# SCIENTIFIC CONDUCT POLICY

# OF THE

# CHARLES DARWIN FOUNDATION

Change Control and Approvals

| Revision | Modification description | Name | Date: |
|---|---|---|---|
| 00 | Document preparation | Julio Gallegos | Oct/30/2020 |
| 01 | Full document revision. Editing and adding content of the entire document | María José Barragán P. | Dec/3/ 2020 |
| 02 | Format standardization, and correlation with CDF Code of Ethics. | Julio Gallegos | May/25/2021 |
| 03 | Reviewed by Human Resources | Galo Del Hierro | May/31/2021 |
| 04 | Reviewed by Science Directorate | Maria Jose Barragan | Aug/22/21 |
| 05 | Reviewed by Executive Directorate | Rakan Zahawi | Aug/24/21 |
| 06 | Approved by Executive Directorate | Rakan Zahawi | Oct/10/21 |

## INDEX

## 1. Introduction and Preamble

**Development of Scientific Conduct Policy**

The Scientific Conduct Policy of the Charles Darwin Foundation has been developed as a shared effort between the Executive Directorate, Science Directorate and Human Resources. This Policy is part of CDF's Code of Ethics, which is described in paragraph 14.2.

In the early 60s, the Charles Darwin Foundation for the Galapagos Islands (CDF) in its Research Station (ECCD), began the development and maintenance of scientific research activities in the Galapagos Islands. For more than six decades, CDF has carried out scientific research in alignment with its institutional mission and vision, and complying with the values and ethical principles detailed in this document. As a starting point within the ethical context in scientific practice, a key initial step is the establishment of 'guiding' questions by each scientist (e.g., What for? For whom is this research relevant? Who benefits from it? Who gets hurt?) to reflect on the implications of their research and see the staff's own personal appreciation of what is right to do or say, or not. In this sense, there are a few hundred instruments (i.e., codes, declarations) (Rydén 1984) that, at the time, intended to propose research ethics in the development of studies, mainly those with human beings in the medical field (Mappes and Zembaty 1981.) Since then, instruments of this nature have increased in number, with one of the first examples being the Uppsala University 'Code of Ethics for Scientists', produced in 1984, which details a four-point code guiding this practice (Lemarchand 2010.) Currently, important references of this topic are the instruments of large institutions -such as the European Research Council (ERC)- in the performance of scientific practices. This instruments dictate clear patterns for the development of science at all levels. Examples of such instruments are ERC's twelve golden rules for research conduct and integrity (2021), the guidelines on research environmental ethics, ethics in information, ethics in society, professional ethics, ethics in science and technology, applied ethics, and professionalism and integrity in research (NSF 2021, ACRCR 2018.)

## 2. Objectives of CDF's Scientific Conduct Policy

2.1. Guiding and regulating, within an ethical framework, the actions, and scientific practices of CDF and of persons directly linked to CDF.
2.2. Providing a clear instrument and procedures for the successful implementation of this scientific conduct policy.
2.3. Encouraging best scientific practices based on the ethical framework for research and all its branches.

## 3. Scope

This Scientific Conduct Policy applies to all staff members who develop their scientific activity and are attached to the Science Directorate, and/or who collaborate with this area within CDF. This includes principal investigators junior investigators, field assistants, volunteers, thesis students, fellows, and consultants of the Charles Darwin Foundation, without prejudice to their geographical location, and without limiting any other internal enforcement instruments such as CDF's Internal Regulations, Occupational health and Safety Regulations, CDF Code of Ethics, and Workplace Sexual Harassment Policy.

## 4. Scope of Action of this Instrument

In CDF's scientific context, two major areas have been defined on which this instrument is structured:

4.1 ***Scientific conduct***, which sets out patterns and guidelines for the exercise of scientific practice

4.2 ***Compliance*** **with the instrument**, which includes the reporting, verification, sanction analysis and monitoring mechanisms (procedures) of those scientific practices that are not aligned with institutional ethics and this policy.

