GUIDANCE

on the application of the precautionary principle in the EU

REconciling s**C**ience, **I**nnovation and
Precaution through the **E**ngagement of **S**takeholders

RECIPES
Precaution • Innovation • Science

Editors

Niels-Kristian Tjelle Holm, *The Danish Board of Technology*
Marion Dreyer, *DIALOGIK non-profit institute for communication and cooperation research*

Authors

Johannes Andresen Oldervoll, *University of Bergen, Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities, Ch. 4*
Desislava Asenova, *Applied Research and Communications Fund, Ch. 5*
Adriana Dimova, *Applied Research and Communications Fund, Ch. 5*
Marion Dreyer, *DIALOGIK non-profit institute for communication and cooperation research, Ch. 4*
Laura Elisabet Drivdal, *University of Bergen, Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities, Ch. 4*
Tijs Sikma, *Rathenau Institute, Ch. 3*
Pia-Johanna Schweizer, *Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies, Ch. 5*
Jeroen van der Sluijs, *University of Bergen, Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities, Ch. 3, 4*
Kristel De Smedt, *Maastricht University, Faculty of Law, Ch. 3*
Julie Thornvig, *The Danish Board of Technology, Ch. 5*
Niels-Kristian Tjelle Holm, *The Danish Board of Technology, Ch.5*
Dino Trescher, *Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies, Ch. 5*
Ellen Vos, *Maastricht University, Faculty of Law, Ch. 3*

Contributors

Sofia Camorani, *Maastricht University, Faculty of Law, Ch. 3*
Frank Dratsdrummer, *DIALOGIK non-profit institute for communication and cooperation research, Ch. 4*
Matthias Kaiser, *University of Bergen, Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities, Ch. 4*
Aske Palsberg, *The Danish Board of Technology, Ch. 5*
Jeroen van der Sluijs, *University of Bergen, Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities, Ch. 5*

Layout

Jennifer Rahn, *Ecologic Institute*

With thanks to

The RECIPES consortium for review and feedback;
David Gee, René von Schomberg, Roger Strand, *Ch. 5*

Manuscript completed in April, 2022

Acknowledgments and Disclaimer

The RECIPES team is very grateful to those whose contributions have informed the development of the RECIPES guidance on the application of the precautionary principle in the EU. We owe a considerable debt of gratitude to the participants in RECIPES citizen meetings, the interview partners of the RECIPES case studies, the participants in the multi-step stakeholder consultation process on the future application of the precautionary principle, and the members of RECIPES advisory panel. We acknowledge with great appreciation that these individuals took their time to commit themselves to our work and provided us with valuable input, feedback and ideas.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 824665.

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information. The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

What is RECIPES?

The RECIPES project aims to reconcile innovation and precaution by developing tools and guidelines to ensure the precautionary principle is applied while still encouraging innovation. The RECIPES project works closely with different stakeholders through interviews, workshops and webinars.

Project title: *RE*conciling s*C*ience, *I*nnovation and *P*recaution through the *E*ngagement of *S*takeholders
Project consortium: 11 partners from 7 European countries
Project duration: 01/2019 – 06/2022
Project website: *recipes-project.eu*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Boxes

Table of Figures

1 OVERALL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The RECIPES guidance advises on how to deal responsibly with uncertain risks[i] in the development and implementation of technology in the EU. It helps EU risk regulation and innovation policy to use the precautionary principle for responsible technological innovation.

Target groups of this guidance are primarily EU policymakers, EU agencies[ii], and EU policy support organisations and bodies[iii] that are concerned with risk regulation or the governance of science, technology and innovation. The guidance offers them ideas about how to further improve addressing uncertain risks in EU risk regulation and innovation policy.

The guidance also addresses researchers and innovators and the multitude of societal actors who can contribute to a society-wide innovation system. The guidance illustrates to these target groups how their contributions are needed for applying the precautionary principle for responsible technological innovation.

Key messages

- **The precautionary principle works best in a double role: as a safeguard and a compass.** As a legal principle and safeguard, it can justify early policy or regulatory action to manage uncertain risks. As such, it ensures that the rights of current and future EU citizens are protected. As a compass and policy principle in research and innovation, the precautionary principle can trigger debates upstream and research about the potential impacts of emerging technologies and related innovation pathways, and can lead to adjustments in innovation development and stimulate responsible innovation. Through this double role, the precautionary principle enhances the EU's capacity to anticipate, identify and proactively manage scientifically uncertain, but plausible and potentially serious risks, and contributes to (re)directing science and technology to societally beneficial ends.

- Precaution is often defined as a risk management principle applied after scientific assessment takes place. However, there is good reason to **invoke the precautionary principle in risk assessment (as well as in problem scoping)**. Such an approach **safeguards against understating uncertainty** and opting by default for the application of a more narrowly focused quantitative risk assessment that is inadequate for dealing with states of knowledge characterised by strong uncertainties and/or ignorance. The overall process of risk governance should be precautionary in the sense that it is sensitive throughout to uncertainties and knowledge gaps and to potentially serious harm.

i 'Uncertain risks' are understood in the RECIPES guidance as threats for which it is not possible to confidently quantify the magnitude of a defined and agreed range of outcomes or the probabilities of these outcomes.
ii For example, the European Environmental Agency (EEA) or the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).
iii For example, the Science Advice for Policy by European Academies (SAPEA), the European Political Strategy Centre (EPSC), or the European Parliament's Panel for the Future of Science and Technology (STOA).

- **Early and recurrent risk research and anticipatory and foresight processes in risk and innovation** governance (precautionary principle as a compass) are a cornerstone in responsible innovation. Responsible innovation obliges researchers to remain sensitive to the plausible social and ecological impacts in ongoing research and development processes, and in the development of emergent and potentially future-shaping technologies. From a responsible innovation perspective, the precautionary principle is essential to help ensure responsive, adaptive and integrated management of the innovation process.

- **Participation of relevant stakeholders and knowledge holders is another cornerstone in responsible innovation.** A transdisciplinary approach is required where not only scientific experts from multiple disciplines but also other knowledge-holders (e.g., professionals, workers, consumers or local people) are asked to contribute their specific knowledge regarding the likely consequences of the particular technology under scrutiny that may carry uncertain risks. Moreover, participatory processes can uncover and help address conflicts of knowledge, values and interests in connection with dealing with uncertain risks.


© unsplash.com / Josh Hild

Why is it strategically relevant to address the relationship between precaution and innovation?

The precautionary principle is an important instrument for EU law and policy. The precautionary principle allows policymakers to adopt decisions to counter potential serious harm, despite a situation of scientific uncertainty.

The precautionary principle is a general principle of EU law, laid down in the EU Treaty and case law. This implies that there are principally no defined boundaries with regards to the question to which risks or what technologies the precautionary principle can be applied. It should be noted though that in each application of the principle the scope of application is informed by the relevant laws.

The precautionary principle is an open and flexible principle. It is not – and cannot be – used as a rigid decision-making instrument. The principle urges policy-makers to carefully reflect on the situation and the uncertainties around it, but does not offer predetermined solutions. This also implies that policymakers have more discretion compared to situations of standard risk management. The best course of action in the case of an uncertain risk depends greatly

on the context of the situation. This emphasis on prudence – and the subsequent open-endedness and flexibility – forms, arguably, the core strength of the principle.

The use of the precautionary principle, however, also poses challenges to policymakers. They are expected to manoeuvre levels of uncertainty to find the right course of action in a specific situation. Meanwhile, different stakeholders might address them with varying demands and considerations. Some stakeholders fear that the precautionary principle is applied haphazardly, thereby discouraging innovation. Others are afraid that the scope of the precautionary principle will be too limited, resulting in serious harm to public health and the environment.

There have been fierce debates among EU-level stakeholders about the relationship between precaution and innovation in the wake of the emerging notion of an 'innovation principle' at the European level.[iv] In this debate, it is important to clarify the application of the precautionary principle, in particular with respect to its influence on innovation.

There is a need to further discuss and clarify how the precautionary principle can help implement a transformation-oriented and value-driven approach to innovation as envisioned by the current research and innovation strategy of the European Commission (2020-2024). This strategy identifies research and innovation as a key driver in achieving the European Commission's goals that are geared towards a sustainable and prosperous future for people and the planet, based on solidarity and respect for shared European values. We need a better understanding of how the precautionary principle can help guide established technologies and technological development towards a high level of protection of human health and the environment and of social rights (such as the right to safe and healthy work) in the implementation of the desired transformation towards sustainability. **Considering the precautionary principle as a safeguard and compass can make an important contribution to developing this understanding.**

iv The RECIPES policy brief dealing with the innovation principle can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-03/PolicyBrief_Recipes_Online20200320_01.pdf.

What can you expect from this guidance?

The guidance connects the precautionary principle with a new concept of governing research and innovation.

The RECIPES project has demonstrated the clear **relevance that the precautionary principle has at international, EU and national level.**[v] It was in the 1970s that precautionary thinking was first developed as a legal principle in domestic law, notably in Germany (the so-called 'Vorsorgeprinzip'), Switzerland and Sweden. Since then it has been increasingly incorporated by states and international institutions in various international instruments and conventions, by the EU in the Maastricht Treaty, and by several EU Member States in their national legislation. At EU level, the precautionary principle is not only a key principle for EU environmental policy, but also by virtue of the integration principle included in all policy areas. While the focus of application is still in the 'traditional' policy areas of environmental, consumer and health protection, the principle has gained relevance in other policy fields as well.

Various interpretations of the principle are applied at international, EU and national level. They differ, amongst others, in the ways they draw on the several normative underpinnings and ethical considerations that the precautionary principle incorporates (albeit not explicitly). Still, the various versions of the precautionary principle share a **common basic idea**: we should not require full evidence of harm to protect us from potentially dangerous effects from for example a product, service or technology. To put it in the vernacular: **When in doubt, be cautious.**

The RECIPES guidance **links the precautionary principle to the more recent notion of 'responsible innovation' and highlights the precautionary principle as an important enabler** in the implementation of this new approach to the governance of research and innovation.

v The RECIPES stock-taking report on the application of the precautionary principle can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/taking-stock-precautionary-principle-2000.

"Responsible Research and Innovation" was introduced as a crosscutting issue under the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation "Horizon 2020" (2014-2020), and became an operational objective of the strategic plan for the next and current EU Framework Programme, "Horizon Europe" (2021-2027). In EU Member States, there are also research funding initiatives that operate under responsible innovation taken by national research councils such as, for example, the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), and the Dutch or the Norwegian Research Council. The concept also resonated internationally, notably in the United States.

Scholars have provided a variety of perspectives of what needs to be addressed by responsible innovations. The editors of an International Handbook on Responsible Innovation however see a shared notion: "Responsible innovation advocates will argue that the innovation process is neither steerless nor inherently good. Instead of being steerless, innovation can be managed and a growing body of research constitutes a testimony on how we can manage innovation and shape technologies in accordance with societal values and expectations as well as (re-direct) them towards normative targets such as sustainability goals."

Responsible Innovation: A new concept for the governance of research and innovation. Source of quote: von Schomberg, R., & Hankins, J. (2019). Introduction to the International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. In: von Schomberg, R., & Hankins, J. (eds.), International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. A Global Resource, Edward Elgar, 1-11, here p. 1.

© unsplash.com / Ari Spada

A key prerequisite for responsible innovation is a form of governance that will drive innovation towards societally desirable outcomes, using inclusive innovation processes in which all the relevant actors commit themselves to these outcomes. The European Green Deal and the EU Framework Programme Horizon Europe with its mission-oriented approach and the thematic clusters centred around the United Nations' Sustainability Development Goals can be seen as incorporating this idea.

Another key prerequisite for responsible innovation is a form of governance that will improve dealing with **unintended consequences of innovation in the process of research and innovation**. This requires mechanisms for anticipating and responding to possible harm associated with innovation and applies to innovations which promise to deliver a collectively defined societal purpose (e.g., climate protection technologies can also have unintended and undesired effects that need to be addressed) as well as to innovations in general. The concept of responsible innovation addresses the observation that market innovations do not automatically lead to results that are beneficial to society as a whole or else may be accompanied by negative side effects.

Science and technology scholars have argued that there is a need to promote **anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion and responsiveness** in the governance of science, technology and innovation. More anticipatory, reflexive, inclusive and responsive forms of governing make it easier to raise, discuss and respond to questions about both the intended and unintended impacts of science, technology and innovation. They facilitate directing or re-directing innovation, and the science and research intended to lead to it, towards societally beneficial ends such as sustainability goals or maintaining high levels of protection of human and environmental health.

Anticipation: *"Anticipation involves systematic thinking aimed at increasing resilience, while revealing new opportunities for innovation and the shaping of agendas for socially-robust risk research."*

Reflexivity: *"Reflexivity, at the level of institutional practice, means holding a mirror up to one's own activities, commitments and assumptions, being aware of the limits of knowledge and being mindful that a particular framing of an issue may not be universally held."*

Inclusion: *"The waning of the authority of expert, top-down policy-making has been associated with a rise in the inclusion of new voices in the governance of science and innovation as part of a search for legitimacy […]."* Inclusion could mean taking the time to involve different stakeholders as to lay bare the different impacts of a new technology on different communities.

Responsiveness: *"Responsible innovation requires a capacity to change shape or direction in response to stakeholder and public values and changing circumstances". "There are various mechanisms that might allow innovation to respond to improved anticipation, reflexivity and inclusion. In some cases,* ***application of the precautionary principle****, a moratorium or a code of conduct may be appropriate. Existing approaches to technology assessment and foresight may be widened to engender improved responsiveness […]."* (emphasis added)

Four integrated dimensions of responsible innovation. Source of quotes: Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568-1580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008

The guidance highlights how the precautionary principle as safeguard and compass can be used for responsible technological innovation

The RECIPES guidance shows that the **precautionary principle can serve as an important tool** to make innovation governance more anticipatory, more reflexive, more inclusive and deliberative, and, overall, more responsive in the EU. Specifically, it highlights how the precautionary principle can be used for **responsible technological innovation in the EU**. In the past, scientific and technological progress have not necessarily been accompanied by human or environmental progress. In the context of the increasing transgression of planetary boundaries, in many cases because of (unsustainable) technologies, the need for governments to take responsibility grows significantly. The guidance subsequently answers responds to an urgent need for more guidance on when and in what ways the precautionary principle can be applied towards new or established technologies.[vi]

The document identifies **two ways** in which the precautionary principle can operate for responsible technological innovation in the EU: s**afeguard and compass**. The safeguard function builds on the precautionary principle as a **legal principle**, the compass function on the precautionary principle as a **policy principle**.

The RECIPES guidance provides orientation and inspiration regarding the proposed two-way use of the precautionary principle by

- outlining the founding features of the idea of precaution and the application of the precautionary principle with a special focus on the relationship between precaution and innovation.
- pointing out possible ways forward in the two-way use of the precautionary principle to enhance EU's capacity to anticipate, identify and manage scientifically uncertain, but potentially serious risks in technological innovation.
- pointing to existing tools and guidelines that can contribute to enhancing this capacity: by helping to build a strong basis of expertise for assessing and communicating uncertainties and for related decision-making, and by helping to include relevant input (knowledge, values, concerns) of societal actors in dealing with uncertain risks through participatory processes.

