 - Be alert to the ways in which research derives from and affects the work of other people, and respect the rights and reputation of others.
- **Respect for life, the law, and the public good**
 - Ensure that your work is lawful and justified. Minimise and justify any adverse effect your work may have on people, animals, and the natural environment.
- **Responsible communication: listening and informing**
 - Seek to discuss the issues that science raises for society. Listen to the aspirations and concerns of others.
 - Do not knowingly mislead or allow others to be misled, about scientific matters. Present and review scientific evidence, theory, or interpretation honestly and accurately.

6.2 AD-HOC ETHICS COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY

The SAPEA Board may establish an ad-hoc Ethics committee, in response to concerns regarding scientific integrity in a SAPEA work. The committee will be composed by up to four relevant independent experts. The committee will be asked to recommend appropriate follow-up actions.

7. Review of QA procedures

SAPEA will perform periodically reviews of guidelines and procedures described in this document, in particular, the pragmatic approach used for the Rapid Response Mechanism.

Appendix 1: Bibliography

- ALLEA (2017). *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*.
- Croatian Academy of Engineering, *Code of Ethics*.
- Estonian Academy of Science, *Code of Ethics of Estonian Scientists*.
- EASAC (2011). *Good practice in the Dialogue between Science Academies and Policy Communities*.
- Euro-CASE (2013). *Guidelines on advising policy makers and society*.
- European Commission (2002). *Communication from the Commission on the collection and use of expertise by the Commission: principles and guidelines*.
- European Commission (2016). *Scientific Advice Mechanism: Rules of Procedure of the High-Level Group of Scientific Advisors*.
- French Academy of Technologies (2012). *Charte de l'expertise*.
- French Academy of Technologies (2003). *Charte de la Commission d'éthique*.
- French Academy of Technologies (2001). *Charte de la Qualité*.
- French Academy of Sciences (2012). *Charte de l'expertise*.
- French Academy of Pharmacy (2012). *Charte de l'expertise*.
- German Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities (2008). *Leitlinien Politikberatung*.
- German Academy of Technologies (acatech) (2016). *Qualitätsmanagement-Handbuch, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Science Ethics Code*.
- Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) (2012). *Code for the prevention of improper influence due to conflicts of interest*.

APPENDIX

Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) (2013). *Manual Concerning academy advisory reports: Basic principles, procedures, and quality assurance.*

Royal Society of Canada (2010). *Expert Panels: Manual of Procedural Guidelines.*

Royal Society of Canada (2010). *Peer-review process for expert panels, Royal Society of New Zealand. Expert advice and practice framework.*

Swiss academies of arts and science (2008). *Integrity in scientific research: Principles and procedures.*

Swiss academies of Arts and Sciences (2011). *Scientific Policy Advice: recommendations of the Swiss academies of arts and sciences for researchers.*

Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences (2013). *Directives transparence des intérêts et déclaration des intérêts.*

Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences (2013). *Système d'assurance qualité 'politique' de la SCNAT.*

Swiss Academies of Technologies (2014). *Code de conduit.*

Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences (2016). *Engaging politics with Science.*

UK Government Office for Science (2011). *Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees.*

UK Government Office for Science (2010). *The Government Chief Scientific Adviser's Guidelines on the Use of Scientific and Engineering Advice in Policy Making.*

UK Government Office for Science (2010). *Universal Ethical Code for Scientists.*

UK Government Office for Science (2010). *Principles of Scientific advice to Government.*

UK Royal Academy of Engineering (RAEng) (2003). *Procedures for the production and review of proactive academy reports and statements.*

UK Royal Academy of Engineering (RAEng) (2003). *Procedures for the production and review of responses to enquiries from government and others.*

US National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (2003). *Policy on Committee composition and balance and Conflicts of Interest for Committees used in the development of reports.*

US National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, *Leaflet Study Process.*

US National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (2009). *Conflict of Interest in Medical Research, Education, and Practice.*

Further readings

OECD (2015). *Scientific Advice for Policy Making: the role and responsibility of expert bodies and individual scientists.*

European Risk Forum (2016). *Scientific Evidence and the management of risk.*

The Brussels Declaration (2017). *Ethics & Principles for Science & Society Policy-Making.*