Before defining the areas in which this instrument is developed, several important terms and concepts, in the context of this CDF Scientific Conduct Policy, are described below.

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| Conflict of interest | There is a conflict of interest in a situation where an independent observer can reasonably conclude that a person's professional actions are or may be excessively influenced by other interests. This refers to financial or non-financial interests which may be actually or potentially perceived as a conflict of interest. |
| Institution | Includes universities, independent research institutes, hospitals, or any other organization that conducts research. This term may refer to one or multiple institutions. |
| Research | The concept of research is broad and includes the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understanding. This may include previous research synthesis and analysis to the point that it becomes new and creative. |
| Researcher | Person (or persons) who conduct, assist, or participate in scientific research. |
| Malpractice | A minor violation of the Policy which can be due to intentional or reckless actions, or negligence. |
| Scientific misconduct | A serious violation of the Policy which can be due to intentional or reckless actions, or negligence. |
| Plagiarism | The improper and unauthorized use of any form of data, information, wisdom and practice, without the authorization or permission of the holder of its intellectual property. |
| Violation / Breach | A violation or breach occurs when there is no compliance with the principles and responsibilities of the Scientific Conduct Policy. It may refer to one or more violations and / or breaches. |
| Peer review | It is the impartial and independent research evaluation, conducted by others who work in the same topic, area or discipline, or related areas. |
| Sanction | Actions taken as a result of a violation or breach of the Scientific Conduct Policy. It can be mild or severe, depending on the severity of the violation, breach, or misconduct. |

Source: Modified from the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. National Health and Medical Research Council (2018).

### 4.1 Scientific conduct

**Importance of having an 'Scientific Conduct' instrument**

Within scientific practice, two important dimensions come together: the natural environment in which this practice is carried out and the human aspects (human dimensions) of those doing research and of the human or non-human beings that may be the objects of research. Therefore, it is important to clearly define how scientific practice is conceived, developed, managed, handled, communicated and how these actions actually or potentially affect objects and subjects of scientific research. In that sense, when performing research, it is deemed essential

to take into account aspects such as: the rationality and legitimacy of the research, the implications of the research for the natural environment, and the potential implications that may conflict with the fundamental human rights of those people who are part of such research and that could be related to the outcomes and actions arising from it. Likewise, scientists aim at ensuring the protection of the identity and integrity of the people who are subjects of the study, at minimizing the possible negative impact of research on them, and at increasing the positive effect of their participation. All this, through ensuring a relationship of trust, based on scientific integrity. Thus, one can satisfy personal and institutional ethical demands and finally be prepared to deal with complex situations in the subject of 'ethics' (Israel and Hay 2006.)

**Patterns and Guidelines in Scientific Conduct**

A desirable scientific conduct involves a series of parameters that guide actions before, during, and after scientific practice. This is due to the extended (long-term) time frame of some scientific practice actions and of the scope and implications of scientific activities performed in humans, other living beings, and in the environment.

The definition of desirable scientific conduct requires the description of what is considered inappropriate or undesirable scientific conduct. In this sense, undesirable scientific practice is defined as "*intentional distortion or gross negligence within the research process. This includes, but is not limited to, the production of fake data, texts, hypotheses or plagiarism of ideas, methods and publications of other researchers, sabotage, human or animal abuse, extortion and damage to the environment.*"

The guidelines to be explained in detail in the following sections are among the most important areas accounted for as part of 'desirable' scientific conduct.

- Generation of ideas and intellectual property.
- Development of research activities.
- Data, information, and knowledge management.
- Communication of outcomes.

Any scientific conduct of any member of the scientific area, or another area related to CDF's science area, who acts against the four points mentioned above, thus, affecting the principles of scientific practice described in this document or who interferes with CDF's mission, strategic objectives, and image will be sanctioned by means of the procedures detailed in this document in the 'Sanctions' section, within the CDF's code of ethics and its internal regulations.