RECIPES Guidance: Two-way use of the precautionary principle for responsible innovation

RECIPES research has identified scope of application, organisation of expertise, and participation as three **key themes for the application of the precautionary principle**. The idea of considering the precautionary principle as a safeguard and compass is introduced in the part of the RECIPES guidance that deals with the scope of application of the precautionary principle. It is taken up in the other two parts of the guidance, i.e., the one concerned with organisation of expertise for application of the precautionary principle, and the one dealing with participation processes in support of the application of the precautionary principle.

vi The focus of the guidance includes new and existing technologies as well as cross-cutting technologies such as nanotechnology and specific technologies such as weed control products. The RECIPES case study on the latter illustrates the importance of the precautionary principle in addressing systemic challenges such as biodiversity loss.

Themes addressed in the RECIPES guidance



Scope of application: relates to issues such as when and how the precautionary principle is to be applied, considering its relationship with innovation; it introduces a two-way use of the precautionary principle, as safeguard and compass, and points to six phases in the application of the precautionary principle.

Organisation of expertise: revolves around the question of how to organise and collect and co-create in a timely manner the actionable knowledge required for applying the precautionary principle.

Participation: concerns conceptual and methodological issues in terms of when to involve stakeholders, whom to involve, and how, when applying the precautionary principle.

The bulk of the points of the stakeholders, who participated in the RECIPES consultation process on how to improve the application of the precautionary principle in the EU, was related to one or more of these three themes. The themes played, to varying degrees, a role in the RECIPES case studies, and the relevant literature recognises them as important topics in the interpretation and application of the precautionary principle (below you will find more information about the main sources of information of the RECIPES guidance).

Scope of application of the precautionary principle

Precautionary principle as a safeguard and legal principle

On the one hand, **the precautionary principle acts as a legal safeguard**, through its formal inclusion in EU policies or regulations for the authorisation of products or processes. As a safeguard and legal principle, the precautionary principle can justify early policy or regulatory action in a context of uncertainty to avoid potentially serious harm. It can also justify a policy reform under conditions of uncertainty such as the new EU chemicals strategy, which is part of the European Green Deal and aims to ensure that all new chemicals and materials are inherently safe and sustainable, from production to end of life.

As a safeguard, the precautionary principle works as an appeal to prudence: the precautionary principle allows policymakers and legislators to intervene despite scientific uncertainty when there are reasonable grounds for concern that significant harm may occur through a new technology or that an existing technology may be more harmful than initially expected. This 'permission to act' reflects the limits of science in providing full certainty. Even in cases of scientific uncertainty policymakers should still be able to act in order to ensure the appropriate level of protection. As such, the precautionary principle functions as a guiding principle which provides helpful criteria for determining the best course of action in confronting situations of potential risk and scientific uncertainty on the probability of harm arising and the extent of the harm.

> *The RECIPES guidance proposes to use the precautionary principle in two ways, as safeguard and compass.*

For the application of the precautionary principle as a safeguard the following elements are to be considered: scientific uncertainty (related, for example, to a lack of knowledge or a situation of ambiguity), seriousness of risk (a particular threshold of possible harm must be present, but EU institutions enjoy some discretion in establishing what counts as reasonable grounds for concern), level of scientific analysis (a scientific examination must have been done), and characteristics of the uncertain risks.

Scientifically underpinned grounds for concern are enough to justify precautionary action in cases of uncertain risks. In such cases, action requires neither scientific certainty nor an exhaustive risk assessment. Uncontested scientific proof of risk cannot be available in cases of uncertain risks. In 2021 the EU Court of Justice re-confirmed with regard to plant protection products that *"an exhaustive risk assessment cannot be required in a situation where the precautionary principle is applied, which equates to a situation in which there is scientific uncertainty"*.[1]

The use of cost-benefit analysis is of limited value in cases that require the precautionary principle. Not only can the risks assessment of new products and technologies be plagued by inconclusive evidence and uncertainties, but also the proclaimed benefits can often not be known (exactly) beforehand. Fundamentally unknown costs cannot be weighed against fundamentally unknown benefits without making highly speculative assumptions. If risks can be reliably quantified it is the principle of prevention that is applicable instead, and regulators can set an acceptable risk level and implement the risk reduction measures needed to keep the risk at an acceptable level.[vii]

© unsplash.com / Andras Joo

The choice of who or what gets the benefit of the doubt is a policy issue and should be made explicitly. The decision on whether precautionary action is justified in a given situation needs to take into account the 'knowledge condition' (e.g., reasonable grounds for concern) and consider what is at stake for whom, and subsequently choose which interest(s) is/are given the benefit of the doubt: environmental protection, public health, social rights, intergenerational justice, national economy, or specific economic interests, to name just a few. Such risk-management decisions need to be informed by transparent deliberation over and communication of the outcomes of the risk assessment (what is known or unknown, can be known, cannot be known) and in consideration of wider social and economic factors, legal requirements such as a chosen level of environmental or human health protection, and policy imperatives such as the Sustainable Development Goals.

Precautionary principle as a compass

Besides being a safeguard and legal principle, the precautionary principle should also be applied as a **compass and policy principle** in research and innovation. In this function the precautionary principle:

- triggers upstream debates and research about the potential impacts of emerging technologies and related innovation pathways;
- helps anticipate potential risks and unintended outcomes;
- helps stimulate early adjustments in innovation development.

vii However, what is acceptable at one point in time may not be at a later point, so that reviews of risk management are required.

This implies a broadening of innovation processes in two ways: making space for the societal and environmental aspects of the technology besides only the technical, scientific and economic ones, and anticipating how the technology will function in society.

The compass function of the precautionary principles links to the dilemma of control. By the time the environmental, health-related and other social implications of technologies become manifest (possibly only in multi-decadal timeframes), they may be widely embedded in societal structures so that a change of direction is hardly or no longer possible. Use of the precautionary principle as a compass and policy approach means carrying out activities at an **early stage and on an ongoing basis** in technology development to **anticipate** possible risks. One example activity is funding of early and ongoing risk research. Another example activity is making early and repeated use of foresight approaches or extended forms of technology assessment (such as constructive technology assessment), in order to elucidate the possible risks and benefits by projecting different scenarios of innovation development and their effects. Exploring possible risks and benefits for affected groups (e.g., consumers or workers) and for vulnerable groups (e.g., children or elderly people) and groups that cannot speak for themselves (e.g., future generations) requires the inclusion of different expert disciplines (e.g., to deal with both physical and social impacts). Experience-based and practical knowledge is also needed; therefore the exploration should take place with the engagement of stakeholders. The time lags associated with non-linear impacts also require including groups of young people and addressing the issue of intergenerational equity.

It is part of the dilemma of control that anticipation may not provide scientific evidence for adjustments in the innovation process because the technology is not yet sufficiently developed and widespread. Anticipation can, however, **help to understand the relevant uncertainties and possible ways of exploring alternative innovation pathways**. Anticipation activities are already taking place in EU innovation governance, but could be applied more widely and systematically.

The knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass and policy principle can stimulate responsible innovation. Responsible innovation can consist of technologies that support new ways of living that are more protective for humans and the environment alike. It can also consist in the nurturing of more diverse innovation approaches (including social innovation) that help to better prepare for identified uncertainties, e.g. in regard to how a technology will work in different cultural, social and ecological settings. The knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass can also help **promote a timely and more broadly informed application of the precautionary principle** in EU risk policy and regulation.

Phases of applying the precautionary principle

The six phases of the application of the precautionary principle can be summarised as follows: (1) ensuring value-based innovation processes, (2) a priori risk reduction through anticipation, (3) early warnings, (4) assessing the situation, (5) deciding on the appropriate measures and (6) monitoring the situation. The first two phases concern the use of the precautionary principle as a compass. The first step involves the choices as to what kind of innovation is going to be made, considering what innovations are needed for the pursuit of values that drive EU policy such as a high level of protection of human health and environment, qual-

ity of life or sustainable development. By anticipating possible negative side effects of alternative technological or socio-technical innovation pathways, the precautionary principle can help steer technology and innovation development into societally beneficial directions. The precautionary principle as a safeguard is relevant as soon as there are reasonable grounds for concern as regards a specific technology. The principle also benefits risk assessment processes by pointing to scientific uncertainty and knowledge gaps. Moreover, evaluation should be made as to which measures are appropriate to implement, considering what can and should be done, as well as who can and should act. Finally, the situation should be monitored once the measures have been taken.

Organisation of expertiset for the two-way use of the precautionary principle

Risk assessment, technology assessment as well as innovation policies and funding need to be well-informed by the precautionary principle to ensure that situations that require consideration of the precautionary principle can be detected more adequately and in a timely manner, and to ensure that new technologies become less likely to bring new risks. The well-organised and timely collection and generation of *actionable knowledge*[2] is key for dealing prudently with uncertain risks. Actionable knowledge for applying the precautionary principle is knowledge on the severity and nature of potential adverse effects, the nature of the uncertainties on the risks and proclaimed benefits, explicit articulation of knowledge gaps regarding risks and benefits, and knowledge of possible alternatives to the risky technology or product under scrutiny.


© pixabay / Hubi_img

Pluralisation of expert knowledge in scientific assessment is essential to ensure that science advice for policy (risk management and innovation governance) is in line with the best available evidence and considers all relevant scientific issues and knowledges. It should be ensured that as much relevant knowledge and experience as possible is brought to bear on decision-making about uncertain risks. This requires a transdisciplinary approach where not only scientific experts from multiple disciplines, but also other knowledge-holders (e.g., professionals, workers, consumers or local people) are asked to contribute their specific knowledge regarding the likely consequences of the particular technology under scrutiny.

The EU needs to develop good practices and build capacity regarding how actionable knowledge for precaution can be fruitfully pluralised. It is important to explicitly identify and mobilise relevant knowledge-holders regarding the issue at hand. It further requires that risk assessors work with a greater diversity of ways of knowing than it is the case today. Good practices need to be developed for weaving a wider range of knowledge, such as experience-based or practical

knowledge into risk assessments. Participatory and deliberative governance approaches play a crucial role here *(see next section)*. To pursue pluralisation of knowledge while attending to power requires preventing corporate capture or misinformation campaigners slipping into spaces of knowledge co-creation.

Explicit and transparent problem scoping in risk assessment is essential to ensure that the right questions are addressed, relevant aspects and dimensions of the issue are not overlooked, and problem boundaries in the assessment of the uncertain risks are set wide enough to include the concerns of those affected by the risks and the risk regulation.

Policymakers should require that risk assessment includes systematic and transparent appraisal of scientific uncertainties, knowledge gaps and ignorance. An informed application of the precautionary principle requires that risk assessment authorities identify and characterise the concrete nature of the limitedness or even absence of scientific knowledge (known unknowns and data gaps) in a given case, and communicate the uncertainties and conclusions about the plausibility of possible adverse effects to policymakers and risk managers.

There is room to reform the regulatory system to become more flexible to act on early warnings and more open to include externally produced knowledge (various forms of knowledge produced outside of academia or governmental agencies) in routinised assessment processes and guidelines. It should consider a wide range of potentially relevant aspects of risks, including non-standardised so-called 'endpoints' of the risk assessment. There are reported cases in the past, where uncertain risks that should have required precautionary action were overlooked due to blind spots in the risk assessment protocols and guidance documents used by EU agencies. Knowledge about risks that do not fit in these protocols (mostly academic scientific studies published in peer-reviewed literature) were downplayed, marginalised or ignored. Too often, it is necessary that coalitions of concerned scientists and societal actors step in and 'break the script' of routinised assessment and management processes in order to recognise key uncertainties and the potential for serious harm to human and environmental health.

Limited learning and information sharing across regulatory domains weakens the system's overall capacity to identify, understand and manage plausible threats. Ongoing reforms towards a holistic approach to chemical authorisation and regulation at EU level ('one chemical, one assessment') could lead to improved outcomes. Steps must be taken to ensure that efforts to streamline research and assessment methodologies across agencies and issue areas do not create new blind spots.

Regrettable substitution tends to arise from a lack of foresight and non-contextual, substance-centric thinking. The potential for incremental learning through repeated assessments of similar substances may be a strength and not a weakness.

The search for less harmful and ecologically more sustainable alternatives needs to inform the broader range of public and private research and innovation infrastructures (e.g., research and education funding). The EU should target its substantial legal and financial capacity towards the definition of more ecologically sustainable and, more generally speaking, societally beneficial innovation pathways. Both the use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard and as a compass can contribute to technologies, innovation and lifestyles that do less harm to humans and the environment and are respectful of social rights. It is important that knowledge collection and generation of the two ways of using the precautionary principle are well interlinked and the results from both processes are acknowledged as forming a body of actionable knowledge.

Participatory processes to support the two-way use of the precautionary principle

Inclusive and reflexive participatory processes are essential to promote good governance and adaptive policy-making in the application of the precautionary principle as safeguard and compass. Under conditions of high levels of uncertainty a key question is: how to judge the severity of a (future) situation and the appropriateness of precautionary measures, when the potential harm and its likelihood are unknown or highly uncertain? In this situation, it requires the participation of a diversity of knowledge-holders and stakeholders in the task of finding a balance between doing too little or doing too much with regard to the protection of human health, social rights (such as the right to safe and healthy work) and the environment. When a given uncertain risk is also subject to strongly divergent socio-cultural attitudes, political perspectives or economic interests (high level of social ambiguity and potential for social conflict and mobilisation), a broad societal discussion may be required.

Inclusive-deliberative processes can uncover the plurality of relevant knowledge, of views and concerns of stakeholders including citizens that need to inform the application of the precautionary principle. They can help address conflicts of knowledge, values and interests that may be associated with the question of how to deal with the uncertain risks of a given technology.

Participatory processes need to rely on sound expertise with regard to deliberative methods and analysis of situational factors. Tools such as the Action Catalogue[viii] should be consulted as a database of methodologies for deliberative practices. The Action Catalogue is an online decision-support tool that enables researchers, policymakers and others conducting transdisciplinary research to find appropriate participatory methods and formats for their specific needs. Funders and organisers of participatory processes should have sound knowledge about, e.g., the level of maturity concerning an innovation, the prevailing risk-governance arrangements, the overall objective of stakeholder engagement in those arrangements, and power asymmetries amongst stakeholders, as well as other actors involved in the risk-governance process when choosing a specific method or format of participation. Furthermore, they should be aware of the general need for transparency with regard to participatory decision-making processes.


© Pexels.com / Gunnar Ridderstrom

Participatory-deliberative processes, implemented as instruments of good governance and adaptive policy-learning in the application of the precautionary principle, should aim for fairness and competence. Inclusive as well as fair and competent participatory processes are vital for the EU to uphold its commitment to good risk governance.

Public participation has been incorporated into international treaties such as

viii The action catalogue, developed by the EU-funded Engage2020 project, can be viewed here: http://actioncatalogue.eu/

the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, regional instruments such as the 1998 Aarhus Convention, as well as in EU environmental legislation. **Participatory-deliberative practices need to be improved further to enable policy and decision makers to address the multiplicity of risks and the uncertainties** associated with the most pressing societal problems and to learn to navigate in a multi-risk world, aiming for more resilient and sustainable societies.

Inclusive and reflexive participatory processes on complex topics require **buy-in and follow-through from policymakers and regulators**. This demand should be reflected in the allocation of resources in project calls, regulation processes and decision-making. Ensuring fair and competent participation requires that policymakers and regulators are able and expected to prioritise good governance practices and adaptive policy-learning. Such a prioritisation should be facilitated through the **allocation of resources** as a basic practice of regulation and decision-making.

