

TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL

STAFF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Introduction

Conflicts of interest in our working lives are natural and unavoidable. The existence of a conflict of interest does not necessarily mean that someone has done something wrong, and it need not cause problems. It just needs to be identified and managed carefully.

The main goal of managing conflicts of interest is to ensure that decisions are made – and are seen to be made – on proper grounds and to be guided by the concepts of integrity, honesty, transparency, openness, independence, good faith, service to the public and without bias. They also need to consider the risk of how an outside observer may reasonably perceive the situation.

Conflicts of interest are not easily managed by a simple set of rules, because they can arise in all sorts of situations. Also, some situations are not clear-cut and may involve questions of degree. Therefore Council staff will often need to exercise prudent judgement on a case-by-case basis.

This document sets out what a conflict is, when it can happen etc. Case studies are provided to illustrate some examples of whom/how/what to do etc.

What is a conflict of interest?

A conflict of interest is where someone is compromised when their personal interests or obligations conflict with the responsibilities of their job or position. It means that their independence, objectivity or impartiality can be called into question.

A conflict of interest can be:

- Actual - where the conflict already exists
- Potential - where the conflict is about to happen, or could happen
- Perceived - where other people might reasonably think that a person has been compromised.

A poorly managed 'perceived' conflict of interest can be just as damaging as a poorly managed 'actual' conflict of interest.

A conflict of interest can also be positive or negative. You could be seen to favour or benefit someone, or be against them and disadvantage them.

While conflicts of interest should be avoided wherever possible, they often happen innocently. It's how they're managed that counts. In the context of a procurement activity, a conflict of interest that's not properly managed could seriously undermine its integrity and lead to complaints, challenges and, in some cases, Council's decision being overturned.

It is important that everyone in Council not only behaves ethically, but is seen to behave ethically.

When can a conflict of interest happen?

A conflict of interest can arise in a number of ways: through a relationship, an activity or strong personal views. For example, a person could be compromised if, in carrying out their work duties, they're required to deal with:

- a relative or close personal friend
- an organisation, club, society or association of which they're a member
- a person who's their community or church leader.
- a person or organisation:

- to which they have a professional or legal obligation
- with which they have a business interest or own property
- to whom they owe money
- for whom they've previously worked, or currently work (secondary employment).

An employee could also be compromised if they are given something from a person who stands to benefit from their decision. For example:

- a gift
- an invitation to lunch, dinner or a sporting event
- free or subsidised travel or accommodation
- any other sort of benefit, including money.

In addition, a conflict can arise if a person holds strong personal views on an issue Council is considering.

Public duty to serve the public interest

The 'public interest' is the collective interest of the entire community. All staff have a public duty to put the public interest above their personal or private interests when carrying out their official duties.

This principle applies to anyone procuring goods or services, whether they are full-time, part-time or temporary employees, casual or contract staff, secondees, consultants and volunteers.

When interests conflict

Conflicts of interest are not wrong in themselves, but they should be properly identified and effectively and transparently managed. When a conflict of interest has been ignored, improperly acted on or influenced actions or decision-making, the conduct (not the conflict itself) can be seen as misconduct, abuse of office or even corruption.

Managing conflicts of interest – a declaration

It's essential that all Council staff involved in a procurement activity complete and sign a Conflict of Interest Declaration. This includes.

- all members of the procurement team (staff, contractors and consultants)
- all members of the evaluation panel
- any consultant asked to advise the team
- anyone involved in making a recommendation
- anyone involved in approving a recommendation or making an important decision
- anyone making a financial approval for the procurement.

The Declaration requires the person to identify any actual, perceived or potential conflicts of interest. If they have none, they can take part in the project.

The Declaration also needs to be revisited regularly and checked once the supplier has been chosen. Everyone who has signed one needs to check whether they have a conflict of interest in relation to the supplier or any of the named personnel in the supplier's tender.

Managing an identified conflict of interest

Conflicts that are identified must be reported to your manager/supervisor. They – and the process for managing them – must then be recorded in writing and filed in Objective [Corporate Management – overview – operational policies processes and procedures – staff conflict of interest] and recorded in the Staff Conflicts of Interest Register [A1259023].