***Generation of ideas and intellectual property.***

Scientific research is an area in which the collaboration and interaction of ideas, concepts and outcome interpretations are a constant. In fact, the performance of science, in all its variants and formats, is nourished by this interaction. Furthermore, it grows and adapts to society's changes as they determine the relevance and urgency in the development of research.

Thus, this interaction in the development of scientific projects requires clear, transparent, fair, and ethical processes in which the role of each researcher and of each institution is defined. Next, the fields that require much attention to ensure that the development of research projects

-from their initial idea to their completion and during their implications' follow-up- is properly carried out.

- Co-creation

For centuries, the development of science (in its most traditional form) has intended to follow a straight line, between the original idea, the development of research and the final result. This format suggests that, amidst the collection of data, the generation of information and the production of knowledge, there is a process solely derived from the interest of answering the original scientific idea and/or question by a researcher or research group. However, within a more holistic and comprehensive approach, it is recognized that the generation of questions, data, information and knowledge production does not follow a 'one-dimensional' line. On the contrary, this is a dynamic and interactive process in which ontological and epistemological dimensions come together to give rise to diverse concerns and forms and formats of knowledge. In this sense, the co-creation of ideas, information and knowledge recognizes this dynamic in inclusive, fair and humble scientific practices that integrate the various ways of understanding, interpreting and describing the observed reality. In the end, this recognition allows an interpretation of the studied phenomenon which is closer to its real dimension. Thus, it gives greater relevance and legitimacy to the research.

- Original idea

Science, in its long trajectory in the history of humankind, has evolved in form and substance to what we now know as 'science.' The development of scientific research and the conceptualization of a scientific question from the beginning, is nourished by ideas that change and evolve and that feed or discriminate one or another theoretical, methodological or analytical approach used in research. Respect for the authorship of this original idea and its implications in the development of the study must always be guaranteed. This way, the intellectual contribution of those who conceived the idea and of those who developed the research projects is recognized. Failure to do so, on the other hand, violates the respect and recognition of intellectual property within the entire life cycle of a research, which are a globally accepted mandate of proper conduct and scientific ethics.

- Pre-existing information

Few disciplines that currently exist start from 'zero' level of knowledge. In any case, there is a background of research, information and previous knowledge that has been generated by someone and that sets the basis to raise our idea or research question. And this pre-existing information is very useful in order to validate the approach we make in our research. On the one hand, it allows to define what exists, what is known and the advances that have been made in one or another discipline or subject. On the other hand, it allows to identify the information and knowledge gaps, which make evident and highlight the relevance of our research, and contextualize our project. Recognizing this pre-existing knowledge -in addition to being a strategic step in the justification of our study- is a fair and ethical practice in recognizing the people and institutions that have collaborated to advance the development of research in various ways.

***Development of research activities***

- Fieldwork with animals and/or humans

Research work *with animals* is, in some cases, the object of criticism when practices considered inhumane are used in sampling and collection. In this sense, the work developed by CDF, where samples are made with live animals, is carried out by following processes that have been documented in specialized scientific literature and that has been used and tested in other locations, globally. If negative side effects are identified due to process use/application, such process is definitively ruled out. In addition, in the case of specimens added to the Natural History Collections, an opportunistic approach is followed, that is, dead specimens are used. In the case of 'invasive' species -regarded as such in scientific literature and in the Galapagos Invasive Species Management Plan- that are harmful to the conservation of Galapagos species and ecosystems, they are collected by means of the mechanisms defined in scientific literature and backed by invasive species research, control and eradication protocols developed in other locations.