Main sources of information for the RECIPES guidance

The main sources for the guidance are the insights that were gained through the following empirical activities of the RECIPES research project:

- An extensive **review of literature and legal documents and a legal analysis** of how the precautionary principle has been applied in practice at international and EU level and in five European countries since the year 2000.[ix]
- Nine **case studies** and an inter-case study analysis aimed at understanding and analysing the commonalities and differences in the application of the precautionary principle towards innovation in the EU depending on the topic and the context.[x]
- A year-long **stakeholder engagement process** in which participants from the policy sector, industry/business (predominantly from the chemical, pharmaceutical and biochemical industries), civil society (including organisations in the areas of environmental protection, consumer protection, and occupational health and safety), and academia (mostly scholars of science and technology governance) identified needs with regard to the future application of the precautionary principle. The stakeholders were asked what they thought is needed to ensure that the application of the precautionary principle encourages innovation and, through it, contributes to the achievement of societally beneficial goals.[xi]
- A series of **review-workshops** in which draft versions of the guidance were discussed amongst the abovementioned stakeholders as well as other knowledgeable stakeholders (including European and national agencies in the fields of environmental protection, health protection, and occupational health and safety) who had not contributed to the origin of the drafts, i.e. the stock-taking report, the case studies and the needs assessment.

ix The stock-taking report can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/taking-stock-precautionary-principle-2000.
x The case study reports can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/analysis-case-studies.
xi The needs assessment report and the related RECIPES policy brief can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/recipes-co-creative-process-and-needs-assessment-results.

© pexels.com / Tima Miro Shnichenko

2 OVERALL INTRODUCTION

This guidance advises on how to deal responsibly with uncertain risks[xii] in the development and implementation of technology in the European Union (EU). It helps EU risk regulation and innovation policy to use the precautionary principle for responsible technological innovation.

The guidance is motivated by recent debates about the relationship between precaution and innovation. These debates include calls for a critical review of the application of the precautionary principle and requests that we need to better understand how the precautionary principle can support current EU research and innovation strategy and its ambitions to promote value-driven innovations and achieve sustainability goals.

The guidance supports the idea that there is no inherent contradiction between precaution and innovation, and that a prudent use of the precautionary principle can help steer innovation in societally beneficial directions. Target groups of the guidance are primarily EU policymakers, EU agencies[xiii] and EU policy support organisations and bodies[xiv] that are concerned with risk regulation or the governance of science, technology and innovation. The guidance offers them ideas about how to further improve addressing uncertain risks in EU risk regulation and innovation policy.

The guidance also addresses researchers and innovators and the multitude of societal actors who can contribute to a society-wide innovation system. The guidance illustrates to these target groups that their contributions are needed for applying the precautionary principle for responsible technological innovation.

xii 'Uncertain risks' are understood in the RECIPES guidance as threats for which it is not possible to confidently quantify the magnitude of a defined and agreed range of outcomes or the probabilities of these outcomes.

xiii For example, the European Environmental Agency (EEA) or the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).

xiv For example, the Science Advice for Policy by European Academies (SAPEA), the European Political Strategy Centre (EPSC), or the European Parliament's Panel for the Future of Science and Technology (STOA).

2.1 The precautionary principle and responsible innovation

The guidance connects the precautionary principle with a new concept of governing research and innovation

In the past decade, the EU has fostered an innovation ecosystem in which technologies (and other innovations) are not thought of as ends in themselves, but are brought in line with fundamental values and principles upon which the EU is built. These include – amongst others – the right to life, the right to liberty and security, a high level of human health and a high level of environmental protection and the improvement of the quality of the environment.[3]

The current research and innovation strategy of the European Commission (2020-2024) identifies research and innovation as a key driver in achieving European Commission goals that are geared towards a sustainable and prosperous future for people and the planet, based on solidarity and respect for shared European values. Among other things, the Commission's research and innovation strategy identifies the following tasks for research and innovation. Research and innovation shall help restore ecosystems and give space to nature so that Europe can become the first climate-neutral continent. They shall help improve people's health at all ages, tackle emerging threats and improve crisis preparedness so that citizens are protected and European values defended. They shall further help develop innovations, policies and institutions to support democratic processes and enhance trust in democratic institutions, so that more resilient democracies are built across the EU [4].

The European Commission's research and innovation strategy with the European Green Deal and related EU policy frameworks support the 'responsible innovation' agenda. 'Responsible Research and Innovation' was introduced as a crosscutting issue under the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation "Horizon 2020" (2014-2020), and became an operational objective of the strategic plan for the next and current EU Framework Programme, "Horizon Europe" (2021-2027). In EU Member States, there are also research funding initiatives that operate under responsible innovation taken by national research councils such as, for example, the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), the Dutch or the Norwegian Research Council. The concept also resonated outside the EU, notably in the United States.

Scholars have provided a variety of perspectives of what needs to be addressed by responsible innovations. The editors of an International Handbook on Responsible Innovation however see a shared notion: *"Responsible innovation advocates will argue that the innovation process is neither steerless nor inherently good. Instead of being steerless, innovation can be managed and a growing body of research constitutes a testimony on how we can manage innovation and shape technologies in accordance with societal values and expectations as well as (re-direct) them towards normative targets such as sustainability goals."*[5]

The RECIPES **guidance links the precautionary principle to the concept of 'responsible innovation' and highlights the precautionary principle as an important enabler** to the implementation of this new approach to the governance of research and innovation.

A key prerequisite for responsible innovation is a form of governance that will drive innovation towards societally desirable outcomes, using inclusive innovation processes in which all relevant actors commit themselves to these outcomes. The European Green Deal and the EU Framework Programme Horizon Europe with its mission-oriented approach and the thematic clusters centred around the United Nations' Sustainability Development Goals can be seen as incorporating this idea.

Another key prerequisite for responsible innovation is a form of governance that will improve dealing **with unintended consequences of innovation in the process of research and innovation**. This requires mechanisms for anticipating and responding to possible harm associated with innovation and applies to innovations which promise to deliver a collectively defined societal purpose (e.g., climate protection technologies can also have unintended and undesired effects that need to be addressed) as well as to innovations in general. The concept of responsible innovation addresses the observation that market innovations do not automatically lead to results that are beneficial to society as a whole or else may be accompanied by negative side effects.

Science and technology scholars have argued that there is a need to promote **anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion and responsiveness** in the governance of science, technology and innovation[6]. More anticipatory, reflexive, inclusive and responsive forms of governing make it easier to raise, discuss and respond to questions about both the intended and unintended impacts of science, technology and innovation.[6] They facilitate directing or re-directing innovation, and the science and research intended to lead to it, towards societally beneficial ends such as sustainability goals or maintaining high levels of protection of human and environmental health.

> The RECIPES guidance shows that **the precautionary principle can serve as an important tool** to make innovation governance more anticipatory, more reflexive, more inclusive and deliberative, and, in total, more responsive in the EU.

The guidance highlights how the precautionary principle as safeguard and compass can be used for responsible technological innovation

Specifically, the guidance highlights how the precautionary principle can be used for **responsible technological innovation in the EU**[xv]. Creativity, entrepreneurship and the general impulse to create solutions with the help of science and technology are certainly admirable traits which have brought many benefits for humanity. The sobering fact is that scientific and technological progress have not necessarily been accompanied by human or environmental progress in the past. In the context of the increasing transgression of planetary boundaries, in many cases because of (unsustainable) technologies, the need for governments to take responsibility grows significantly. The guidance subsequently responds to an urgent need for more guidance on when and in what ways the precautionary principle can be applied towards new or established technologies.

The document identifies **two ways** in which the precautionary principle can operate for **responsible technological innovation** in the EU: **safeguard and compass**. The safeguard function builds on the precautionary principle as a **legal principle**, the compass function on the precautionary principle as a **policy principle.**

The RECIPES guidance thus sees the application of the precautionary principle as going beyond formal inclusion of the principle in EU policies or regulations for the authorisation of products or processes (which we refer to as the 'application of the precautionary principle as a legal principle and safeguard'). There are other ways to use the precautionary principle in shaping our common technological future such as foresight processes, anticipatory risk research and monitoring. Policymakers can use funding and incentive schemes for research, development and innovation that are accompanied by a strengthened emphasis on such precaution-related mechanisms (which we refer to as the 'application of the precautionary principle as a policy principle and compass' in innovation policy and development).

The knowledge generated through the use of the precautionary principle as a compass (e.g., via technology assessment, foresight processes or risk research) can help promote a timely and more broadly informed application of the precautionary principle as a safeguard in EU risk policy and regulation. Exercise of the precautionary principle as a compass has value, also independently of the precautionary principle formally included in policies or regulations. It can stimulate and shape 'responsible innovation', e.g., clean production, development of inherently safe chemicals as alternatives for currently used chemicals of concern, technologies supporting new ways of living that offer greater protection for humans and the environment alike.

xv The focus includes new and existing technologies as well as cross-cutting technologies such as nanotechnology and specific technologies such as weed control products. The RECIPES case study on the latter illustrates the importance of the precautionary principle in addressing systemic challenges such as biodiversity loss.

The document provides guidance regarding the proposed two-way use of the precautionary principle by

- outlining the founding features of the idea of precaution and the application of the precautionary principle with a special focus on the relationship between precaution and innovation.
- pointing out possible ways forward in the two-way use of the precautionary principle to enhance European society's capacity to anticipate, identify and manage scientifically uncertain but plausible and potentially serious risks in technological innovation.
- pointing to existing tools and guidelines that can contribute to enhancing this capacity: by helping to build a strong basis of expertise for assessing and communicating uncertainties and for related decision-making, and by helping to include relevant input (knowledge, values, concerns) of societal actors in dealing with uncertain risks through participatory processes.

2.2 Structure of the guidance

The guidance document is organised in three parts. Each of them deals with one of the themes that the RECIPES project has identified as key themes for the application of the precautionary principle. The three themes are: i) scope of application, ii) organisation of expertise, and iii) participation.

Each part offers an executive summary that highlights the major points regarding the specific theme and describes conclusions and advice from this part. The literature references are also listed separately for each part. Accordingly, the three parts can also be read as guidance documents in their own right.

2.2.1 Scope of application



This part provides guidance with regard to when the precautionary principle is relevant and in what ways it can be applied with regard to uncertain risks, in particular in relation to new technologies. It provides the basic understanding of the role of the precautionary principle which also informs the other two parts of the guidance. In particular, it points out how the application of the precautionary principle as a legally given safeguard can be complemented by use of the precautionary principle as a policy approach and compass for directing innovation towards societally beneficial goals. It specifies that the precautionary principle used as a safeguard is an instrument that lets policymakers intervene when there are reasonable concerns that an uncertain risk will do severe damage. It offers considerations and principles that should be taken into account, underlining that standard instructions on the application of the precautionary principle are inappropriate given the advantages of a flexible use of the principle. Further, this part provides an overview of different ways through which the precautionary principle, used as a policy approach and compass, can be inserted in innovation processes.

2.2.2 Organisation of expertise

This part of the guidance looks more closely at knowledge-related aspects. It highlights that well-organised and timely collection and generation of 'actionable knowledge' – on the nature of the uncertainties, the seriousness of potential adverse effects, and possible alternatives to the risk (technology, product) under scrutiny – are key for dealing prudently with uncertain risks and for applying the precautionary principle prudently. The guidance sets out possible ways to broaden and strengthen the knowledge base in dealing with uncertain risks. One key piece of advice is that policymakers and scientific expert advisors ensure that the widest possible range of potentially usable knowledge is included in problem scoping and the assessment of uncertain and potentially serious risks. The pluralisation of the knowledge used in regulatory risk assessment is a tool to reduce the risk of blind spots that may result from taking into account exclusively 'routine' regulatory science. The guidance points out that invoking the precautionary principle in risk assessment (as well as problem scoping) is a safeguard against understating uncertainty. It helps to avoid opting by default for the application of a more narrow-focused quantitative risk assessment that is not suited to deal with states of knowledge characterised by great uncertainties and/or ignorance. Learning within and across regulatory domains, and promoting early risk research and anticipatory and foresight processes (use of precaution as a compass) are other possible ways to strengthen the knowledge base for dealing with uncertain risks that the guidance identifies. The guidance points to a range of existing tools and guidelines that can be useful for building a broad actionable high-quality knowledge base.

2.2.3 Participation

This part of the guidance deals specifically with the topic of participation and highlights the value of participatory approaches in relation to precaution. It explains why participation should be inserted throughout the innovation cycle and provides considerations on how to strengthen participation in the different phases of the innovation cycle in order to inform both the application of the precautionary principle as a safeguard and the use of precaution as a compass. It points out in particular that participatory processes can spark dialogue that helps to identify conflicting claims of knowledge and values which is important for decision-making on precaution. More specifically, the guidance sets out what needs to be considered to reduce the likelihood of common shortcomings in designing and performing participation processes. It provides advice on how to select appropriate methods for participatory processes and to deal with questions of transparency, facilitation and power asymmetries in participation processes. It points to a number of existing tools and guidelines that can help in dealing with related issues.

© unsplash.com / Aaron Burden

© unsplash.com / freestocks

2.3 Sources of the guidance

The guidance that this document offers is based on the results of research carried out in the context of the EU-funded project entitled *"REconciling sCience, Innovation and Precaution through the Engagement of Stakeholders"* (RECIPES).

The main sources for the guidance are the insights that were gained through the following empirical activities of the research project. First, RECIPES carried out an extensive **review of literature and legal documents and a legal analysis** of how the precautionary principle has been applied in practice at international and EU level and in five European countries since the year 2000.[xvi] Second, RECIPES conducted **nine case studies** and an inter-case study analysis aimed at understanding and analysing the commonalities and differences in the application of the precautionary principle towards innovation in the EU depending on the topic and the context.[xvii] Third, RECIPES carried out a year-long **stakeholder engagement process** in which participants from the policy sector, industry/business (predominantly from the chemical, pharmaceutical, and biochemical industries), civil society (including organisations in the areas of environmental protection, consumer protection, and occupational health and safety), and academia (mostly scholars of science and technology governance) identified needs with regard to the future application of the precautionary principle. The stakeholders were asked what they thought is needed to ensure that the application of the precautionary principle encourages innovation and, through it, contributes to the achievement of societally beneficial goals.[xviii] Fourth, RECIPES carried out a series of **review-workshops** in which draft versions of the guidance were discussed by the abovementioned stakeholders and other knowledgeable stakeholders (including European and national agencies in the fields of environmental protection, health protection, and occupational health and safety) who had not contributed to the originating of the drafts, i.e., the stock-taking report, the case studies and the needs assessment.

xvi The stock-taking report can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/taking-stock-precautionary-principle-2000.
xvii The case study reports can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/analysis-case-studies.
xviii The needs assessment report can be viewed here: https://recipes-project.eu/results/recipes-co-creative-process-and-needs-assessment-results.

3 GUIDANCE ON THE SCOPE OF APPLICATION OF THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE



3.1 Executive summary

The precautionary principle is an important instrument for EU law and policy. The precautionary principle traditionally ensures that policymakers can adopt decisions in situations of scientific uncertainty.

The precautionary principle is a general principle of EU law, laid down in EU legislation and case law. This implies that there are in principle no defined boundaries with regards to the question of which risks or what technologies it can be applied to.

The precautionary principle is an open and flexible principle. It is not – and cannot be – used as a rigid decision instrument. The principle urges policymakers to carefully reflect on the situation and the uncertainties around it, but does not offer predetermined solutions. This also implies that it leaves more room for the discretionary power of policymakers than during situations of standard risk management. What the best course of action is in the case of an uncertain risk, depends very much on the context of the situation. This emphasis on prudence – and the subsequent open-endedness and flexibility – forms arguably the core strength of the principle.