The options for managing a conflict of interest include:

- **restricting:** imposing restrictions on the person's further involvement in the matter
- **recruiting:** engaging an independent third party to oversee all or part of the process and verify its integrity
- **removing:** where the person chooses, or is asked, to be removed completely from the matter
- **relinquishing:** where the person relinquishes the private interest that created the conflict

In the following circumstances, staff are prohibited from:

- being involved in a decision to appoint or employ a relative;
- conducting business on behalf of Council with a relative's company;
- owning shares in (or working for) particular types of organisation that have dealings with (or that are in competition with) Council;
- Influencing or participating in a decision to award grants or contracts where a member is connected to a person or organisation that submitted an application or tender.

Role of Managers and Supervisors

To assist in dealing with conflicts of interest you should:

- understand your role;
- know what a conflict of interest is;
- know Council's policy and procedures regarding conflicts of interest;
- form part of staff induction
- advise staff on how to deal with conflicts of interest;
- create the sort of relationships and environment where open dialogue can take place;
- are vigilant, through constant supervision, and are ready to take action;
- promote a strong ethical culture by talking about conflicts of interest with staff;
- model how to deal with dilemmas and conflicts of interest;
- remove opportunities for wrongdoing; and
- show leadership, together with other managers/supervisors, through decision-making on policies, processes and training.

Handling complaints or breaches of the policy

Any sanctions must act as a deterrent but be proportionate to how serious the breach is.

Reporting conflicts of interest may involve disclosing personal information.

Council will treat all information confidentially according to legislation.

If disclosing a conflict of interest to a supervisor raises privacy concerns, that person may disclose their interests to the Group Manager Corporate and Community, Democracy & Community Engagement Manager, Corporate Solicitor or People and Capability Manager.

Consequences of non-compliance

Individuals are responsible for avoiding and managing any conflict of interest that involves them personally. Any breach of this obligation may result in disciplinary action, which may include dismissal.

Case Studies:

Fictitious case studies have been provided to illustrate how conflicts of interest can arise, and be managed, in practice. They are intended to show the range of scenarios that can occur, and the issues that may need to be considered in assessing their seriousness and deciding how to manage them. They should not be treated as prescriptive for any given situation. They are examples, not rules.

In reality, sometimes a small difference in context or detail can make a critical difference. People will have to exercise their own judgment.

These Guidelines will be reviewed within three years – July 2020.

Author	Democracy & Community Engagement Manager
Approval	Taupō District Council Chief Executive Officer, or the collective Senior Leadership team, has the authority to approve or amend this policy
Approval Date	This version was approved by SLG on 25 May 2017.

The case¹ studies are:

Case study 1: Funding for a club;

Case study 2: Family connection to a tenderer for a contract;

Case study 3: Decision affecting land;

Case study 4: Gifts and hospitality;

Case study 5: Mixing public and private roles;

Case study 6: Personal dealings with a tenderer for a contract;

Case study 7: Duties to two different entities; and

Case study 8: Professional connection to a tenderer.

Case study 1: Funding for a club

Sam is a grants officer for a Crown entity that offers funding to community organisations for a range of environmental projects. In her role, she carries out an initial assessment of applications and writes reports for the committee that will consider and decide on each funding round. She also monitors the use of the funding.

Sam is also a member of a small local residents' association. The association has applied for funding to clean up a local stream and carry out a native shrub replanting programme in her community.

Normally, this application would be one that Sam would deal with in her work.

A conflict of interest exists here. Someone could reasonably allege that Sam's likely desire for her association to be successful in its bid might mean that she will not be completely impartial in the way she analyses this application (and the other applications that are competing for the same pool of money). The decision to be made is specifically about the residents' association, and probably affects its funding in a significant way.

Sam should tell her manager about her personal connection to this application.

Sam's manager should consider the nature of Sam's role in processing these sorts of applications, whether her position has a significant influence on decision-making, and whether it is practicable for someone else in the organisation to work on the particular application.

It may be prudent for Sam's manager to ensure that all of the applications for this particular set of funding (including the applications from others) are processed by someone else. If the manager takes this view, it may also be preferable that the other person should not be someone for whom Sam has line management responsibility. If the application from Sam's association is successful, Sam might also need to be excluded from administering that grant.

¹ Case studies taken from Office of Auditor General - Managing conflicts of interest: Guidance for public entities

Alternatively, it might be the case that no steps are warranted because Sam's role is a low-level administrative one and all the substantive analysis is done by others. Another possibility is that the above steps are impracticable, because Sam is the only person in the organisation who can do the work. In that case, some other option (such as carrying out an additional peer review of her work on the matter) might have to be used.