The fieldwork of research involving *human beings* implies a level of responsibility that aims at ensuring adequate treatment of participants, in any possible way, during the research. In this sense, it is a practice recognized by academic and research institutions, to present a detailed protocol of methods and data analysis in human research, before the Ethics Committees of these institutions. After the review of these protocols, these bodies authorize the execution of the research in which the actions that can and cannot be developed are detailed. An important part of this protocol is the use of 'Informed consent' -both signed and oral- which informs the study participants, about the research objective, research participants, use of data, rights of the participants, etc.) Such protocol must be used in all research involving human beings.

- Fieldwork: data collection

Fieldwork is a fundamental part of scientific activities. The experimental design, sampling and collection of data must follow strict and rigorous methodological and analytical procedures that allow an analysis and interpretation of data under the international ethical, scientific standards.

- Desktop work: data curation, analysis, data interpretation

Post-fieldwork requires a systematic and rigorous process of transcribing and curating data, storing data sets, and analyzing and interpreting data to produce study results. at this stage it is of the utmost importance to recognize any influence on the data interpretation, which may be a bias or a specific element that alters a more neutral understanding. Recognizing sampling and analysis limitations is key and gives greater legitimacy to study results.

***Data, information, and knowledge management.***

- Confidentiality of information

In the development of research in which the participation of human beings is involved, the anonymity and confidentiality of the data provided are key in the good management of the data and the analysis of the information. In this sense, it is crucial to ensure that the identity of the participants is protected, to avoid possible effects or reprisals against them, because of their participation in the study. This is even more relevant in the case of research involving controversial or legal/illegal topics or that studying activities handled outside the law.

- Confidential data protection

This aspect is related to the previous point and defines the need for adequate infrastructure and procedures of the institution under the affiliation of which the research is carried out to ensure the long-term confidential management of this data and the information contained therein. The storage, processing and management of this information is the responsibility of the researcher and his/her institution, which must ensure that only persons with permission to access this information can access it. This can be implemented thanks to systems mechanisms, platforms, passwords, which only allow access to authorized persons. Thus, the technological dimension of this management and handling process of this type of information is important because it allows a differentiated treatment of the possible information users.

- Data and information storage

Data management and storage must be seen in an intergenerational dimension. What is produced today will surely remain in time, far beyond the duration of the project, the program and even the direct involvement of the researcher. For this reason, it is important that this long-term data and information management meets technical, operational and infrastructure requirements that ensure adequate storage over time. An issue of great relevance in this scenario is the budget related to the process implementation, data and infrastructure maintenance and management, which makes the institutional commitment guarantee the fulfillment of this CDF objective.

***Communication of outcomes.***

- Co-authors

Rarely, a research is carried out by one single person. In general, research projects include the effort of several people and institutions that make it possible to develop and achieve the project's objectives. The preparation of results -in different formats- therefore requires the recognition of the contribution of all people involved in the development of the research in different stages and in different ways. Authorship and co-authorship in the various scientific products obtained from research can be defined on the basis of acceptable criteria in the scientific field and, in some cases, are described in various instruments governing scientific practice. The order of authors in publications, for example, is clearly defined according to the idea conception, the development of fieldwork, data collection, data analysis, substantial manuscript revisions, development of models or prototypes, and so on. In this case, it is proposed as a healthy practice, to raise, in a transparent and honest way, at the beginning of any scientific collaboration, the possible agreements in relation to publications, authorship, co-authorship and various rights regarding the use and exploitation of data.

- Acknowledgements

The acknowledgements section is usually dedicated to a mention of gratitude to those who have contributed, in different ways, to the development of the research, mainly with the granting of permissions, translations, revisions to previous manuscript versions, and even donor agencies or research funders. Acknowledgements record the number or code of the research grant or permit under which it was developed.

***Professional relations and integrity***

- Peer relations and research integrity

Personal and professional kinship is always present in scientific practice, as part of the human nature that governs the actions of people and also of scientists. In this sense, the existence of conflicts or disagreements between researchers should not be an excuse for carrying out practices that ignore the elements that have been identified in this Scientific Conduct Policy. Therefore, intellectual property is a higher dimension that must always be respected. In the case of personal relationships influencing or affecting the development of scientific practice, it is necessary to mention it before the corresponding supervisor to analyze the case and make decisions that allow an acceptable research performance of the parties involved.