The use of the precautionary principle however also poses challenges to policymakers. They are expected to manoeuvre levels of uncertainty to find the right course of action in a specific situation. Meanwhile, different stakeholders might address them with varying demands and considerations. Some stakeholders fear that the precautionary principle is applied haphazardly, thereby discouraging innovation. Others are afraid that the scope of the precautionary principle will be too limited, resulting in serious harm to human health and the environment.

This guidance proposes a two-way use of the precautionary principle. On the one hand, **the precautionary principle acts as a legal safeguard**, through its formal inclusion in EU policies or regulations for the authorisation of products or processes. The use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard is an approach for policymakers and legislators to better anticipate and respond to uncertain, however potentially serious, risks. In this way it is particularly tied to the dimensions of responsiveness and reflexivity of the concept of Responsible Innovation.

On the other hand, **the precautionary principle can also be used proactively as a compass** and policy principle that helps policymakers guide innovation towards more societally acceptable directions. Introducing precaution into the processes of innovation will result in technologies that are better suited to the demands and values of society.

As a safeguard, the precautionary principle works as an appeal to prudence: when there are reasonable grounds for concern on the possible damage that a substance, process or innovation could cause or when such a substance, process or innovation proves more harmful than first understood, the precautionary principle permits policymakers and legislators to intervene despite scientific uncertainty. The precautionary principle is based on the acknowledgment of the limits of science in providing full certainty; in this case too policymakers should still be able to act, ensuring the appropriate level of protection. As such, the precautionary principle functions as a guiding principle which provides helpful criteria for determining the best course of action in confronting situations of potential risk and scientific uncertainty on the probability of harm.

For the application of the precautionary principle as a safeguard the following elements are to be considered: scientific uncertainty (related, for example, to a lack of knowledge or a situation of ambiguity), seriousness of risk (a particular threshold of possible harm must be present, though EU institutions enjoy a degree of discretion in establishing what counts as reasonable grounds for concern), a level of scientific analysis (a scientific appraisal must have been carried out) and the characteristics of the uncertain risks.

Precautionary action requires scientifically underpinned grounds for concern, not certainty nor an exhaustive risk assessment. Uncontested scientific proof of risk cannot be required in cases of uncertain risks. The EU Court of Justice re-confirmed in 2021 in regard to plant protection products that *"an exhaustive risk assessment cannot be required in a situation where the precautionary principle is applied, which equates to a situation in which there is scientific uncertainty."* (Case C 499/18 P, para. 81)

The use of cost-benefit analysis is of limited value in cases that require the precautionary principle. Not only can the risks assessment of new products and technologies be plagued by inconclusive evidence and uncertainties, the proclaimed benefits are often also unclear. Fundamentally unknown costs cannot be weighed against fundamentally unknown benefits without making highly speculative assumptions. If risks can be reliably quantified it is the *principle of prevention* that is applicable rather than the precautionary principle, and regulators can set an acceptable risk level and implement the risk reduction measures needed to keep the risk below the maximum acceptable level. However, acceptable risk levels often tend to become lower. What is acceptable at one point in time may not be at a later point, so that reviews of risk management are required.

The choice on who or what gets the benefit of the doubt is a policy issue and should be made explicitly. The decision on whether precautionary action is justified in a given case needs to take into account the 'knowledge condition' (e.g., reasonable grounds for concern) and what is at stake. Subsequently a choice will be made as to which interest(s) is/are given the benefit of the doubt: environmental protection, social rights, corporate interests, intergenerational justice or national economy, to name a few. Such risk management decisions need to be informed by transparent deliberation – that should be available for the public – over the outcomes of the risk assessment (what is known, is unknown, can be known, cannot be known) and made

in consideration of wider social and economic factors, legal requirements such as a chosen level of environmental or human health protection, and policy imperatives such as Sustainable Development Goals.

The six phases of the application of the precautionary principle can be summarised as follows: (1) The choice for responsible innovation and innovation processes, (2) a priori risk reduction through anticipation, (3) dealing with early warnings, (4) assessing the situation, (5) deciding on the appropriate measures and (6) monitoring the situation.

Besides being a safeguard and legal principle, the precautionary principle should also be applied as a compass and policy principle in research and innovation. In this function the precautionary principle:

- triggers **upstream debates and research about the potential impacts** of emerging technologies and related innovation pathways;
- helps **anticipate potential risks and unintended outcomes**;
- helps **stimulate early adjustments** in innovation development.

Using the precautionary principle as a compass in innovation implies a broadening of innovation in two ways: making space for the societal and environmental aspects of the technology besides only the technical, scientific and economic ones, and anticipating how the technology will function in society.

The compass function of the precautionary principle links to the dilemma of control. By the time the environmental, health-related and other social implications of technologies become manifest (possibly only in multi-decadal timeframes), they may be widely embedded in societal structures so that a change of direction is hardly or no longer possible. Use of the precautionary principle as a compass means carrying out activities at **an early stage and on an ongoing basis** in technology development to **anticipate** possible risks.

The knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass can stimulate responsible innovation. Responsible innovation can consist of technologies that support new ways of living that are more protective for humans and the environment alike. It can also consist in the nurturing of more diverse innovation approaches (including social innovation) that helps to better prepare for identified uncertainties, e.g., in regard to how a technology will work in different cultural, social and ecological settings. The knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass can also help **promote a timely and more broadly informed application of the precautionary principle** in EU risk policy and regulation.

© pexels.com / Isaque Pereira

3.2 Introduction

This guidance informs EU policymakers, scientific advisers and legislators about the scope of application of the precautionary principle. It is based on the research from the Horizon2020 project RECIPES and part of a series of three sets of guidance. The other two focus on 'Organisation and production of expertise' and 'Participation'.

3.2.1 The need for this guidance

The precautionary principle is an important instrument for EU law and policy. However, it is sometimes not clear when the principle is relevant and in what ways it can be applied. It is a persistent myth that Europe suffers from excessive precaution. The RECIPES case studies, along with previous case studies on the application of the precautionary principle in Europe and elsewhere, demonstrate that precautionary interventions tend to be too late and to fall short of adequately reducing occurrence of harm to human health and the environment.

This guidance proceeds from this observation and seeks to identify barriers to precautionary action and suggest some ways of overcoming them.

Emerging developments in science and industry only strengthen the sense of urgency for more guidance on the scope of application of the precautionary principle. New technologies provide ever more possibilities to alter the world in more detailed, bigger and lasting ways. Aspects of our surroundings that were thought to be unchangeable have increasingly become modifiable. Through nanotechnology some of the smallest physical building blocks can be influenced. Biotechnology provides new ways to recreate and transform life. Developments in information sciences, neuroscience and behavioural sciences even make human thought, conduct and reasoning subject to possible technological control. And the discipline of geo-engineering promises interventions that can affect the Earth as a whole. Moreover, while in the past human action could only affect people nearby and in the short-term, new technological developments often bear the potential of harming future generations and humanity as a whole.[7]

New technologies offer all kinds of possibilities to solve important societal issues. Medical technology for example has done a great deal to reduce human suffering and improve wellbeing. The increased power by means of technology however also demands responsibility, as power exercised thoughtlessly often turns out to be destructive, power in the hands of a few tends to serve the goals of the few, and power that remains unchecked often turns out to be corrupted. The past shows us that scientific and technological progress is not necessarily accompanied by human or environmental progress. In the context of the increasing transgression of planetary boundaries, in many cases because of (unsustainable) technologies, the need for government to take responsibility becomes urgent.

This guidance subsequently answers an urgent need for more guidance on when and in what ways the precautionary principle can be applied towards new technologies. This will hopefully ensure a swifter and more effective use of the principle within EU innovation policy.


© pexels.com / Cottonbro

3.2.2 Outline of guidance

This document consists of three parts. The first part clarifies when the precautionary principle is relevant. This can help policymakers and legislators recognise when this principle, and, for example, not the prevention principle, is relevant. This part is useful for all policymakers and legislators who deal with the precautionary principle in the context of technologies that are accompanied by uncertain risks, but is also useful for other stakeholders e.g., producers who apply for market authorisations.

The second part specifically describes how the precautionary principle is to be used as a legal safeguard; as an instrument that enables policymakers and legislators to intervene when there are reasonable concerns that an uncertain risk will do severe damage. It contains considerations and principles that should be taken into account. This part is useful for policymakers and legislators who (possibly) have to intervene in situations of uncertain risks.

The third part is specifically concerned with the use of the precautionary principle as a compass and policy principle. Applying the precautionary principle as a compass has the potential to shape and (re)direct innovation pathways in such a way that the new technologies and products are designed to be safe, compatible with a circular economy and produced cleanly. This part is useful for policymakers and legislators in the field of innovation policy, as well as for innovators themselves.

3.3 When to apply the precautionary principle

3.3.1 The precautionary principle in short

The precautionary principle guides policymakers faced with uncertain risks[xix] and public concerns around a technology. The principle is based on the acknowledgement of the limits of science in providing conclusive evidence, i.e., the impossibility of absolute certainty, and the acknowledgement that public concerns should be taken into account by public officials in a democracy.

The principle essentially becomes relevant when standard risk management procedures do not suffice because of a situation of uncertainty about the risk. When a risk poses a threat to human health or the environment, but the risk is difficult to assess scientifically, policymakers should still be able to act.

The precautionary principle was first developed in the early 1970s, as a legal principle in domestic law in Germany (the so-called 'Vorsorgeprinzip'),

xix In the sense of: poorly characterised and plausibly serious hazards.

Switzerland and Sweden[8]. This 'Vorsorgeprinzip' was introduced as part of a policy for taking care of nature and the environment at a time when the limitations of scientific understanding over environmental change became apparent[9]. In the early 1980s, references to precaution, the precautionary principle or to a precautionary approach found their way into the international setting[10] and the principle was codified for the first time in 1992 in Principle 15 of the non-binding Rio Declaration on Environment and Development[11]. In that same year, the precautionary principle was introduced in what is now called the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union, in Article 191.

Today, a universally accepted definition of 'the' precautionary principle does not exist and we observe that different interpretations of the precautionary principle are used at international, European and national level.

3.3.2 The place of the precautionary principle within the EU

Within the EU, the precautionary principle is considered to be a general principle of EU law, laid down in the EU Treaty, legislation and case law. This implies that there are no defined boundaries with regard to which uncertain risks or technologies it can be applied.

Principles of EU Law are legal principles that – in contrast to a rule or a policy – are open-ended in character, not applied in an all-or-nothing approach[xx], and do not dictate a particular outcome. Legal principles can, in contrast to policies or approaches, also be legally binding and form the basis of specifically formulated rules. For example, the precautionary principle explicitly underpins EU's Regulation of Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH). The rules in this Regulation, stipulating a registration and authorisation procedure, have in part been established on the basis of the fact that the EU recognises the precautionary principle as a guiding standard.[xxi]

Considering the invocation of the precautionary principle, it is important to distinguish between applying the precautionary principle in the context of EU regulation and existing national laws (for example, in the context of REACH), and the political decision to invoke the pre cautionary principle for a particular subject matter before any regulation or law is available.[12]

In the first case, the action required for the application of the precautionary principle depends on the formulation of the principle in the specific legal act. For example, EU food safety legislation has expressly defined the precautionary principle for application in that sector. EU secondary environmental legislation however provides no equivalent definition, though, as we have noted above, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) directly refers to the precautionary principle as a basis for EU environmental policy. This has left the precautionary principle open to interpretation within each individual environmental policy area.

Its flexibility and open-endedness are arguably one of the strengths of the precautionary principle.[13] This also means that there is no clear rule for when and how the principle should be applied. The application of the precautionary principle has to be decided on a case-by-case basis. However, based on previous applications of the principle, legal literature

xx This means that a rule in general always applies when particular clearly defined criteria are met. Principles on the other hand are only invoked after due consideration for which sufficient or necessary criteria are less easily definable.

xxi "To ensure a sufficiently high level of protection for human health, including having regard to relevant human population groups and possibly to certain vulnerable sub-populations, and the environment, substances of very high concern should, in accordance with the precautionary principle, be subject to careful attention" (Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, recital 69).

and the outcomes of the RECIPES project, several general guidelines become clear for when the precautionary principle is relevant.

3.3.3 Guidelines for when the precautionary principle is relevant

Precautionary action means adopting risk management measures that reduce the probability – or remove the possibility – that the harm can occur, and/or reduce the magnitude of the harm, were it it occur.[xxii] The precautionary principle has been criticised by some for being 'vague' about which knowledge condition (scientific uncertainty about possible harm) triggers its consideration. It is, however, evident that the term scientific uncertainty cannot be defined and fixed with any degree of generality. What grounds for concern can trigger risk management measures in a specific case of uncertain risk? This is a key variable in the different understandings and definitions of the precautionary principle.[14] In practice, precautionary interventions can be applied when the possibility of occurrence of harm is considered 'plausible', or when there are 'reasonable grounds for concern' regarding the potential harm of a substance, technology, process or intervention.

The following reflections and clarifications can help when dealing with the key question above. Four elements are especially relevant in considering whether the precautionary principle is relevant.

Figure 1: Four elements to consider whether the precautionary principle is relevant



xxii It is important to note that precautionary action does not automatically imply the implementation of bans (provisional or otherwise). There is a wide variety of regulatory measures that could be applied (See Renn O., and Dreyer, M. (2009). Food Safety Governance, Springer, pp. 80-81).

The basic triggers for the application of the precautionary principle are the seriousness of the harm and the scientific uncertainty around it.[15] The potential consequences of a risk are what matter more than the probability of occurrence. It is not the level of probability that triggers application of the precautionary principle, but the existence of tenable and scientifically underpinned grounds for concern. In other words, the precautionary principle is not about hypothetical risks or well-known risks where the probability of harm can be reliably quantified. The latter class of risks is the domain of the principle of prevention and regulators can set an acceptable risk level and implement the preventative risk reduction measures needed to keep the risk below an agreed maximum acceptable level. In the case of risks that require the precautionary principle, the need for some kind of plausibility 'proof' of a threat of harm must therefore not run to demanding conclusive evidence of this threat of harm to justify precautionary action. The EU Court of Justice indeed re-confirmed in 2021 in regard to plant protection products that *"an exhaustive risk assessment cannot be required in a situation where the precautionary principle is applied, which equates to a situation in which there is scientific uncertainty"*.[16]

We will now further elaborate on the four elements that are useful to consider whether the precautionary principle should be applied:

- Scientific uncertainty
- The seriousness of the risk
- The level of scientific analysis that has been done
- The character of the technology or the anticipated risks

3.3.3.1 Scientific uncertainty

The first element to consider is that of scientific uncertainty. When a technology is accompanied by 'uncertain' risks, the knowledge required for standard assessment procedures is still lacking. The establishment of scientific certainty about a risk is important because it determines the ability to manage a risk. There is no way to prepare or act in the face of harmful effects of something if not (enough) is known, for example, about the probability or the nature of the effects will be.

Scientific uncertainty may mean different things in different situations, as different situations demand different types and extents of knowledge *(see also RECIPES Guidance on The Organisation and Production of Expertise)*. Furthermore, sometimes more knowledge will expose even more uncertainties.[17]

Scientific uncertainty remains as long as there is no certainty. The search for evidence never stops and evolves in the light of scientific and technological progress. It should not be forgetten that the absence of evidence of risk is not evidence of the absence of risk. Scientific uncertainty can be related to:

- A lack of data or inadequate models of risk assessment.
- A form of indeterminacy, when not all the factors influencing the causal chains are known.
- Ambiguity or contradicting data/opinions.
- The fact that certain risks are still unknown, which often is labelled as 'unknown unknowns', bordering ignorance.