In this case, a conflict of interest exists even though Sam is not one of the leaders of the residents' association, did not prepare the application, does not personally have a financial interest in the matter, and believes she could still consider all applications fairly and professionally. The association is small, and so Sam is likely to know its leaders well and work closely with them. However, the situation might be different if the association was a large nationwide organisation like Rotary, and the application was from a different branch of that organisation.

Case study 2: Family connection to a tenderer for a contract

Hoani is a project manager for a district health board (DHB). The DHB contracts out some functions to private providers. As part of his role, Hoani is running a tender process for contracts for a provider to deliver certain health services.

Hoani's brother-in-law, who he knows well, is the managing director and a significant shareholder of one of the private companies that is tendering for the latest contract.

A conflict of interest exists here. It is not a financial conflict of interest, because

Hoani is not involved in the tendering company and is not dependent on his brother-in-law. But the family connection to the company is a reasonably close one, and the decision to be made by the DHB directly relates to the company. Hoani is likely to have feelings of loyalty to his brother-in-law (or at least this would be a likely perception).

Hoani should tell his manager about his personal connection to the tendering company, and the manager should assign the management of this particular tender process to someone else. It may also be prudent to take steps to ensure that Hoani does not have access to information about the other tenders, or other confidential information about this particular tender process.

It is relevant to the assessment of this situation that Hoani's relative is in an important role at the tendering company. The answer might be different if the relative was in a much more junior position and was not personally involved in the company's tender, especially if the company was a large one. The answer might also be different if the relative was a distant relative whom Hoani had met only a few times in his life. Assessing the closeness of a personal connection to someone (or the appearance of such closeness) requires careful judgement.

Case study 3: Decision affecting land

Tom is a civil engineer and works for a State-owned enterprise (SOE) that is responsible for a national infrastructure network of gas pipes. The SOE is planning to build a major new mains pipeline to increase supply capacity from a refinery to a large city.

The pipeline has to cross a distance of 300 kilometres, and the SOE has come up with several different options for its route, which it will now consider in more detail. The SOE has to acquire land – compulsorily if necessary – along its chosen route. The project is opposed by many people who live along the possible routes, who fear the pipeline will adversely affect the natural environment and devalue their remaining land. Tom has worked on a number of areas of the project, and has now been appointed to the Route Options Working Group that will assess the route options and make a recommendation to the board.

Tom is also part-owner of a farm that lies directly in the path of one of the route options.

Tom has a conflict of interest here. He has a personal stake in the decision about which route to choose, because his land could be affected. Although the working group is not the final decision-maker in this matter, it does have a key role in analysing the route options and making a recommendation.

Tom should advise his manager that he has an interest in a property affected by one of the options. Tom's role will need to be considered carefully. It may be that Tom does not mind whether the pipeline ends up crossing his land – he may not share any of the concerns of the project's opponents. He may believe that he could contribute conscientiously to the working group to help it arrive at the best technical answer. But his manager should bear in mind the risk that, if Tom's personal connection becomes publicly known, others might easily think that it could affect his views or actions.

His manager might have to remove him from the working group and assign him to other tasks. (There may be other aspects of the project that Tom remains well-suited to work on, which have no connection to the question of which route to choose.) It may also be prudent to ensure that Tom does not have access to confidential information about the decision before it is made public, in case he is considering selling his land.

Alternatively, Tom's expertise may be indispensable to the project, or he may have a very small part in the overall process. Some other options might therefore need to be considered (such as only partly limiting his role, or imposing extra supervision).

Case study 4: Gifts and hospitality

Rawiri works in the corporate services division of a government department. As part of his role, he manages the department's contractual relationship with its preferred rental car provider. The arrangement with this preferred supplier has been in place for several years, and so the department has decided to re-tender the contract. Rawiri has told the existing provider that he will soon be inviting expressions of interest for a new contract from the existing provider and its main competitors.

Rawiri has regular relationship management meetings with the existing provider.

At a recent meeting, the provider offered to fly him to another city to inspect a new fleet of cars that will shortly be available, and said that the provider would also be able to arrange for Rawiri to have complimentary corporate box tickets to a rugby test match that happened to be on that night, and to stay on for the weekend in a downtown hotel.