Appendix 2: SAPEA Declaration of Interests

POLICY ON DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

1. Spanning the disciplines of engineering, humanities, medicine, natural sciences and social sciences, SAPEA brings together the outstanding knowledge and expertise from over 100 academies, young academies and learned societies in more than 40 countries across Europe. SAPEA is part of the European Scientific Advice Mechanism (SAM) which provides independent, interdisciplinary and evidence-based scientific advice on policy issues to the European Commission and works closely with the SAM High Level Group of Scientific Advisors.
2. SAPEA experts come from a variety of academic and business backgrounds. The external activities they may engage in ranges from collaborations with the commercial world (e.g. through consultancy, research and development, or intellectual property licensing), to serving on government, business and community boards, or providing expert advice in the media or professional practice, outreach in schools or involvement in international projects.
3. While these activities are considered to be in the public interest and of benefit for the home institution and the individuals concerned these activities may, on occasion, also give rise to conflicts of interest, whether potential or actual, perceived or alleged.
4. Provisions in the Horizon 2020 standard Grant Agreement of SAPEA require the beneficiary to *"to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective implementation of the action is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest ('conflict of interests'). They must formally notify to the Commission without delay any situation constituting or likely to lead to a conflict of interests and immediately take all the necessary steps to rectify this situation. The Commission may verify that the measures taken are appropriate and may require additional measures to be taken by a specified deadline."*
5. Against that background the SAPEA Consortium opted for making possible conflicts of interest transparent using a slightly adapted standard Declaration of Interest used in other EU contexts. The SAPEA Consortium will manage possible conflicts of interest thus allowing activities to proceed as normal. By contrast, conflicts which are not managed effectively may jeopardise the Consortium's public standing and may cause serious damage to SAPEA's reputation and those of the individuals concerned.

6. It is therefore SAPEA's policy to encourage and foster external activities whilst ensuring that when conflicts or perceived conflicts of interest arise they are acknowledged and disclosed, and where needed, they are managed appropriately.

STANDARD DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (DOI) FORM FOR MEMBERS OF SAPEA WORKING GROUPS

Introduction

The purpose of this form is to provide an overview of the interests of experts invited to participate in Working Groups convened by the Consortium of European Academies of Science in the context of Grant Agreement Nr 737432 "Science Advice for Policy by European Academies" (SAPEA) signed on 22 November 2016, hereafter referred to as 'SAPEA Consortium' and 'SAPEA Working Groups'. The Grant Agreement is a Coordination and Support Action further to the H2020-BA-EUROPE-ENA-2016 call - Coordinating scientific advice for policy making provided by the European Networks of Academies.

The first paragraph of Article 35 *"Conflict of Interests" of the aforementioned Grant Agreement states that the beneficiary must take all measures to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective implementation of the action is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest ('conflict of interests'). They must formally notify to the Commission without delay any situation constituting or likely to lead to a conflict of interests and immediately take all the necessary steps to rectify this situation. The Commission may verify that the measures taken are appropriate and may require additional measures to be taken by a specified deadline.*

The current document is to be considered as a measure taken by the beneficiary to identify and, if it would exist, prevent any conflict of interests.

The interests listed below by the expert who signed the document will be examined by the SAPEA Consortium in order to assess whether they would constitute a conflict of interests ('Col'). In that case appropriate measures should be taken to forestall that an interest could unduly influence the capacity of an expert to act independently and in the public interest when participating in Activities of the Working Group.

The following Declaration of Interest has been slightly adapted from the Standard Declaration of Interests (DOI) Form for Experts invited by the Commission or by the High Level Group of Scientific Advisors to participate in activities organised under the aegis of the Scientific Advice Mechanism of the European Commission (SAM).

Definitions

"Activity" or **"Activities"** (capitalised 'A') means an activity or activities organised by the SAPEA Consortium in particular for instance in its Working Groups.

'Description' includes any additional or useful comment the expert would like to mention.

«Conflict of interest» means any situation where an expert has an interest that may compromise or be reasonably perceived to compromise the expert's capacity to act independently and in the public interest when participating in the Activities of a Working Group that will contribute to advice given to the Commission.

«Immediate family member» means the individual's spouse, children and parents. «Spouse» includes a partner with whom the expert has a registered non marital regime. «Children» means the child(ren) the expert and the spouse have in common, the own child(ren) of the individual and the own child(ren) of the spouse.

«Legal entity» means any commercial business, industry association, consultancy, research institution or other enterprise whose funding is significantly derived from commercial sources. It also includes independent own commercial businesses, law offices, consultancies or similar.

«Body» means a governmental, international or non-profit organisation.

«Meeting» includes a series or cycle of meetings.