During most risk assessments, a large and diverse body of evidence has to be assessed. Often the quality of just 'one' piece of evidence is not sufficient to attain scientific certainty about the risks in question. For example: though there may be evidence that a new material is less toxic than previously assumed, if there remains a significant lack of clarity about the possibilities of bioaccumulation, scientific uncertainty about the situation as a whole is still relevant. It is therefore important to not reduce the risk assessment to single pieces of evidence, but to look at the situation as a whole *(see: Guidance on organisation of expertise)*.

Box 1: Scientific uncertainty can have multiple causes*

There simply might not have been enough time to gather sufficient empirical evidence or develop theories to adequately assess the nature, seriousness or probability of the risks. For example, with regard to some new nanotechnology applications the precise effects on human health are still unclear.

No research has yet been undertaken to study the effects of a technology. Scientific certainty may even have been wilfully obstructed because of private interests, as has been the case with the risks of the chemical DDT.

Certainty about risks are 'inherently' difficult to assess adequately. The use of gene drives for example might have effects on ecosystems worldwide. The interconnectedness of such ecosystems with other ecosystems and social systems, such as agricultural systems makes the risks of this technology inherently difficult to estimate.

No clarity or consensus exists yet about the acceptability of a risk. The application of biotechnology to humans for example brings up ethical discussions. A serious public debate is required before a standard risk assessment procedure can be established.

There is an absence of applicable risk management or risk governance procedures. When the nature and the probability of a risk are known, but it is not known how to deal with it, there still exists fundamental uncertainty since the effects would be irreversible and uncontrollable.

* Trescher et al. (2021). D2.5 Comparison of case study analysis with results of WP1. Available at www.recipes-project.eu.

3.3.3.2 Seriousness of the risk

A second element to consider is the seriousness of the risk. The precautionary principle is not applied to just any type of uncertain risk. A particular threshold of possible harm must be at stake. It is however difficult and even ill-advised to qualify rigid thresholds completely beforehand. In some cases, new insights can emerge with regards to what types of harm are acceptable and new forms of harm or new exposure pathways might be discovered when knowledge about risks advances. Moreover, the acceptability of the harm can also be related to the extent that it is, for example, deemed unnecessary or easily preventable.

As described in section 3.2.2, the precautionary principle is only mentioned in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union in relation to the protection of the environment. In practice, the scope is broader[18] and the principle can be invoked in every situation where there are reasonable grounds for concern that the potentially dangerous effects on the environment, human, animal or plant health may be inconsistent with the level of protection chosen for the EU.[19] EU institutions moreover enjoy broad discretion as to the level of risk deemed unacceptable for society.[20]

This broad discretion should however not lead to a situation where 'all risks' are to be avoided at all costs. Moreover, it could be important to contrast the risks concerned with the situation of 'doing nothing'. For example, uncertain risks related to the development of a vaccine might be justifiable in the case of a growing pandemic (though it should be noted that, for example, a lack of regulatory approval is also accompanied by risks related to public distrust). In any case, it is important to explain on what grounds and considerations a risk is deemed sufficiently serious in a specific case. In this way companies also know what to expect when developing an innovation. They then better know what uncertainties and types of harm to look for and avoid when researching and designing an innovation.


© pexels / Erik Mclean

3.3.3.3 Some form of scientific analysis

Thirdly, the precautionary principle is not intended to apply to hypothetical effects or imaginary risks, and it should be based on a scientific examination of the issue[21]. All legal formulations of the precautionary principle include a knowledge condition, i.e., the tenability of the grounds for concern that justify application. The UNESCO 2005 report stated for example that the judgement of plausibility of the grounds for concern should be grounded in scientific analysis, it cannot be a fantasy or wild speculation.[22] The European Commission's 2000 Communication on the precautionary principle states 'reasonable grounds for concern' as a prerequisite for the adoption of 'provisional risk management measures'.[23]

It is difficult to qualify 'reasonable grounds for concern' further, as this is highly dependent on the context of the situation. Notably, in the case of early warnings, scientists have often not yet been able to perform an analysis. The precautionary principle may trigger the need for such an analysis. In other words, it may very well make sense to acknowledge the precautionary principle and scientific uncertainty in the risk assessment phase, not limiting the principle to risk management. The guidance on social organisation of expertise discusses this insight and its implications in more detail.

It should also be stressed that the 'seriousness' of the expected damage should be taken into account in this case. When the expected damage is deemed to be enormous, the demands on a detailed and extensive scientific analysis should be less strict.

3.3.3.4 The characteristics of the risks and risk anticipatio

The fourth element to consider is the characteristics of the risks or the anticipated risks. Though it can depend on the context of the situation whether the precautionary principle is relevant, previous cases in which the principle was applied have some similarities:

Novelty
First of all, the precautionary principle is often applied to technologies that are relatively new and which are subsequently often accompanied by unknown effects. This was the case for example with biotechnology and the first generations of nuclear power plants. This is not surprising since technological applications that are merely slight adjustments of existing technologies are less often characterised by uncertainties. To the extent that they are similar to older technologies, the way to measure their (possible) harm has already been examined as well as the best measures to take against their harms.

Knowledge
The precautionary principle can also be used in cases of technologies that are not new, but present a new state of knowledge that requires reconsideration of possible risks. For example, glyphosate was considered relatively safe to use and was marketed since the 1970s, but subsequently new information and studies questioned its safety; because of the potential impacts on the health and the environment, the precautionary principle hence applies.

Systems
The precautionary principle is also often used in the context of technologies that pose systemic risks. Their negative effect is often not merely demarcated by a specific incidence, but tends to affect a whole system or even multiple (interlinked) systems. In many cases, these are ecosystems, in some cases these are systems that are (indirectly) affected by the disruption of public health. Think for example of crucial professions – such as public transport, healthcare and education – that can no longer fulfil their societal function when they are disabled on a large scale because of a pandemic. Characteristic in this regard is the fact that such risks often can spread or 'spill over'. This makes them less easy to contain and control. An example of this are neonics (neonicotinoids). The use of this class of neuro-active insecticides has been identified as one of several key factors that have been contributing to the sharp world-wide declines in pollinator diversity and abundance observed over the past decades.

Dependencies
Another reoccurring aspect is that the technologies in question specifically disrupt systems on which humans are dependent. Their disruption often poses risks in relation to things that humans need to survive in the long run. A prime example of this are the different services that ecosystems provide, like food, purification of air and water, and flood regulation. This can however also relate to social systems. Some people for example argue that the precautionary principle should be applied in the context of the use of AI in healthcare as people are considerably dependent on the sustainability of the healthcare system. For example, if a hospital decides to make use of one particular AI system to help doctors with diagnosing their patients, malfunctions in this system could disrupt the care that is given insofar as doctors have become used to or dependent on making use of it.

Vulnerability
Another element that is often at play in the context of the precautionary principle is that of vulnerability. Precaution is especially relevant in relation to systems that do not have the ability to recover or 'defend' themselves. This may both apply, for example, to natural systems and overlooked social groups. These are not only vulnerable in the sense that they are

less able to physically protect themselves and are more affected by changes induced by new technologies, but also in the sense they often have less means to let their interests be known. Vulnerability in this sense logically requires a cautious approach and the social consequences of the introduction of new technologies and innovations should therefore be considered.

Irreversibility
The precautionary principle is often applied in the context of irreversible effects. The irreversibility of effects intrinsically poses difficulties for control as it prevents going back to the known and secure situation. Irreversibility is especially an issue in relation to the rights of future generations. Instigating irreversible negative consequences, for example through introducing polluting and non-circular technologies, by definition diminishes the freedom of future generations. Irreversible negative effects are especially problematic in the context of finite resources. For example, making use of the limited stock of oil worldwide for airplane fuel not only leads to irreversible global warming effects, the same oil can subsequently possibly not be used again as a source to help kickstart a transition to more new sustainable technologies and industries.

We will now turn to the question how the precautionary principle can be used as a safeguard.

3.4 The precautionary principle as a safeguard

The precautionary principle traditionally serves as a legally provided safeguard that gives policymakers the necessary space to intervene when there are reasonable concerns that an uncertain risk will do severe damage. The principle allows them to act prudently despite scientific uncertainty in the case of reasonable concerns, for example through (temporarily) banning a technology. To ensure the chosen level of protection in the EU, policymakers are even obliged to make use of this safeguard.

The principle however does not offer predetermined solutions. It is essentially an appeal to prudence. Policymakers should always carefully think for themselves about which precautionary measures are appropriate in a particular situation. Nevertheless, the following checklist presents some considerations and principles that are often relevant in the context of the application of the precautionary principle. Please note that these considerations may, at times, be at odds with each other and need to be weighed and selected carefully when applied.

We distinguish six phases in the application of the precautionary principle:

1. Choosing value-based innovation processes
2. A priori risk reduction through anticipation of possible risks before market introduction
3. Early warnings becoming strong enough to reach the policy agenda
4. Assessing the situation
5. Deciding on the appropriate measures
6. Monitoring the situation

We will discuss the considerations and principles of these six phases in relation to the precautionary principle.

Box 2: General preconditions for precautionary governance

It is important to note that the precautionary principle can only serve its function when a variety of other institutional requirements are met. Precautionary action can only be taken to the extent that relevant knowledge about new uncertain risks reaches the relevant authorities *(see also: guidance 'Organisation and production of expertise')*. To guarantee this, there needs to be a certain degree of transparency, openness and trust inside the research and development community, and for example, room for whistle-blowers and criticism.

Researchers need to be able to communicate freely about (possible) new risks, and authorities have to be able to examine such warnings independently of political or private interests. Furthermore, there needs to be a certain degree of accountability with regard to communicating such risks when necessary. This also requires clarity about such responsibilities and the burden of proof. Industry actors for example have to know what is expected from them with regard to the reporting and examining of early warnings.

Also of primary importance in this regard is the research culture. When researchers and innovators are driven by a 'move fast and break things' approach and (financially) incentivised to bring a new product on to the market as fast as possible, they are less inclined to take into account precaution and signal early warnings. Research programmes that, for example for example, have sustainability as an aim, as is the case with the new Horizon Programme, may have a more intrinsic incentive for being precautious.



© unsplash.com / D ebby Hudson

3.4.1 Choose responsible innovation and responsible innovation processes

The first step concerns the choices in what kind of innovation is going to be made. Good choices about the goals and values of the intended technology, and how innovation processes will be organised are the first step in precaution.

3.4.2 A priori risk reduction before market introduction

If the precautionary principle only comes into play after the market introduction of new products and technologies and after early warning signals of unanticipated impacts have become strong enough to reach the policy agenda, harm is done that could have been avoided. In the literature on the precautionary principle, this is referred to as culpable ignorance). When precautionary thinking and systematic anticipation of possible negative side effects would steer and shape the innovation trajectory when new technologies are still on the drawing table, harm can be avoided before it materialises. As such, the use of the precautionary principle should not only be about a posteriori control (after early warnings have reached the policy agenda), but also be about a priori risk management (inherently safe/clean technologies).

It also means that lock-ins on particular technologies should be avoided. To that end, the EU should strive to nurture a diverse plurality of competing technologies that can perform the same function (e.g., energy supply, transport, food packaging, telecommunication or infectious disease control). Such alternatives should be developed in parallel so that, if one technology, product or substance turns out to bring unforeseen harm, a safer alternative can rapidly replace it. Investment in sufficient redundancy and diversification of technologies is essential for achieving a resilient society that can rapidly respond and adapt when early warnings of unacceptable side effects of innovations emerge.

These first two phases concern the use of the precautionary principle as a compass. *(See chapter 3.5: The precautionary principle as a compass)*

3.4.3 Early warnings

As soon as reasonable grounds for concern are expressed, the precautionary principle as a safeguard will become relevant. Already in the case of such early warnings, there ideally should already be responsibility with regard to examining them. There can be a duty for decision-makers to investigate.

3.4.4 Assessing the situation

When there are indications that there are reasonable grounds for concern, it becomes necessary to assess the situation in more detail. This is the moment when there is a need for a risk assessment, even though risk may not be as-

certained. To the extent that the situation allows, a scientific analysis is carried out and as much evidence as possible is collected. The EC Communication[24] established the precautionary principle as a principle relevant for risk regulation, specifically risk management. However, the precautionary principle may benefit risk assessment processes as well, pointing to scientific uncertainty and knowledge gaps *(see also Guidance on the organisation of knowledge and expertise)*.

The precautionary principle requires taking into account the following considerations, in risk assessment as well:

Inclusiveness: include all actors that may be relevant for getting a full picture of the threat, such as those that may be affected by the innovation *(see: Guidance on participation and Guidance on expertise)*.

Independence: be aware of the different interests of the parties that deliver information. If a party has a substantial interest in the assessment of the situation, it might be better to let an independent party do it.

Carefulness: different types of risks and different technologies require different standards and methods of risks assessment. *(see: Guidance on organisation of knowledge and expertise)*.

When the risks can be reliably characterised and quantified, the principle of prevention should be invoked. The principle of prevention is referred to in the Treaty of the Functioning of the EU that states that policy on the environment in the Union shall (also) be based on the principle that preventive action should be taken.[25]

The decision on whether precautionary action is justified in a given case needs to take into account the 'knowledge condition' (e.g., reasonable grounds for concern). Subsequently, a choice has to be made as to which interest(s) is/are given the benefit of the doubt: environmental protection, protection of human health, social rights, corporate interests, intergenerational justice or national economy, to name a few. Ultimately such decisions are taken on normative and political grounds and are therefore primarily risk management decisions.

The decision needs to be informed by transparent publicly available deliberation over the outcomes of the risk assessment (what is known, is unknown, can be known, cannot be known) and in consideration of wider social and economic factors (e.g., proclaimed benefits of which there also can be inconclusive evidence and uncertainties – societal needs, quality-of-life factors, etc.), legal requirements such as a chosen level of environmental or human health protection, and policy imperatives such as Sustainable Development Goals.

How to address wider social considerations may already be defined in problem scoping and as part of the risk assessment policy. Examples are the question of what weight should be given to present versus future risks, or to risks to especially vulnerable groups versus risks to the general public. In order to strive to lower the general risk level and avoid precautionary action itself having serious adverse consequences, the decision as to what kind of precautionary action is required needs to consider risk offsetting, the pros and cons of different precautionary measures and the availability of alternatives for the regulated product or technology.

3.4.5 Deciding on the measures that are appropriate

Once the relevance of the precautionary principle and the need to take action has been established, it is necessary to assess which measures are the most appropriate to take. The following considerations are relevant as a minimum:



What can be done?