This situation creates risks at any time, but especially given the imminent tender process. Rawiri might not be seen as impartial if he is involved in choosing the new preferred supplier. A competitor of the existing provider could allege that Rawiri is being given an inducement or reward in the implicit expectation that he will look more favourably on the existing provider in the coming tender round (or that he will receive further gifts if the existing provider is successful).

Rawiri should discuss the offer with his manager, and carefully consider the department's policy on gifts and hospitality. Given the circumstances, it would not be appropriate to accept the offer of the sports tickets and hotel accommodation. With the offer to be flown to another city to inspect the new fleet of cars, careful consideration should be given to whether business reasons can justify the visit. (If it goes ahead, the public entity might decide to offer to pay the cost of it.) If other forms of gift or hospitality have already been accepted, the appropriateness of Rawiri having a role in the coming tender process might need to be reconsidered, too.

This does not mean that gifts must always be refused. It is reasonable to consider the value or nature of the gift and extent of personal benefit (for example, it may be acceptable to accept a gift that is inexpensive and widely distributed). The context and reason or occasion for the gift is relevant, too. For an entity that operates in a more commercial environment, some types of gift or hospitality may be seen as a necessary element in maintaining relationships with stakeholders and clients. However, in Rawiri's case, the risk is higher because of the proximity to the coming tender round where a strict and fair process will need to be followed (and because the justification for at least some elements of the offer appears dubious).

Case study 5: Mixing public and private roles

Antonia is a senior scientist working for a Crown research institute (CRI). The CRI has developed a new product that has significant revenue-earning potential, and Antonia has worked on the product as part of her role in the CRI. However, the CRI needs help in manufacturing and marketing the product on a large scale, so plans to enter into a joint venture with a private company. The CRI is considering appointing Antonia as one of its representatives on the governing body of the joint venture.

Coincidentally, Antonia is also a shareholder in the private company that will be the CRI's joint venture partner (although she had no role in the CRI's selection of it).

The situation creates a conflict of interest for Antonia. She stands to benefit from the financial success of the private company. The fact that there may be no direct disadvantage to the CRI (because the joint venture partners are working together, hopefully for their mutual benefit) does not remove the conflict of interest. Her interests in both the CRI and the private company could create confusion about her role and primary loyalty. She could be accused of using her official position in a way that advances her own private interests.

Antonia should advise her manager. It will probably be necessary for Antonia not to be given any major role in governing or managing the joint venture, while she has an interest in the private company.

Antonia's manager might also need to think carefully about what other work, if any, it is appropriate for Antonia to do on the project in her capacity as a CRI employee. This decision may not be clear-cut. Antonia might be the best person in the CRI to carry out certain tasks, but the risk is that she could be regarded as spending a large part of her time as an employee of a public entity, and using the CRI's resources, to carry out work that has a significant element of private benefit for her. Her manager might judge that some involvement in the project is acceptable (or even necessary), but it may also be desirable to confine this. For example, Antonia's role could be changed so that she does not have the ability to influence decisions about how the joint venture and project are run. Alternatively, Antonia might be asked to give up one of her roles – that of employee or that of shareholder.

If circumstances changed to a point where the CRI and the private company became direct competitors with each other, then Antonia's situation might become even more difficult (especially if she remains in a senior position at the CRI, or is still involved in this particular area of work). In that case, it may become necessary for Antonia's manager to insist on divestment of one or other role – either that she relinquish her private interest or leave her job.³

Case study 6: Personal dealings with a tenderer for a contract

Sandra is a consultant who specialises in project management. Her services have been engaged by a government department to help it carry out a new building project. As part of this role, Sandra has been asked to analyse the tenders for the construction contract and provide advice to the department's tender evaluation panel.

Sandra has a lot of personal knowledge about one of the tenderers for the construction contract. She used that firm to build her own house last year, and she is currently using it to carry out structural alterations on several investment properties that she owns. Because of this, she knows the directors of the company very well, and has a high regard for their work.

This situation may create a conflict of interest for Sandra. She is expected to impartially and professionally assess each of the tenders, yet she could be regarded as being too close to one of the tenderers.