- Conflicts of interest

Conflicts of interest, both personal and institutional, may be present at any stage of the scientific activity. In the event that the existence of a conflict (real or perceived) of this nature is identified, it is appropriate to discuss it with the supervisor and analyze the case. If such conflict causes a (direct or indirect) effect on the development of the research, it is advisable to decline the involvement of the person or institution in the research process and seek alternatives that are acceptable, fair and ethically valid.

- Other ethical areas - competition for research funds with institutions or persons collaborating with CDF

Funding for scientific research is increasingly scarce. Competition for these funding sources has, therefore, become frequent. This causes two or more people or institutions, who collaborate in one or other research, to be in a competitive position, at a given time, before a funding opportunity. In these cases, it is advisable to discuss the issue with the immediate supervisor, with the Head of Area and/or with the Science Directorate and/or Executive Directorate to find the appropriate open and honest communication mechanisms, to raise the issue before the person or institution with whom this competence is perceived.

## *4.2 Compliance and implementation of the Scientific Conduct Policy*

Within CDF, a Process Management System implementation process has been carried out. This process seeks a more efficient management with measurable and controllable results. Knowing that scientific activity corresponds to CDF's 'purpose' and 'raison d'être', part of this policy is related to scientific practice and compliance with its statements. In this sense, compliance with

the Scientific Conduct Policy is executed through the monitoring of PI's, Executive Directorate, and institutional authorities.

The identification and confirmation of a fact breaching the Scientific Conduct Policy, will be analyzed by the Ethics Committee[1], which will determine the severity and penalties. This analysis will be based on the instruments described in CDF Code of Ethics.

Institutional activities directly and indirectly related to the development of scientific practice are among some of the instances in which follow-up and accompaniment are carried out. In this document, processes to respect and punish non-observance of the policy are shown within the following sections:

- **Identifying the issue of Scientific Conduct Policy compliance**

In cases in which a breach, non-observance or non-compliance are identified, their order and severity are recognized, as well as the field, within the scientific activity, it refers to. At this point, the parties involved are also identified.

- **Documenting the problem**

Once the identification of the problem has been completed, we proceed to document the background and situations that led to the breach.

- **Talk to the parties involved**

At this point, CDF's Science Director convenes the parties involved to define the situation, steps to follow and formal processes detailed by the institutional policy. In the event that the breach is serious or compromises the research results or CDF's image, the Science Director must inform the Ethics Committee.

- **Informing and extraordinarily convening the Ethics Committee[2]**

CDF's Ethics Committee is informed of the previous steps and is convened to initiate the case review process and make a decision on it (in case of serious misconduct.) The committee's case analysis includes estimating the costs, risks, benefits, opportunities, and consequences of the breach.

- **Incident report**

The Ethics Committee describes the case and prepares a report on the incident, and details the conclusions and decisions made to solve the problem, within the provisions of this policy and CDF Code of Ethics.

- **Application of the rule or sanction**

Depending on the analysis made by the committee and the decision made to execute the sanction, the consequences of the breach will be defined (under labor laws) and the person involved in the process will be informed in a timely manner.

- **Avoid direct and collateral damage and do good.**

The ultimate goal of the compliance process is to ensure that the breach or non-compliance does not have major repercussions either within or outside CDF. The whole process followed, should, therefore, aim at mitigating the implications, avoiding direct and indirect affectations, and collateral damage and seeking to do good.

[1] The formation of the Ethics Committee is detailed in CDF Code of Ethics.
[2] Within the CFD Code of Ethics, regular meetings are scheduled throughout the year.