First of all, once the situation asks for precautionary measures it is useful to produce an overview of the actions that are possible. The following measures can in principle be taken as a minimum:

Prohibit the technology: a first option is to completely ban the technology in question. Such a ban however can also be specified in terms of time and conditions. For example, banned until the safety of the technology has been assessed with certainty. In the case of a moratorium, an indication should be given about the evidence that is necessary to lift a ban. It is however sometimes difficult to ever acquire certainty in the case of biological systems due to their complexity. For example, the use of Bisphenol A has been limited in the EU to protect health and environment because of its hazardous properties; it has been banned in infant feeding bottles since 2011 and in plastic bottles and packaging containing food for infants and children under 3 years old since 2018 with Regulation 2018/213.[26]

Limited admission of the technology: Another option would be to allow for limited admission of the technology in question. For example, in terms of:

- **Product:** some neonics – a type of insecticide – have for example been banned for certain applications, while others have not (yet).
- **Area:** some risks can be clearly limited to their application in a particular area. In some cases, like wind turbines, there are for example reasonable concerns about the disruptive effects of noise pollution on the natural behaviour of animals, and thereby of their disruptive consequences. These risks do not apply when such technologies are not placed near a nature reserve.
- **Users:** some uncertain risks are, especially in the case of health risks, limited to specific groups of people. Prohibition of a product could in that sense be limited to, for example, children, the elderly or the more vulnerable.
- **Usage:** finally, some uncertain risks are clearly related to their specific usage. In the case of PFAS-chemicals, a distinction is sometimes made by jurists between non-essential use (not essential for the functioning of society), substitutable use (essential but substitutable by safer chemicals) and essential use (and no suitable alternative exists).[27]

Adjustment of the technology: another option is the demand that the manufacturer of the technology adjusts it in such a way that the uncertain risks are resolved. Examples of this are kill switches in biotechnology or removing the chemical that is causing the risks from a product.

Extra safety measures: in the case of nanotechnology, the precautionary principle, for example, led to specific legislation in consumer product areas. Food consisting of engineered nanomaterials should, according to the EU Novel Foods Regulation,[28] for example, be assessed using the most up-to-date test methods to assess their safety and specific methods applicable to them may be required.[29]

Scientific development: the application of the precautionary principle (also) leads to more research into the risks. As long as there is scientific uncertainty, research is conducted until scientific uncertainty disappears and scientific certainty is established.

Reversal of the burden of proof: the European Commission is of the opinion that with prior approval mechanisms, the burden of proof is placed on the manufacturer. In absence of such mechanisms, this should not be the general rule, but may be applied ad hoc to the case.[30]

© pexels.com / Léo Léo

What should be done?

After it has been established what the options are, the question is what should be done. Relevant considerations to take into account are the following:

The relevant legal framework: depending on the risk and technology in question, different (regional) laws may be applicable.

The policy framework: on top of the legislation, policies might have been developed that can guide the decision.

Experience from earlier examples and solutions: it might be wise to look at similar cases to assess which measures are appropriate and effective, mindful that uncertain risks (and their potential solutions) are difficult to compare.

Principles and considerations

Moreover, the following **principles and considerations** can play a role in deciding on what should be done[31]:

Legality: measures may not transgress existing laws.

Non-discrimination is a general principle of EU law providing that similar situations must not be treated differently unless there are objective reasons for doing so. For example, the adoption of restrictive measures justified by the precautionary principle for the protection of human health cannot create discriminatory treatment between companies.[32] Non-discrimination can also be triggered by the inconsistency of measures adopted under the precautionary principle. For example, when EU countries adopt differentiated measures for the protection of human health, they might discriminate between national and non-national EU citizens.[33]

Consistency: the measures should, if possible, ideally be consistent with measures already taken. This ensures a sufficient level of legal certainty. It should however be noted that inconsistencies in the application of the precautionary principle are deemed to arrive due to the specificity of different situations. Changes in the legal norms and the knowledge about a new technology can offer new insights into the measures that are necessary. One should thus be very reserved inferring general rules of consistency based on earlier measures.

Subsidiarity: the EU attaches importance to the principle of subsidiarity. This means that decisions are retained by Member States if the intervention of the European Union is not necessary. However, when a product or technology is in development across the whole EU it might be advised to impose EU-wide measures. This depends on the extent that the EU has competence over the domain in question.

Checks and balances: When it comes to the types of risks that the precautionary principle is concerned with, it is important that there is a clear division of responsibility, accountability and oversight in relation to the measures taken. When the independence and quality of assessments by industry is doubted, it is better to have an independent, disinterested actor be responsible for this.

Impact assessment

When the precautionary principle is invoked, an impact assessment should be applied to set out the necessary elements for the exercise of the principle. It is important to note that uncertain situations are difficult to assess through the means of, e.g., a cost benefit analysis, and thus the impact assessments should be carried out sparingly. This is because fundamentally unknown costs cannot be weighed against fundamentally unknown benefits without making highly speculative assumptions.[34]

According to the EU Court, impact assessments need to be carried out to ascertain that a given measure is necessary and appropriate for the pursuit of a legitimate aim.[35] The EU Court also argues that the formal requirements of such an impact assessment are moderate.[36] It would not be sensible to argue that all precautionary interventions must prove that the benefits of a precautionary intervention outweigh the costs, as this is often impossible to sufficiently make clear in the case of scientific uncertainty.

The EU courts have defined the principle of proportionality as requiring that measures are appropriate, suitable and should not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objectives pursued.[37] Notably, this can be difficult to assess in the case of uncertain risks.[38]

When health is at stake, the European Court of Justice allowed competent authorities wide discretionary power to decide, on the basis of the 'scientific risk assessment', 'which measures appear to it to be appropriate and necessary to prevent the risk materialising'.[39] The EU Court also stated that 'a cost/benefit analysis is a particular expression of the principle of proportionality in cases involving risk management'.[40]

The Commission defines this as 'comparing the overall cost to the EU of action and lack of action, in both the short and long term´. This is not simply an economic cost-benefit analysis, but should consider non-economic criteria such as the efficacy of possible options and their acceptability to the public. An examination of the pros and cons should include an economic cost-benefit analysis where this is appropriate and possible.[41] Other points that are useful to take into account during the cost-benefit analysis are:

- The fact that many benefits of innovations are in themselves also accompanied by significant uncertainty.
- That there may be alternative technologies or innovation pathways that provide the same benefits, but do not carry (the same) risks.
- That some measures can lead to regrettable substitution. For example, while phthalates are strictly regulated and even banned for some products, a complete ban of phthalates could result in industry using other chemicals that are less known and perhaps even more harmful.

Who can act?

In principle, the precautionary principle is directed at public authorities.

Moreover, it depends on the measures that need to be taken, but in general this comes down to an interaction between public authorities who issue for example a ban, regulatory agencies that adjust their admission procedures, a public research institute that is assigned to further examine a particular risk, and particular companies that are required to adjust their technological development or are made responsible for delivering the burden of proof for the safety of the technology.

3.4.6 Monitoring the situation

Once the appropriate measures have been taken, there should ideally be a way through which the need and effect of the measures are monitored.

Measures should ideally be subject to review, in the light of new scientific data. According to the European Commission this means that 'measures based on the precautionary principle should be maintained so long as scientific information is incomplete or inconclusive, and the risk is still considered too high to be imposed on society, in view of chosen level of protection. Measures should be periodically reviewed in the light of scientific progress, and amended as necessary'.[42]

This also means that the measures should assign responsibility for producing the scientific evidence. It should be made clear what the conditions for sufficient scientific evidence are, and which parties or methods are capable of and/or reliable for providing it in the future.

Figure 2: Six phases in the application of the precautionary principle



3.5 The precautionary principle as a compass

The precautionary principle can also be used proactively as a policy principle and compass that helps policymakers guide innovation in more societally acceptable directions. Introducing precaution into the processes of innovation will result in technologies that are better suited to the demands and values of society. In the compass function the precautionary principle triggers **upstream debates and research about the potential impacts** of emerging technologies and related innovation pathways and **helps anticipate potential risks and unintended outcomes and stimulate early adjustments** in innovation development.

This section gives an introduction in the different ways in which the precautionary principle can shape and (re)direct innovation processes towards inherently safe, clean and sustainable production, consumption and technologies. This makes it possible to pro-actively anticipate the uncertain risks of emerging technologies and adjust these technologies by making them safer before they enter the market. This is especially useful for policymakers concerned with R&D programmes where there are reasonable grounds to think that the end product could do serious harm when it is implemented or implemented on a wide scale.

3.5.1 The precautionary principle and responsible innovation

Applying the precautionary principle in shaping and (re)directing innovation processes, basically implies a broadening of innovation in two ways: making space for the societal and environmental aspects of the technology besides only the technical, scientific and economic ones, and anticipating how the technology will function in society.

This approach connects to four dimensions that Stilgoe et al[43] connect to Responsible Innovation:

Anticipation:
"Anticipation involves systematic thinking aimed at increasing resilience, while revealing new opportunities for innovation and the shaping of agendas for socially robust risk research".[44]

Reflexivity:
"Reflexivity, at the level of institutional practice, means holding a mirror up to one's own activities, commitments and assumptions, being aware of the limits of knowledge and being mindful that a particular framing of an issue may not be universally held".[45]

Inclusion:
Inclusion could mean taking the time to involve different stakeholders in such a way as to lay bare the different impacts of a new technology on different communities.

Responsiveness:
"Responsible innovation requires a capacity to change shape or direction in response to stakeholder and public values and changing circumstances"[46].


© unsplash.com / Haley Truong

The compass function of the precautionary principle links to the dilemma of control. By the time the environmental, health-related and other social implications of technologies become manifest (possibly only in multi-decadal timeframes), they may be widely embedded in societal structures so that a change of direction is hardly or no longer possible. Use of the precautionary principle as a compass and policy approach means carrying out activities at an **early stage and on an ongoing basis** in technology development in order to anticipate possible risks. One example activity is the funding of early and ongoing **risk research**. Another example activity is making early and repeated use of **foresight or constructive technology assessment approaches**, in order to elucidate the possible risks and benefits by projecting different scenarios of development of innovations and their effects. Exploring possible risks and benefits requires both scientific-technical and practical knowledge and the inclusion of different perspectives and should take place with the engagement of stakeholders. The time lags associated with non-linear impacts also require including groups of young people and addressing the issue of intergenerational equity.

It is part of the dilemma of control that anticipation may not provide scientific evidence for adjustments in the innovation process because the technology is not yet sufficiently developed and widespread. Anticipation can, however, **help to understand the relevant uncertainties and possible ways of exploring alternative innovation pathways**. Anticipation activities are already taking place in EU innovation governance, but could be applied more widely and systematically.

In summary, the knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass can stimulate responsible innovation. Responsible innovation can consist of technologies that support new ways of living that are more protective for humans and the environment alike. It can also consist in the nurturing of more diverse innovation approaches (including social innovation) that helps to better prepare for identified uncertainties, e.g., in regard to how a technology will work in different cultural, social and ecological settings. The knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass can also help **promote a timely and more broadly informed application of the precautionary principle** in EU risk policy and regulation.

3.5.2 Examples of good practices

Examples of good practices[47] that adhere to using the precautionary principle as a compass are:

- Stimulating 'safety-by-design': this means the prevention of risks through strengthening safety as design factor in research and innovation of materials, products and processes.[48]
- Financially incentivising low-risk innovation pathways.
- Supporting technologies and supply chains that are modifiable, adjustable, repairable and circular as to increase responsiveness. This decreases the chance that design choices in technology are irreversible.
- Involving societal stakeholders in the design of the technology. For more information, *see guidance on participatory processes*.
- Stimulating 'constructive technology assessment': this means involving different stakeholderrs in the assessment of the future risks of a new technology. For more information, *see guidance on participatory processes*.
- Requiring a broader assessment of the wider impact of the introduction of a new technology before the start of an R&D programme. For more information, *see guidance on expertise*.

3.6 Conclusion

This guidance informs EU policymakers, scientific advisers and legislators about the **scope of application** of the precautionary principle.

In particular, this guidance proposes a **two-way use of the precautionary principle**.

On the one hand, the precautionary principle acts as a **legal safeguard**, through its formal inclusion in EU policies or regulations for the authorisation of products or processes. The use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard is an approach for policymakers to respond to improved anticipation of uncertain but potentially serious risks. In this way it links especially with the dimensions of responsiveness and reflexivity of the concept of RRI and RI.

On the other hand, the precautionary principle can also be used proactively as a **compass** that helps policymakers guide innovation in more societally acceptable directions. Introducing precaution into the processes of innovation will result in technologies that are better suited to the demands and values of society.

This guidance moreover offers considerations and principles that should be taken into account, underlining that standard instructions on the application of the precautionary principle are inappropriate given the advantages of a flexible use of the principle.

4 GUIDANCE ON THE ORGANISATION AND PRODUCTION OF EXPERTISE FOR PRECAUTION IN RISK REGULATION AND INNOVATION POLICY

4.1 Executive summary

The precautionary principle works best in a double role: as a safeguard and a compass. As a legal principle and safeguard, it can justify early policy or regulatory action to manage uncertain risks. As such, it ensures that the rights of current and future EU citizens are protected. As a compass and policy principle in research and innovation, the precautionary principle triggers upstream debates and research about the potential impacts of emerging technologies and related innovation pathways, and can lead to adjustments in innovation development and stimulate responsible innovation. Through this double role, the precautionary principle enhances the EU's capacity to anticipate, identify and proactively manage scientifically uncertain but plausible and potentially serious risks and contributes to (re)directing science and technology to societally beneficial ends.

Risk assessment, technology assessment as well as innovation policies and funding need to be well-informed by the precautionary principle so that situations that require consideration of the precautionary principle can be detected more adequately and more timely and new technologies become less likely to bring new risks. Well-organised andtimely collection and generation of **actionable knowledge** is key for dealing prudently with uncertain risks. Actionable knowledge for the precautionary principle is knowledge on the severity and nature of potential adverse effects, the nature of the uncertainties on the risks and on the proclaimed benefits, explicit articulation of knowledge gaps or risks and benefits, and knowledge on possible alternatives to the risky technology, or product under scrutiny.

Pluralisation of expert knowledge in scientific assessment is essential to assure that science advice for policy (risk management and innovation governance) is in line with best available evidence and considers all relevant scientific issues and knowledges. It should be ensured that as much relevant knowledge and experience as possible is brought to bear on decision-making about uncertain risks. This requires a transdisciplinary approach where not only scientific experts from multiple disciplines but also other knowledge-holders (e.g., professionals, workers, consumers or local people) are asked to contribute their specific knowledge regarding the likely consequences of the particular technology under scrutiny.

The EU needs to develop good practices and build capacity regarding how actionable knowledge for precaution can best be fruitfully pluralised. It is important to explicitly identify and mobilise relevant knowledge-holders regarding the issue at hand. It further requires that risk assessors work with a greater diversity of ways of knowing than it is the case today. Good practices need to be developed for weaving a wider range of knowledge, such as experience-based or practical knowledge into risk assessments. Participatory and deliberative governance approaches play a crucial role here (see Guidance C on participation). To pursue pluralisation while attending to power requires preventing corporate capture or misinformation campaigners slipping into spaces of co-creation.

Explicit and transparent problem scoping in risk assessment is essential to ensure that the right questions are addressed, relevant aspects and dimensions of the issue are not overlooked, and problem boundaries in the assessment of the uncertain risks are set wide enough to include the concerns of those affected by the risks and the risk regulation.

Policymakers should require that risk assessment includes systematic and transparent appraisal of scientific uncertainties, knowledge gaps and ignorance. An informed application of the precautionary principle requires that assessment authorities identify and characterise the concrete nature of the limitedness or even absence of scientific knowledge (known unknowns and data gaps) in a given case and communicate the uncertainties and conclusions about the plausibility of possible adverse effects to topolicy-makers and risk managers.