Please answer each of the questions below. If the answer to any of the questions is «yes», please briefly describe relevant interests and circumstances, as appropriate.

If you do not describe relevant interests and your DOI form is considered to be incomplete, or if declared interests are considered to constitute a Conflict of Interest, you may be excluded from all or part of the Activities of the SAPEA Working Group.

First name:

Family name:

Employer/Affiliation:

Date:

Name of Working Group/Topic:

1 EMPLOYMENT, CONSULTANCY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION

	Within the past 5 years, were you employed or have you had any other professional relationship with a natural or legal entity, or held any non-remunerated post in a legal entity or other body with an interest in the field of the Activity in question?	YES	NO
1a	Employment		
1b	Consultancy, including services as an advisor		
1c	Non-remunarted post		
1d	Legal representation		

Activity	Time period (from... until month/year)	Name of entity or body	Description

2 MEMBERSHIP OF MANAGING BODY, SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BODY OR EQUIVALENT STRUCTURE

	Within the past 5 years, have you participated in the internal decision-making of a legal entity or other body with an interest in the field of Activities in question or have you participated in the works of a Scientific Advisory Body with voting rights on the outputs of that entity?	YES	NO
2a	Participation in a decision-making process		
2b	Participation in the work of a Scientific Advisory Body		

Activity	Time period (from... until month/year)	Name of entity or body	Description

3 RESEARCH SUPPORT

	Within the past 5 years, have you, or the research entity (institute or department) to which you belong, received any support from a legal entity or other body with an interest in the field of Activities in question?	YES	NO
3a	Research support, including grants, rents, sponsorships, fellowships, non-monetary support		

Activity	Time period (from... until month/year)	Name of entity or body	Description

4 FINANCIAL INTERESTS

	Do you have current investments in a legal entity with an interest in the field of Activities in question, including holding of stocks and shares, and which amounts to more than 10,000 EUR per legal entity or entitling you to a voting right of 5% or more in such legal entity?	YES	NO
4a	Shares		
4b	Other stock		

Investment	Name of legal entity	Description

5 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

	Do you have any intellectual property rights that might be affected by the outcome of the Activities in question?	YES	NO
5a	Patent, trademarks, or copyrights		
5b	Others		

Intellectual property	Description

6 PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND POSITIONS

	Within the past 5 years, have you provided any expert opinion or testimony in the field of Activities in question, for a legal entity or other body as part of a regulatory, legislative or judicial process? Within the past 5 years have you held an office or other position, paid or unpaid, where you represented interests or defended a public statement or position in the field of Activities in question?	YES	NO
6a	For a legal entity or other body as part of a regulatory, legislative or judicial process		
6b	Represented interests or defended an opinion		

Activity	Time period (from... until month/year)	Name of legal entity or body	Description

7 INTERESTS OF IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS

7a	To your knowledge, are there any interests of your immediate family members which could be seen as undermining your independence when providing advice to the Commission in the field of the Activities in question?	YES	NO
----	---	------------	-----------

Interests	Time period (from... until month/year)	Name of legal entity or body	Description

7b	If interests of your immediate family members are declared, it is your responsibility to inform them about the collection of information on their interests included in the DOI and to provide them with the privacy statement attached to the guidance for filling in this DOI, and this at the latest when you file the DOI form with the SAPEA Consortium.
----	--

8 OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

8a	Are there any other elements that could be seen as undermining your independence when providing advice to the Commission in the field of the Activities in question?	YES	NO
----	---	------------	-----------

Description:

I hereby declare on my honour that I have read the guidance for completing this form. I also declare on my honour that the information disclosed in this form is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Should there be any change to the above information, including as regards upcoming activities, I will promptly notify the SAPEA Consortium and complete a new DOI form describing the changes in question.

I am informed that my personal data are stored and processed by the SAPEA Consortium in accordance with Article 39, paragraph 2 of the Grant Agreement Nr 737432 signed between the SAPEA Consortium as beneficiary of the grant, and the Commission on 22 November 2016.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

ANNEX 1 TO THE APPENDIX

Guidance for filling in the declaration of interest (DOI) form for experts to participate in activities of the SAPEA consortium

This present DOI form is by and large similar in content to the one used to list the interests of members of experts of Commission Expert Groups as established by the Commission's horizontal rules on Commission expert groups and other similar entities are consultative bodies. Individuals invited to participate in Activities as defined in the introduction to the form (i.e. Activities organised by the SAPEA Consortium), are due to act independently and in the public interest.