## 5. Ethical principles governing CDF Scientific Conduct Policy

The principles that govern the institutional mission are based on the commitment to generate scientific knowledge based on research to contribute to the conservation and sustainable development of the Galapagos Archipelago. In this sense, the scientific practice developed at CDF is based on defined institutional values: commitment, excellence, integrity, respect, and discipline. These values are, therefore, aligned with the basic ethical principles that define the conduct and scientific practice of CDF. They are detailed below:

### 5.1. Legitimacy of research (aligned with value: commitment)

The legitimacy of scientific research conceived and developed by CDF refers to what motivates and inspires the development of one or the other project and the approach of one or the other research question. This line proposes that the research developed (actions and content) be timely, necessary, genuine, true, and raises critical questions that must be answered, such as: What for? Whom for? Why? Who benefits from it? Who gets hurt? What are the implications of the results?

### 5.2. Scientific rigor (aligned with value: excellence)

This principle is defined by the strict application of the scientific method (qualitative and quantitative) in all phases and steps of the scientific practice. Through this, an approach, conceptualization, design, sampling method and data collection, analysis, interpretation, presentation of results, replicability (in the scope quantitative), conclusions and recommendations -preliminary or final- in a solid way and adapted to scientific practice guidelines, and under an international standard, is ensured.

### 5.3. Integrity, honesty, and responsibility (aligned with value: integrity)

Members of CDF's science area, who are under the scope of this policy must perform their work with (personal and professional) integrity, honesty, and responsibility in order to carry out research attached to these three fundamental universal principles in every action of human beings and, thus, of scientific practices. This dimension also includes principles such as diligence and loyalty to institutional values. This also implies that each researcher must look after the institutional assets, CDF's infrastructure and its adequate and positive representation. Likewise, it is also expected for personal and institutional conflicts of interest (personal ones with CDF) with those positively or negatively affected by the research execution to be avoided.

### 5.4. Transparency (aligned with value: integrity)

An important principle within scientific practice is the transparency of the entire process before, during and after its execution. This not only results in the possibility of replicating the use of the knowledge generated in other areas of pure applied science, but allows for this scientific process to be made available for consultation or even for criticism and debate. Making the strengths and limitations of a scientific exercise visible increases the possibility of acceptance by non-scientific sectors of the population and, thus, helps fulfill the institutional mission.

In this sense, this element is identified as an instrument of CDF that governs the ethical field within the institution (Code of Ethics of the Charles Darwin Foundation.)

*"The free flow of truthful and complete information must be ensured in order to meet the needs of the authorities, civil and scientific community. This is a responsibility declared in the agreement with the Ecuadorian government and in the ethical principle of the code of conduct, so as to generate trust and contribute to making informed and responsible decisions. Therefore, CDF will refrain from engaging in the acts of scientific misconduct mentioned in this policy."*[3]

### 5.5. Honesty (aligned with values: respect and integrity)

Within diverse geographical, cultural, and social contexts globally, one of the most important universal values is honesty. And scientific practice is no exception. The anti-principle, in this case, is seen as an undesirable aspect in the field of science, thus, the strengthening of the principle of honesty, both personally and institutionally, is explicitly sought to promote for such undesirable aspect to be avoided. Some examples of principles and anti-principles are included in this point:

***Veracity of data vs. fake data production and data falsification:*** This includes the invention or adulteration of methods, sampling, data, analysis, interpretation of results or tampering of other research items including annexes, tables, and giving deliberate consent to the intentional or unintentional disclosure or deletion (through negligence) of such data, information, and knowledge. ***Authenticity and respect for the ownership of data, information, and knowledge vs. plagiarism:*** This includes the misappropriation and misuse of ideas, concepts, data, information, knowledge, intellectual property and/or work and involvement of other people without giving due credit, without respecting the due authorship order in accordance with the standards that the scientific practice recognizes as valid, and without acknowledging and/or without having permission from the author and/or owner of the distribution right. Plagiarism can be executed through written, digital or print media, visual and audiovisual media, audio and other media, and repetition of ideas in the production of objects and in the development of models and prototypes. This segment includes respect for intellectual property as a macro principle, including but not limited to legal intellectual property rights, distribution rights, ownership of information collected, document production, access to financing opportunities and funds per se.