There is room to reform the regulatory system to become more flexible to act on early warnings and more open to include externally produced knowledge (various forms of knowledge produced outside of academia or governmental agencies) in routinised assessment processes and guidelines. It should consider a wide range of potentially relevant aspects of risks, including non-standardised so-called "endpoints" of the risk assessment. There are reported cases in the past, where uncertain risks that should have required precautionary action were overlooked due to blind spots in the risk assessment protocols and guidance documents used by EU agencies. Knowledge about risks that do not fit in these protocols (mostly academic scientific studies published in the peer-reviewed literature) were downplayed, marginalised, or ignored. Too often, it is necessary that coalitions of concerned scientists and societal actors step in and 'break the script' of routinised assessment and management processes in order to recognise key uncertainties and the potential for serious harm to human and environmental health.

Limited learning and information sharing across regulatory domains weakens the system's overall capacity to identify, understand and manage plausible threats. Ongoing reforms towards a holistic approach to chemical authorisation and regulation at the EU level ('one chemical, one assessment') could lead to improved outcomes. Steps must be taken to ensure that efforts to streamline research and assessment methodologies across agencies and issue areas do not create new blind spots.

Regrettable substitution tends to arise from a lack of foresight and non-contextual, substance-centric thinking. The potential for incremental learning through repeated assessments of similar substances may be a strength and not a weakness.

Early and recurrent risk research and anticipatory and foresight processes in risk and innovation governance (precautionary principle as a compass) are a cornerstone in responsible innovation. Responsible innovation obliges researchers to remain sensitive to the plausible social and ecological impacts

in ongoing research and development processes, and in the development of emergent and potentially future-shaping technologies. From a responsible innovation perspective, the precautionary principle is essential to help ensure responsive, adaptive and integrated management of the innovation process.

The search for less harmful and ecologically more sustainable alternatives needs to inform the broader array of public and private research and innovation infrastructures (e.g., research and education funding). The EU should target its substantial legal and financial capacity towards the definition of more ecologically sustainable and, more generally speaking, societally beneficial innovation pathways. Both the use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard and as a compass can contribute to technologies, innovation, and lifestyles that do less harm to humans and the environment and are respectful to social rights (such as the right to safe and healthy work). It is important that knowledge collection and generation of the two ways of using the precautionary principle are well interlinked and the results from both processes acknowledged as forming a body of actionable knowledge.

4.2 Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance on how to broaden and strengthen the knowledge on which the application of the precautionary principle is based. As shown in the *part on Scope of Application* the RECIPES guidance relates to:

- the application of the precautionary principle as a legal principle and safeguard, justifying early policy or regulatory action, and
- the use of the precautionary principle as a compass and policy approach in research and innovation, triggering upstream debates about and research on emerging technologies (or existing technologies considered safe until demonstrated otherwise) and related innovation pathways.

Both ways of using the precautionary principle are important to enhance European society's capacity to anticipate, identify and manage scientifically uncertain but plausible and potentially serious risks and thereby contribute to directing (or redirecting) science and technology to societally beneficial ends.


© pexels.com / Susanne Jutzeler sujufoto

4.2.1 The need for this guidance

The precautionary principle enables decision makers to deal prudently with uncertain risks and act to proactively protect human health and the environment when there are scientifically underpinned grounds for concern that these are at stake. That the precautionary principle is about dealing with uncertain risks[xxiii] does not mean that risk-related knowledge is of little relevance in the principle's application. To the contrary, well-organised and timely collection and generation of knowledge – on the nature of the uncertainties, the severity of potential adverse effects, and possible alternatives to the risk under scrutiny – are key for dealing prudently with uncertain risks.

xxiii We use the term 'risk' to encompass two types of risk: threats for which it is possible to confidently quantify the magnitude of a defined and agreed range of outcomes and also the probabilities of these outcomes (simply 'risk' or 'routine risk'), and threats for which this is not possible ('uncertain risks').

In the wake of the emerging notion of an 'innovation principle' at the European level[49], there have been fierce debates among EU-level stakeholders about the quality of the knowledge basis of using the precautionary principle in EU risk regulation. In these debates, grave doubts have been expressed about using regulatory science. Large parts of the chemical, pharmaceutical and biotech industry sectors have called for safeguards against regulatory science that, according to them, bows to political pressure, which leads to politicised risk assessments, over-precaution, and stifling of innovation. An opposite view has been expressed by various civil society organisations that have called for safeguards against corporate capture of regulatory science that leads to industry-friendly risk assessments, under-precaution, and missed opportunities of stimulating, directing or redirecting innovation towards societally beneficial outcomes. These controversies show that the knowledge basis on which the precautionary principle is applied (or not applied) in EU risk regulation, often referred to as 'regulatory science', is a political issue. In the scientific literature, regulatory science has been scrutinised critically in relation to the application of the precautionary principle. One of the conclusions from this critical reflection is that precautionary measures are frequently taken too late and often in a restrictive and piecemeal fashion[xxiv].

Another is that management of uncertain threats may result in regrettable substitution *(see Box 10)*. To overcome these issues, it is necessary to recognise that the precautionary principle has important implications for the organisation of risk assessment processes. As will be made clear, it requires a risk assessment practice that is geared towards the identification of scientifically uncertain but plausible threats to protected values. Against this background, this document provides orientation and inspiration regarding the following questions:

- How could the production of 'actionable knowledge' be organised in ways that improve the timely identification of scientifically uncertain but plausible and potentially serious risks and improve their management?
- How could the credibility and transparency of the processes of producing regulatory knowledge for decisions on whether to apply the precautionary principle be improved?

In this document, **actionable knowledge**[xxv] for the precautionary principle is knowledge on the severity and nature of potential adverse effects, the nature of the uncertainties on the risks and on the proclaimed benefits, explicit articulation of knowledge gaps regarding risks and benefits, and knowledge on possible alternatives to the risky technology, or product under scrutiny. Actionable knowledge includes regulatory knowledge[xxvi] but is not limited to knowledge relevant for risk assessment or risk management. Moreover, it includes knowledge that may help proactively shape technology and innovation pathways towards a high level of human health and environmental protection.

xxiv The Late Lessons from Early Warning reports from the European Environment Agency together analyse 34 case studies where long delays between early warnings and regulatory action led to huge error costs. Haunting examples are the case of asbestos, lead in petrol, and mad cow disease (EEA, 2001; EEA, 2013).

xxv On the science of actionable knowledge as an emerging area of inquiry that "aims to understand and catalyze transitions in scientific knowledge making and use" see: Arnott, J.C., Mach, K.J., & Wong-Parodi, G. (eds.) (2020). Advancing the science of actionable knowledge for sustainability. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 42 (Special Issue), A1-A6, 1-82.

xxvi Regulatory knowledge may include diverse forms or bits of knowledge relevant to risk assessment and to informing decisions on whether to adopt precautionary measures in a regulatory arena.

4.2.2 Outline of the guidance

The next chapter *(Chapter 4.3)* deals with the implications of the precautionary principle for risk assessment processes in Europe. The chapter highlights four features of any risk governance regime that are fundamental to ensuring that timely and precautionary actions can be taken. Society needs to be assured that the right questions are being asked, that the right knowledge-holders are involved in answering these to the best of their ability, and that the processes are geared to achieving the systematic identification and appraisal of scientific and other uncertainties and their potential consequences. Moreover, key uncertainties must be communicated in a way that makes it possible to hold policymakers accountable for failures to address plausible threats to human health and the environment. These questions are matters of scoping, knowledge pluralisation, uncertainty appraisal and uncertainty communication[xxvii].

Chapter 4.4 then provides some suggestions for **ways forward** to strengthen and broaden the knowledge base for using the precautionary principle in EU risk regulation and for exercising precaution in technology development and innovation policy. Amongst other things, it shows that the use of the precautionary principle as a compass, via risk research or foresight processes for example, ideally at an early stage of technology development, can inform the application of the precautionary principle in an upcoming or existing regulatory arena. It highlights that the value of the use of the precautionary principle as a compass is not exhausted in informing the application of the precautionary principle. Rather, it is another way – beyond formally including the precautionary principle in EU policies or regulations – to shape our common technological future. It can help capture early warnings and help European societies towards more sustainable innovation trajectories.

4.3 Fundamental issues relating to the knowledge for precaution

In order for assessment processes to enable societies to take precautionary action against plausible harm, society needs to be assured that these processes are capable and intended to identify risks that are plausible, even though scientifically uncertain. If the precautionary principle is a tool for risk management only, then its usefulness would be sorely weakened if the guidelines and protocols used by European agencies to generate knowledge that informs managerial decisions do not adequately address sources of uncertainty. That would substantially compromise Europe's capacity to detect and act upon early warnings of threats that are yet to be completely understood. As demonstrated by RECIPES's case studies, and previous work on the application of the precautionary principle in Europe and elsewhere[50], assessment regimes often fail to account for uncertainties, ignorance and knowledge gaps. Indeed, they tend to emphasise the features of given problems that are most amenable to standardisation, protocolisation and control[51].

It seems that parts of the European risk governance regime are currently premised on an ignorance of known sources of uncertainty about potentially serious and deleterious impacts on protected values. Hence, the impact assessments produced by the regime cannot in themselves give impetus to precau-

xxvii Matters of knowledge pluralisation and uncertainty communication are also explored in the guidance on participation.


© pexels.com / Pixabay

tionary interventions because they do not mention plausible threats, to insect biodiversity, for example. Even though uncertainties (especially unquantifiable ones) are often excluded from the scope of assessment processes, precautionary interventions cannot be precluded. Risk assessment procedures will often fail to account for all relevant aspects of the issue at hand, which increases the probability that routine risk assessment fails to detect situations that require consideration of the precautionary principle. For this reason, the broader risk governance regime needs to be open to knowledge claims from the outside *(see Chapter 4.4 for details)*.

The shortcomings of applying the precautionary principle highlighted in case studies in the scientific literature and stakeholders' publicly expressed doubts about the trustworthiness and legitimacy of regulatory science show the importance of subjecting the science and knowledge underlying the application of the precautionary principle to transparent quality assurance. Transparency has been awarded the status of a cornerstone in the EU's concept of good governance[xxviii]. By transparency of quality assurance, we mean that those responsible for applying the precautionary principle in EU risk regulation (the use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard) specify in publicly available documentation the provisions taken to assure the credibility and social robustness of the science and knowledge basis used in risk governance.

In the following sections, we highlight four features of any risk governance regime that are fundamental to ensuring that precautionary actions can be taken if there is no external interference. Society needs to be assured that (1) the right questions are being asked, that (2) the right knowledge-holders are involved in answering these to the best of their ability, (3) that the processes are intended to systematically identify and appraise scientific and other uncertainties and their implications, and that (4) these are communicated in a way that makes it possible to hold policymakers accountable for failures to address threats to human health and the environment. These questions are matters of scoping *(Section 4.3.1)*, knowledge pluralisation *(Section 4.3.2)* and uncertainty appraisal and uncertainty communication *(Section 4.3.3)*.

xxviii The European Commission's 2001 White Paper on European Governance prescribes with regard to the principle of openness, that EC institutions 'should work in a more open manner' and 'actively communicate about what the EU does and the decisions it takes'. The white paper stresses that openness and transparency are particularly important 'whenever the Union is required to apply the precautionary principle and play its role in risk assessment and risk management' (European Commission, 2001).

4.3.1 Problem scoping to avoid addressing the wrong problem

Which uncertain risks and aspects of an uncertain risk are considered relevant to include in a risk assessment and which knowledge gaps or blind spots result from the choices made, depends on the scoping of the risk problem. During problem scoping, the risk to be scrutinised is broadly framed and defined, and the range and types of (plausible) effects, the knowledge needed about them, and the experts who will supply this knowledge are identified. Scoping delimits the system used to investigate the risk in the assessment, as well as the procedures necessary for this examination. Explicit problem scoping requires well-informed judgements *(see Box 3)*.

Box 3: Judgements relating to risk assessment policy[52]

- The kinds of impact deemed to be within the scope of the assessment, and those that are outside it;
- The kinds of evidence that should be included and those that should be discounted;
- How to interpret the available evidence;
- How to respond to uncertainties, and;
- How much of different kinds of evidence would be necessary or sufficient to sustain different types of judgement (e.g. that precautionary action is needed)

In practice, it is untenable to make a distinction between a purely scientific upstream risk assessment phase followed by a downstream risk management phase. Scientific and socio-political factors are intertwined throughout the assessment and management of risk. Scoping of a risk problem is often an implicit and informal process in European risk governance and regulatory practice, and it is difficult to ascertain whether it is part of risk assessment, risk management, or both. There are good reasons for scoping to be an **explicit process and a risk governance step in its own right that includes both risk assessors and risk managers**. One reason is that this can help ensure that scientific expert advisors address the right questions, i.e., those that are relevant to the overall goals of policymaking and the needs of risk management and that resonate with the concerns of those affected by the risks and the risk regulation.

Problem scoping organised as an explicit and interactive process can also help ensure that expert scientific advisors address the right questions in the right manner. Policymakers and scientific experts, and, depending on the case, also relevant stakeholders *(see chapter 5 on Participation of the RECIPES guidance)* should engage in dialogue with the purpose of defining the risks and scientific uncertainties that need to be addressed in assessment. This can include, for example, a participatory bottom-up process to elicit from stakeholders' rival hypotheses on the causal relations underlying a risk and rival risk assessments.[53]

With regard to problem scoping, EU policymakers and agencies can demonstrate quality assurance in the science and knowledge basis of the application of the precautionary principle by documenting the procedures and outcome of explicit problem-scoping processes. This can include, for example, documentation[xxix] that:

- Problem scoping allows for interaction and deliberation between risk assessors and risk managers, and, if relevant, also stakeholders.
- Problem scoping is not reduced to defining questions for assessing measurable risk but is sensitive to uncertainties and ignorance that need to be treated differently from risks that can be confidently quantified in the assessment process.

xxix Transparent documentation of problem scoping can also help prevent unjustified accusations of a 'politicisation' of risk assessments.


© pexels.com / Alvaro Tejero

- Review mechanisms for problem scoping have been used where appropriate, e.g., in response to new scientific findings or stakeholder debates. A typical question to be posed during review is whether a current problem definition (for example, expressed as a health risk) is so narrow that salient features of the problem have been left out (such as uncertain environmental impact) or, alternatively, that the definition is too broad (for example, expressed as a general health risk) after specific aspects of a given problem have been solved (providing evidence, for example, that there is health risk only for especially vulnerable individuals).

4.3.2 Pluralisation of expert knowledge in assessment

European-level guidelines on procedures for assuring the quality of scientific advice for policymakers and society highlight that the group of scientific expert advisors as a whole need to have 'the full range of expertise required for the topic'[54]. The same applies to risk-related expert advice provided by regulatory agencies such as the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) or the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA). Including the 'full range of expertise' can assure that scientific reports 'are in line with best available evidence and consider all relevant scientific issues and knowledge'[55]. A plurality of disciplinary perspectives can moreover 'act as a check-and-balance procedure to test disciplinary presumptions and norms that may themselves introduce unintended bias'[56].

When informing decisions on risks and innovation it is critically important that both systematic and experiential / practical knowledge is included in the diversity and plurality of expertise applied in the assessment. In addition to scientists of the different relevant expert disciplines also relevant stakeholders (e.g., workers and worker representatives, consumers, or local residents) should be asked to contribute their specific knowledge on the likely consequences of the particular technology under scrutiny that may carry uncertain but potentially serious risks[57] *(see chapter 5 on Participation of the RECIPES guidance)*.

It is of particular importance to include a plurality of perspectives and forms of expertise in the scoping process to reduce the likelihood, that important aspects of the issue are overlooked. Case study analyses have highlighted blind spots of routine regulatory science regarding risks[58]. This calls more generally for the inclusion of a wider range of relevant knowledges and expertise *(see Section 4.4.2)*.