In order to ensure the highest integrity of experts, you are requested to duly complete the DOI form. You are required to disclose any circumstances that could give rise to a conflict of interest, i.e. any situation where your interests may compromise or may reasonably be perceived to compromise your capacity to act independently and in the public interest in participating in Activities. In particular, you must disclose in this DOI form any relevant professional and financial interests.

You must also declare relevant interests of your immediate family members. If interests of your immediate family members are declared, it is your responsibility to inform them about the collection of information on their interests included in this DOI form and to provide them with the privacy statement attached to this guidance, and this at the latest when you file the DOI form with the SAPEA Consortium.

Please submit the completed DOI form to the SAPEA Consortium, together with your CV, in order for the Consortium to determine if a Conflict of Interest would exist and if so, whether measures should be taken to avoid that a secondary interest that you may

have could compromise your capacity to act independently and in the public interests in the work that you are requested to perform. If there is any change concerning the information provided in the form, including on upcoming activities, you must promptly inform the SAPEA Consortium and amend the DOI indicating the changes in question. Please note that having a declared interest **does not necessarily mean** having a conflict of interest. Answering «Yes» to a question on this DOI form **does not automatically disqualify you or limit your participation** in the Working Group. The SAPEA Consortium will review your answers in a manner similar to what is done in the context of the aforementioned horizontal rules and determine whether a conflict of interest relevant to the subject at hand exists⁴.

Where the SAPEA Consortium concludes that no conflict of interest exists, you can continue your work in the Working Group in a personal capacity. Where the SAPEA Consortium concludes that your interests may compromise or be reasonably perceived to compromise your capacity to act independently and in the public interest in the context of contributing to the working group in question, they can propose measures to avoid that a Conflict of Interests could compromise the results of the work in the working group.

If you decline to complete a DOI form, you shall be excluded from the Activities.

Personal data shall be collected and processed by the SAPEA Consortium in accordance with Article 39, paragraph 2 of the Grant Agreement Nr 737432 signed between the SAPEA Consortium and the Commission on 22 November 2016.

STANDARD PRIVACY STATEMENT

Protection of your personal data

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Why do we process your data?
3. Which data do we collect and process?
4. How long do we keep your data?
5. How do we protect your data?
6. Who has access to your data and to whom is it disclosed?
7. What are your rights and how can you exercise them?
8. Contact information
9. Where to find more detailed information

INTRODUCTION

This privacy statement explains the reason for the processing, the way the SAPEA Consortium collects, handles and ensures protection of all personal data provided, how that information is used and what rights you may exercise in relation to your data (the right to access, rectify, block etc.). The SAPEA Consortium is committed to protecting and respecting your privacy.

WHY DO WE PROCESS YOUR DATA?

Purpose of the processing operation: the SAPEA Consortium collects and uses your personal information to ensure transparency on participation and Activities.

The processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest.

As regards, in particular, the declarations of interests filled in by experts, the processing of personal data of these experts serves the public interest of enabling the SAPEA Consortium to verify the experts' independence in contributing to the Activities that may directly or indirectly be used to advise the Commission.

WHICH DATA DO WE COLLECT AND PROCESS?

The personal data collected and further processed may be:

- Name;
- Professional title;
- Professional profile;
- Nationality;
- Gender;
- Information included in the declarations of interest.

HOW LONG DO WE KEEP YOUR DATA?

The SAPEA Consortium only keeps the data for the time necessary to fulfil the purpose of collection or further processing.

When an individual is no longer participating in Activities in question the SAPEA Consortium keeps personal information for 5 years after the date where relevant individuals cease to participate in the Activities.

Declarations of interests of individuals participating in Activities carried out under the Grant Agreement Nr 737432 signed between the SAPEA Consortium and the Commission on 22 November 2016 which was awarded in the context of the call for

³ Commission Decision of 30 May 2016, ref C(2016) 3301, Article 2.1 - See http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert-/PDF/C_2016_3301_F1_COMMISSION_DECISION_EN.pdf

the Coordination and Support Action referenced as H2020-BA-EUROPE-ENA-2016 - Coordinating scientific advice for policy making provided by the European Networks of Academies ('SAPEA contract').

HOW DO WE PROTECT YOUR DATA?

Article 39, paragraph 2 of the Grant Agreement mentioned in the previous section states that the Consortium and its members -as grant beneficiaries- must process personal data in compliance with applicable EU and national law on data protection (including authorisations or notification requirements). The beneficiaries may grant their personnel access only to data that is strictly necessary for implementing, managing and monitoring the Agreement.