### 5.6. Care and protection of data, information, and knowledge (aligned with value: discipline)

Scientific practice includes a series of steps and activities, one of which involves responsible, adequate, and long-term management: the administration and management of data, information, and knowledge. In this sense, the principle of proper care and management of this good, is raised in contrast to its anti-principle, as follows:

[3] Excerpted from CDF Code of Ethics.

***Proper data management and storage vs. mismanagement, improper use and conservation of raw or processed data, information, and knowledge:*** To meet this need, the establishment of personal and institutional practices and processes to ensure that field data obtained in the development of research (e.g., data, data sets, tables, videos, photographs, audios) are systematically stored, backed up, protected and maintained over time is included. Part of this management involves ensuring that confidential and anonymous data (e.g., personal data of individuals who have been interviewed in quantitative or qualitative research) are protected through various mechanisms. All this aims at overcoming the lack of a system that allows to keep clear and accurate records of sampling procedures, raw and processed data, and research results.

### *5.7. Sabotage (aligned with values: responsibility, respect, and integrity)*

The development of scientific research requires for its conceptualization, theoretical, methodological, and analytical approach to follow a scientific logic and an ethical pattern. This is required for scientists' own research, as well as for that of colleagues, for it to develop under these principles as a key to avoid the damage, destruction or manipulation of data, sampling, experiments, equipment, documents, hardware, software, use of chemicals or other elements that other scientists or institutions need to carry out their research activities. Respect for these practices is part of the commitment that each researcher must guarantee.

### *5.8. Avoiding the influence of (personal and institutional) conflicts of interests (aligned with values: integrity and commitment)*

Scientific practice includes certain human dimensions that makes it unlikely for it to be fully impartial or free from bias. In the development of scientific activities, however, avoiding the influence of conflicts of interest is key to give legitimacy to research. In this sense it is expected for the existence of conflict of interests (if any) be made explicit, and for the person who is part of a real, potential and/or perceived conflict to be excluded in order to avoid improper handling in terms of assessment, review and rating of results, publications, applications to calls and funds, nominations, nepotism, misuse of funds or those described in the institutional policy on conflict of interest.

### *5.9. Humane treatment of humans and animals (aligned with value: respect)*

Humanitarian treatment of humans and animals is a topic that is given attention to in scientific practice globally. Failure to comply with these guidelines is subject to criticism and even sanctions. Non-humanitarian treatment includes any intentional or negligent action in scientific research that damages the integrity (i.e., physical, psychological, or social health) of humans and animals. It also includes irreversible animal and/or environmental damage caused by the research. This last point (i.e., irreversible damage to animals) excludes, in the case of CDF Scientific Conduct Policy, actions in which the very aim of the research is to ‘remove, control

and/or eradicate invasive biota affecting Galapagos native and endemic biodiversity. The existence of these invasive species is removed through several mechanisms.

## 6. Roles and Responsibilities

Since ethics and scientific conduct are an intrinsic part of the CDF's activity and institutional mission, the implementation of this policy is the responsibility of all CDF scientific staff. Therefore, determining the roles and responsibilities of science staff and managers is important for their implementation and compliance. In case further information on the roles and responsibilities of institutional ethics is required, it can be found in **CDF Code of Ethics.**

### 6.1. All Scientific Staff

Have the obligation to read this policy, to follow the principles and guidelines set forth in this document, and to express any doubts through the institutional channels, respecting the institutional hierarchy.

In the event of concerns or complaints about scientific conduct in which the immediate heads/PIs/Science Director are involved, it is necessary to report them to the Human Resources Coordinator and Executive Director.

