



## File #18-04

**Subject Member:** Registered Professional Biologist

**Complaint Submitted:** November 1, 2018

**Date of Decision:** February 27, 2019

### Complaint Summary:

A complaint was submitted by a College member (the complainant) against a Registered Professional Biologist (RPBio) alleging unethical conduct. In particular, the allegations were that the RPBio breached the following Principles of the Code of Ethics:

- a) Code of Ethics - Section 1: Provide objective, science-based, unfettered, forthright and intellectually-honest opinion, advice and reports in applied biology.
- b) Code of Ethics - Section 2: Undertake assignments and offer opinions only in areas in which they are competent.
- c) Code of Ethics – Section 3: Ensure they meet a professional standard of care by practicing applied biology with attention, caution, prudence, and due diligence.
- d) Code of Ethics – Section 4: Provide a professional standard of service to clients and employers by conducting business practices fairly, avoiding conflict of interest and respecting client/employer confidentiality.

The RPBio was listed as providing editorial advice on a public document (“the document”) in which data that had been collected and presented by the complainant was used to articulate information about a resource management issue. The complainant alleges the data was misrepresented. The allegations stated that basic mathematical computations were not completed and incorrect conclusions were made and so the document misrepresented factual information. In addition, the complainant alleges the RPBio was working outside their area of expertise.

### Decision:

The Discipline Committee reviewed the information provided by the complainant and requested a response from the RPBio regarding the allegations. Although the RPBio was listed as providing editorial advice on the document, they stated clearly that they were not aware of the details of the document and how the data was used or how the authors arrived at their conclusions. Specifically, the RPBio indicated they were asked to only respond to one small section of the document and did not have any role in writing the document, reviewing overall content, or providing professional advice overall for the document.



COLLEGE OF  
**APPLIED BIOLOGY**

Professional Accountability

Lastly, the RPBio maintains they were never consulted on the final draft of the document, and, while they were asked whether their name could be attached, never gave expressed permission for the authors to do so.

Upon review of the information provided by the RPBio, the Discipline Committee determined that the allegations were not substantiated by the evidence provided and the complaint was dismissed.

Complaint file 18-04 is closed.