In Sandra's case, it is probably unwise for her to play a role in the selection of the tenderer, and she should be replaced for that role. (This may or may not require ending the consultancy arrangement altogether, depending on what else Sandra has been engaged to do.) Her dealings with the firm are recent and significant. The risk is that, if this firm wins the contract, Sandra's personal connections with it might allow someone to allege that the department's decision is tainted by favouritism.

These sorts of situations are not always clear-cut. Particularly in small or specialised industries, people often have had some degree of personal knowledge of, or previous dealings with, other people or organisations that they have to make decisions about. That is not necessarily wrong. Indeed, they will often be chosen for this role precisely because of their experience or expert knowledge, and that might include general impressions about the reputation or competence of others. So, sometimes, these sorts of connections might be judged to be too remote or insignificant. For instance, in this case, the response would probably be different if the firm's private work for Sandra had been a single, smaller job carried out several years ago.

To take another similar example, careful judgement would also be necessary if the connection was instead that the tendering firm was run by a friend or acquaintance of Sandra. For example, it might

be improper for Sandra to be involved in assessing the tenders if the firm was run by a very good friend she had known for many years and who had attended her wedding. By contrast, there might not be any problem if Sandra simply knew the person in a casual way through membership of the same sports club. Further careful judgements might be necessary if Sandra had worked for the firm. For instance, the situation might be problematic if she had been a full-time employee within the last year, or was also currently providing significant consultancy advice to the firm on another matter. On the other hand, it might not be problematic if she had worked for the firm several years ago, or if she had provided only occasional pieces of consultancy advice in the past.

This case also shows that public entities need to think about whether and how to manage conflicts of interest that arise for someone who is not a member or employee, but is instead a consultant or contractor. Sandra's role is important to the department and affects a key decision it has to make, and so can expose the department to legal and political risk. She should be required to agree to abide by the relevant conflict of interest policy that exists for staff. The departmental manager who oversees her work should ensure that she understands the policy, and should monitor her in the same way as an employee.

Case study 7: Duties to two different entities

Jean-Paul is a member of the council of a tertiary education institution (TEI). The TEI has some contracting arrangements with private organisations to help to deliver some educational courses. One of those arrangements is with a charitable trust, under which the trust is funded by the TEI to prepare, administer, and teach the course on behalf of the TEI. However, the TEI is now about to decide whether to discontinue this arrangement.

Jean-Paul also happens to be one of the trustees of the charitable trust.

Jean-Paul has a conflict of interest in this decision. He may not be affected personally by the decision, but the trust will be, and he is closely associated with the trust. (The conflict of interest may be particularly acute if the course is a significant source of the trust's funding and ongoing viability.) In addition, as a member of the governing body of the TEI, Jean-Paul has a duty to act in the best interests of the TEI, but, as a trustee, he also has a duty to act in the best interests of the trust. In this case, the best outcome for one entity may not be the best outcome for the other, and so it may be impossible for Jean-Paul to faithfully give effect to his obligations to both entities.

Jean-Paul should declare a conflict of interest at relevant meetings of the TEI's council, and refrain from discussing or voting on the TEI's decision. It might be wise for him not to be provided with confidential information about the matter. Jean-Paul may also need to consider whether he has a conflict of interest in the matter at meetings of the trust.

Case study 8: Professional connection to a tenderer

Viliami works for a large multi-disciplinary professional services firm. Viliami, through his firm, has been engaged by an SOE to help it choose a contractor to manage a major land development project. Viliami is the person who will provide expert advice to the panel that considers tenders.

Another division of Viliami's firm wishes to submit a tender for the project.

A conflict of interest exists here. Viliami will be providing advice about a matter that affects his own firm. Viliami does not personally have two conflicting roles, but his firm does, and that creates a problem for him. In some situations involving organisational connections, different individuals in the organisation can be managed by insisting on a "Chinese wall" separation of roles and information. Because this device is not always entirely satisfactory, it is best reserved for situations when the connection is almost inevitable or the risk is very low. In this case, however, the connection is fairly direct, even though it is not intended that Viliami be one of the individuals managing the project. Another tenderer might object that he is unlikely to be impartial. The risk of challenge could be high, especially if the project is worth a lot of money.

Viliami should discuss the matter with the relevant manager in the SOE. If his firm's tender is to be considered, it is likely that Viliami will not be able to continue with his role. Alternatively, when it first

engaged Viliami's services, the SOE could have insisted on a condition that his firm would not be permitted to tender for the project.