### 6.2. Immediate Heads / PIs

Immediate heads/PIs must additionally:

- Socialize, address, and enforce aspects of scientific conduct addressed by this policy. If necessary, request assistance from the Human Resources Director.
- Lead by example by applying the principles of this instrument in all their daily activities.
- Ensure that your staff in charge know and understand this policy.
- Promote the continued implementation of this policy.
- Ensure that complaints are addressed and submitted to the Science Directorate.

### 6.3. Science Director

The Science Director must additionally:

- Socialize, address, and enforce aspects of the scientific conduct policy. If necessary, request assistance from the Human Resources Director.
- Lead by example, applying the principles of this instrument, in all her daily activities related or not to research.
- Ensure fair treatment in the application of this policy for all processes in which action is required.
- Ensure that the processes related to the Scientific Conduct Policy are carried out in an appropriate, fair manner and following the procedures stipulated in the instrument and in CDF Code of Ethics.

- Receive, document, and analyze complaints about breaches of the Scientific Conduct Policy, and submit them to the Ethics Committee[4], if necessary. This body shall determine the severity of the case and the instrument to which it may be subject for a minor or aggravated sanction.

## 7. Ethics committee

The formation of the Ethics Committee as well as its functions is described in **CDF Code of Ethics** section 16 . A detail of who may be part of the Committee -avoiding the inclusion of people who may have conflicts of interest with aspects that could be addressed by the Committee, within the 'Scientific Conduct' context- can be found in such document. The Committee shall base its actions on the Code of Ethics and the Scientific Conduct Policy.

## 8. Procedure for submitting a report or complaint to the Ethics Committee

Draft a written report addressed to your superior who in turn will submit it to the Science Directorate. The Science Director must request all available documentation to document, analyze and try to solve the reported case. If necessary, assistance may be requested from the Human Resources Coordination. In case of determining that it is a serious breach, the Science Directorate must follow the complaints procedure stated in CDF Code of Ethics.

[4] Code of Ethics of the Charles Darwin Foundation. Section *15. Ethics Committee.*

## 9. Reference and Revised Documents


- Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (ACCR.) (2018.) National Health and Medical Research Council. https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/attachments/grant%20documents/The-australian-code-for-the-responsible-conduct-of-research-2018.pdf
- Danish Committee on Scientific Dishonesty. (2009.) Guidelines for Good Scientific Practice.
- European Commission. (2013.) Ethics for Researchers. Facilitating Research Excellence in FP7. Directorate - General for Research and Innovation. Science in society /Capacities FP7. https://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf
- Fanelli, D. (2009) How Many Scientists Fabricate and Falsify Research? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Survey Data. P.
- Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. (2012.) Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland.
- Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP). (2012.) Code of Good Scientific Practice Sao Paulo Research Foundation.
- Israel, M. and I. Hay (2006.) Research Ethics for Social Scientists Between ethical conduct and regulator y compliance. Sage Publications, London.
- Lemarchand, G.A. (2010) Ciencia para la paz y el desarrollo: el caso del Juramento Hipocrático para Científicos. Estudios y documentos de política científica de ALC, Vol. 2. UNESCO Regional Science Office for Latin America and the Caribbean. Montevideo.
- Mappes, T. A. and J. S. Zembarty (eds.) (1981) Biomedical Ethics. New York, Mc Graw-Hill.
- National Science Foundation. https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rcr.jsp
- Rydén, L. (1984.) Ethical Rules in Basic and Applied Research. Seminar on Science Ethics, University of Uppsala.
- IUCN (2013) Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics for the Secretariat. Office of the Director General Version 2.0.


## 10. Pages Viewed

- https://www.sciencedaily.com/terms/scientific_misconduct.htm
- https://sciencenordic.com/academia-denmark-scientific-misconduct/is-scientific-misconduct-a-bigger-problem-than-we-think/1431434
- https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4449617/
- https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5862244/#:~:text=The%20NIH%20defines%20scientific%20rigor,reproduce%20and%20extend%20the%20findings'.