The data will not be collected and processed by the Commission but by the SAPEA Consortium.

WHO HAS ACCESS TO YOUR DATA AND TO WHOM IS IT DISCLOSED?

You are entitled to access and correct your data at any time at request. The SAPEA Consortium will not release or publish any personal data to any third party without your prior approval.

WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AND HOW CAN YOU EXERCISE THEM?

You are entitled to access your personal data and rectify and/or block it in case the data is inaccurate or incomplete.

You can exercise your rights by contacting the SAPEA Consortium or in case of conflict the responsible national Data Protection Officer.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have comments or questions, any concerns or a complaint regarding the collection and use of your personal data, please feel free to contact the SAPEA Consortium, using the following contact information:

(Contact information of the SAPEA Staff of the Lead Network within SAPEA)

- Name:
- Function/position within SAPEA:
- Employer:
- Phone number:
- Email:

Appendix 3: Questions for peer-reviewers

The reviewers must use the following questions as a guideline:

1. Does the report address satisfactorily the study's requirements as contained in the scoping paper?
2. Does the report cite, and rely upon up-to-date relevant literature?
3. Has an executive summary been included and does it concisely and accurately describe the key findings and policy options? Is it consistent with other sections of the report? Is it effective as a standalone summation of the report?
4. Do the arguments advanced in the report show the requisite degree of analytical rigour? If the report contains policy options, are those options well-supported by scientific evidence and argument?
5. Do the authors explicitly acknowledge any uncertainties or omissions?
6. Do the authors identify conclusions and options based on opinion as such, and give satisfactory reasons for this?
7. Does the report deal competently with data and analyses?
8. Has the Working Group produced an objective, autonomous advisory report?
9. Are the bibliography and any appendices relevant, given the purpose of the report?
10. If you believe the report can be improved significantly, what improvements do you suggest?
11. Are there signs of biases or undue influence from interest groups?

Appendix 4: Quality Assurance checklist

Quality Checklist	Date
SAPEA Project (name of topic):	
Name of SAPEA Project Lead:	

VERIFICATION

Quality Item					
	YES	NO	N/A	Date	Comments
Did the lead SAPEA Staff member distribute the SAPEA quality assurance system to the project team?					
Have all Working Group members and Chair(s) been informed about the SAPEA quality assurance system?					
Has the scoping paper been prepared?					
Has a Selection Committee been appointed?					
Have all Working Group members signed a DoI?					
Have all WG meetings' minutes been recorded and approved?					
Has the project team established a repository for all quality documentation?					
Has the final product been peer-reviewed by at least 3 reviewers?					
Have all steps (see Chap. 4) concerning the delivery of the final product been followed by the project team?					
Please indicate any deviation from the SAPEA quality assurance procedures which occurred in the process.					

Appendix 5: List of abbreviations

Col: Conflict of Interests

DoI: Declaration of Interests

EC: European Commission

HLG: High-level group

QA: Quality Assurance

RRM: Rapid Response Mechanism

SAM: Scientific Advice Mechanism

SAPEA: Science Advice for Policy by European Academies

WG: Working Group

Appendix 6: Acknowledgements

Working Group Members

Yves Bamberger, Chair, Euro-CASE

Ole Petersen, Academia Europaea

Göran Hermeren, ALLEA

André Aurengo/George Griffin¹, FEAM

Jos van der Meer, EASAC

Nicole Grobert, Young Academy of Europe

SAPEA Staff Members

Antonella Di Trapani, Lead, Euro-CASE

Louise Edwards, Academia Europaea

Robert Vogt/Cosmas Lambini², ALLEA

Hamed Mobasser, FEAM

Christiane Diehl, EASAC

Thomas Stehnen, acatech

Observers

Yves Caristan, SAPEA Board Member, Euro-CASE

Rudolf Hielscher, SAPEA Coordinator, acatech

Spanning the disciplines of engineering, humanities, medicine, natural sciences and social sciences, SAPEA brings together knowledge and expertise from over 100 academies, young academies and learned societies in more than 40 countries across Europe.

SAPEA is part of the European Scientific Advice Mechanism (SAM), which provides independent, interdisciplinary and evidence-based scientific advice on policy issues to the European Commission. SAPEA works closely with the SAM High Level Group of Scientific Advisors.

www.sapea.info
@SAPEAnews



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 737432