With regard to involvement of expert knowledge, EU public authorities can provide evidence of quality assurance in the science and knowledge basis by documenting the diversity of expertise included in the assessment process and any deliberate attempts to manage conflicts of interest. Here it is important to document that:

- A plurality of scientific disciplines and a diversity of scientific views (including minority views and non-routine regulatory science) have been involved in the risk assessment.
- In cases of strong uncertainty regarding risks and proclaimed benefits, the assessment also includes stakeholders and their experiential and practical knowledge.
- A conflict-of-interests policy has been applied, designed to ensure that when conflicts of interest arise, they are disclosed, acknowledged and managed[59].

4.3.3 Appraisal of scientific uncertainties

The precautionary principle is generally considered a way 'to address uncertain risks' and to 'legitimate[s] decisions and actions in situations characterised by uncertainty'[60]. The precautionary principle is essentially about uncertainty. For some time, there has been growing acknowledgement in EU risk policy of the limitations of available scientific knowledge (data, information, incomplete understanding of causal mechanisms) and of the need to take these into account when deciding on management measures. An informed application of the precautionary principle requires that assessment authorities identify and characterise the concrete nature of the limitedness or even absence of scientific knowledge (known unknowns and data gaps) in a given case and communicate the uncertainties and conclusions about the plausibility of possible adverse effects to non-specialists too, such as policymakers and risk managers.

With regard to scientific uncertainties, EU public authorities can provide evidence of quality assurance in the science and knowledge basis by documenting the procedure and outcome of a systematic uncertainty assessment and communication[xxx]. It is important to document that:

- All plausible sources and types of uncertainty and ignorance have been taken into account *(see chapter 3 on Scope of Application of the RECIPES guidance)* and different key components of uncertainty have been considered[61].
- The judgement of plausibility of possible adverse effects has been grounded in scientific analysis. Scientific assessment should be continuously updated as new knowledge becomes available and the actions chosen should be subject to periodic reviews in the light of advancing knowledge to promote learning and improve policy[62].
- Risk managers are provided with a traceable account of the evidence and uncertainties regarding adverse effects and the reasoning behind the expert judgements on the plausibility of the possible adverse effects.

xxx For precautionary risk governance, the reflexive approach to uncertainty taken by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency is widely recognised as best practice (Petersen et al., 2013). The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently undertaken steps towards formal uncertainty analyses towards requiring uncertainty analyses to be part of risk assessments and endorses such developments (EFSA, 2018). EFSA also provides guidance on communication of uncertainty (EFSA, 2019). This approach is, however, narrower in scope (excludes known and unknown unknowns) and is more suitable for the prevention principle (all uncertainty is quantifiable), whereas the Netherlands approach better matches the precautionary principle (substantial unquantifiable uncertainties and known unknowns).

4.4 Ways forward to strengthen the knowledge basis for precaution in risk regulation and innovation policy

In order to help develop safe and sustainable technologies and products, consideration should be given to broadening and strengthening the knowledge base used when applying the precautionary principle as a safeguard in regulation and when using it as a compass in technology development and innovation policy. These considerations should be discussed in a structured and transparent manner at EU and national levels at the science–policy–society nexus in order to inform current debates about precaution and innovation.

The question which **'grounds for concern'** can trigger consideration of the precautionary principle (the so-called 'knowledge condition') cannot be generalised and needs to be judged **case by case**. The reason for this is that novel ways of causing harm and surprises that may accompany new products and technologies may not fit a universally applicable closed definition of the knowledge condition that justifies precautionary action. In order to be compatible with the precautionary principle, the assessment of risks must reflect on and systematically consider the knowledge condition of the precautionary principle. The assessment process must aim to identify the plausible possible harm that could be caused to protected values (e.g., human health or the environment). Even if they are barred from advising decision-makers to take precautionary measures, assessors must be able to indicate in clear and understandable language the presence of knowledge conditions that trigger the precautionary principle and should systematically search for this (i.e., applying the precautionary principle requires an anticipatory aproach to risk assessment that makes use of activities such as early risk research or foresight and extended technology assessment approaches). The assessment procedures used when applying the precautionary principle must be very sensitive to identifying plausible threats to human health, social rights (such as the right to safe and healthy work), and the environment, as the price of overlooking them can be very high. They must be sensitive to identifying plausible threats for affected groups (e.g., consumers or workers) and for vulnerable groups (e.g. children or elderly people) and groups that cannot speak for themselves (e.g. future generations).

The application of the precautionary principle requires a **scientific risk assessment**, even if, by comparison with a 'standard' quantitative risk assessment, this is incomplete. The results of the scientific assessment should show what is known, what is not known and what can be known about the risk in terms of hazard (inherent properties in the activity or substance that could lead to adverse effects), exposure and magnitude (or seriousness) of potential effects. Analysis of the evidence of hazard, exposure and magnitude needs to be complemented by an analysis of uncertainty. Several possible ways forward for broadening and strengthening the science and knowledge base are highlighted below.



© unsplash.com / Brook Anderson

4.4.1 Extending the scope of risk assessment

Box 4 lists several ways to ensure in assessment that as much pertinent knowledge and experience as possible is brought to bear on decision-making about uncertain risks. Such provisions help ensure that the assessment of uncertain risks is based on the **required depth and forms of knowledge**. Precaution is often defined as a risk management principle applied after scientific assessment takes place[xxxi].

However, invoking the precautionary principle in risk assessment too (as well as in problem scoping) safeguards against understating uncertainty and opting by default for the application of a more narrowly focused quantitative risk assessment that is unsuited to dealing with states of knowledge characterised by strong uncertainties and/or ignorance.[xxxii] The overall process of risk governance should be precautionary in the sense that throughout it is sensitive to uncertainties and knowledge gaps and to potentially serious harm.

Box 4: Heuristic device to guide assessment of uncertain risks[63]

- Extend the scope of assessment to include *additive and cumulative* exposure *and synergistic effects*, if the causal connections are not well understood and cannot be modelled with a high degree of confidence; set priorities on the effects of greatest scientific and political concern.

- Address aspects of possible limitations of standard regulatory science and the need to also draw on knowledge from non-standardized studies and engage with non-standard knowledge holders by gathering evidence of potential effects and uncertainty from *as diverse an array of disciplines (e.g. observational studies, toxicological studies, ecological assessment, modelling and monitoring) and other knowledge holders (e.g. consumers, workers, beekeepers, local residents)* at the outset of assessment, in order to elicit the pertinent prioritisation, conceptualisation and interpretation of the different questions that may arise from the scientific data and the comprehensive exploration of the resulting sensitivities.

- Systematically examine the potential adverse effects of the innovative or established technologies or products presenting the uncertain risk in question at the earliest stages in the innovation process, before firm financial and institutional commitments are made.

- Subject to the terms of reference, make a detailed and balanced comparison of contending merits and drawbacks of a series of alternatives (functional equivalents) to the technologies or products under scrutiny.

- Focus explicitly on the extent to which the technologies or products under scrutiny display properties of *flexibility, adaptability, reversibility* and *diversity* – all of which offer different ways of hedging against exposure to any residual ignorance that has not been addressed by the other elements of the assessment.

- Shift the *burden of persuasion*, so that it is those wishing to implement the technology or product in question who must acquire relevant data and sustain an argument of the acceptability of the associated risk, subject to an appropriate level of proof.

xxxi The European Commission's Communication on the Precautionary Principle describes the principle as particularly relevant to risk management; the Communication does not explicitly negate a relevance for risk assessment (European Commission, 2000).

xxxii In the risk governance literature, it has also been found that from a legal point of view nothing precludes that the risk assessment stage has to be carried out in accordance with the obligations stemming from the precautionary principle (Vos & Wendler, 2009).

4.4.2 Being open to emerging knowledge and 'nonstandard' knowledge in risk assessment and science for policy

As indicated in *Section 4.3.2*, the 'actionable knowledge' bases should include the widest possible range of potentially usable knowledges.[64] Actionable knowledge is knowledge that can inform decision-making and action. It requires identification of the circumstances favourable for desirable outcome or for averting an undesirable outcome. In the context of great uncertainty and controversy (whether scientific or socio-political), science cannot be expected to speak with one voice and multiple tenable scientific perspectives need to be included.[65] Below, we outline some different types of 'non-standardised' knowledges relevant for risk assessments and science for innovation policy more broadly.

4.4.2.1 Why risk assessment must be open to 'non-standard' knowledge

In risk assessments of technologies and innovations, 'regulatory science' is essential[66] [xxxiii]. In practice, however, there is a tendency to prioritise and rely more heavily on evidence from industry-sponsored studies conducted according to standardised and internationally validated test guidelines, than on evidence from scientific studies conducted independently and stringently peer-reviewed before publication in scholarly journals.

However, regulatory science may contain **blind spots**, and has in many cases led to risks being overlooked[67]. The case of the re-evaluation of neonicotinoids in the EU is illustrative of how different bodies of knowledge were taken into account, and how this enabled precautionary measures to be considered *(see Box 5)*. It is therefore strongly recommended to consider to include a **broader knowledge base** (one that includes knowledge from 'non-standardised' studies and involves non-standard knowledge holders) in a more open and holistic way (less restricted by pre-defined end-points) in risk assessment.[xxxiv]

A further lesson from the ongoing debates on Europe's pesticide regulation and the protection of pollinators is that the precautionary principle can be undermined in practice if it is replaced by a limited set of **overly specific protection goals**. In the domain of plant protection products, the last decade has witnessed a prolonged and contentious process of formulating a precise definition of 'acceptable harm' to pollinators. In their current form, the so-called Specific Protection Goals (SPG) assume that pesticide-induced pollinator losses are acceptable if they are within the bounds of bees' 'natural' background mortality.

© unsplash.com / Eric Ward

xxxiii In this document, regulatory science refers to forms or bits of knowledge that are pivotal in institutionalised risk assessment (e.g., toxicological risk assessment) because they are defined in statutory standards or guidelines. They are authorised and standardised forms of knowledge (e.g., knowledge from high-dose animal testing) which play a central role in informing the adoption of policy measures (e.g., authorisation of chemicals), and, more specifically, in informing the application or non-application of the precautionary principle in a regulatory arena.

xxxiv In this document, non-standard knowledge refers to potentially diverse forms or bits of knowledge relevant for risk assessment and for informing the application or non-application of the precautionary principle and the adoption of policy measures in a regulatory arena. Relevant knowledge is diverse and besides standardised forms of systematic knowledge may include non-standardised forms of systematic knowledge, practical knowledge and experiential knowledge.

Box 5: Pluralisation of knowledge in the risk assessment and regulation of neonicotinoids (plant protection products)[68]

In 2013 and 2018 the EU restricted, respectively further restricted the use of a group of 3 neonicotinoids together. The banning of a group of active substances from the same chemical family is highly exceptional in pesticide regulation. Previously, pesticides whose unacceptable impacts were only discovered after they had come onto the market had been phased out one by one. Sublethal effects of pesticides were the key to understanding how neonicotinoids impact bees. Knowledge about sublethal effects on bees has not been routinely produced because the knowledge on which EFSA bases its regulatory risk assessment is generated by using strict protocols that follow a reductionist approach. These protocols reduce the complex reality of risks to a limited set of so-called end-points such as acute toxicity and in the subsequent risk management phase, the risks are balanced against the benefits. The processes of risk assessment and risk management are characterised by substance-centric thinking in which:

- The focus is predominantly on acute toxicity measured in standardised lab experiments.
- Safety knowledge is combined with economic or use knowledge such as the efficacy and practical value as a plant protection tool, which is balanced against the knowledge on the hazards to non-target organisms.
- The regulatory knowledge is substance–centred. This implies that it is unlikely that knowledge about a family of chemicals with similar mode of action and their joint overall impact on the environment and non-target species will be produced when European agencies adhere strictly to their protocols. Historic cases have shown that the only way to expose the risks concealed in the blind spots of these protocols is to step in and break the script.

In the neonicotinoid case, alternative regulatory knowledge emerged because academic researchers, beekeepers, NGOs and politicians advocating environmental action formed a coalition that managed to intervene in the regulatory space. This reconfigured the regulatory space to include new actors and many more sources and forms of knowledge. This pluralisation of the knowledge that is considered in regulatory risk appraisal remedied the blind spots of routine regulatory science for low–dose chronic and sublethal effects, which in turn enabled the ban. Key factors enabling this were that academic researchers did not shy away from contributing their knowledge to the bureaucracies involved, despite this being an uphill struggle. They brought key knowledge from academic research on neonicotinoids directly to expert agencies across Europe such as EFSA and EEA and to national and European policymakers. Second, researchers teamed up with beekeepers who were associated with public interest groups. Journalists stepped up their coverage and specialised NGOs teamed up with academic scientists to make their actions evidence-informed.

Together, this created the momentum that ultimately led to the inclusion of a broader range of scientific evidence. This, in turn, made it possible to recognise the unacceptable harm to pollinators of normal authorised use of neonicotinoids. This externally forced inclusion of a wider range of scientific evidence in the regulatory science enabled the exceptional imposition of a ban on a group of chemicals. This turned upside down the routine, closed functioning of the regulatory space and the production of a standard regulatory science that structurally disregards low-dose and chronic, sublethal effects of pesticides. Unfortunately, the process did not lead to durable changes in the authorisation procedure for pesticides in Europe. It is therefore highly likely that routine regulatory science will continue to have serious blind spots in detecting risks to pollinators posed by existing and new pesticides. It also implies a continued need for academic scientists to be socially responsible and engage in coalitions with other societal actors to help bring excluded knowledge and early warning signals to the attention of the regulators and policymakers.

The formulation of specific protection goals, it is argued, is necessary for the design and implementation of environmental risk assessments. The problem with the ongoing process of establishing EFSA's new 'Bee Guidance',[69] is that it is not entirely clear what the general protection goal is. When the general goal of avoiding 'unacceptable harm to pollinators' is changed into 'unacceptable harm to honeybees' (a managed pollinator that is not representative for wild pollinators) and this is expressed as an acceptable range of pesticide-induced honeybee mortality, in effect the two protection goals (general and specific) collapse. Does specifying an acceptable range of honeybee losses mean that the precautionary principle can no longer apply to pesticide-induced pollinator losses? It seems that the bee guidance in this way conflates the precautionary principle with the **principle of prevention**.

At present, the SPG is calibrated using highly incomplete and contested data. If the general goal is to ensure that pesticides – in combination with other stressors – do not contribute to the eradication of wild pollinators, then the SPG – however it ends up being derived – cannot be said to close the door on precautionary action, either nationally or at the EU level.

4.4.2.2 Including the findings from academic studies in the natural sciences into regulatory science

It is increasingly acknowledged that the advances in sciences reported in peer-reviewed publications need to be better included in regulatory risk assessments. In 'A European Green Deal', the European Commission states that '... the regulatory framework will need to rapidly reflect scientific evidence on the risk posed by endocrine disruptors, hazardous chemicals in products including imports, combination effects of different chemicals and very persistent chemicals'[70]. EU legislation mandates regulatory agencies to take peer-reviewed scientific publications into consideration in risk assessments, and it has become mandatory to include a literature search and review of the available publications in the regulatory process[71, 72]. Guidance documents for risk assessments also recommend a review of all relevant toxicity data in the risk assessment process.[73, 74] Yet, in some cases, risk assessment and management processes are critiqued for neglecting full reviews of academic studies and for not updating guidance documents often enough to reflect advances in the sciences[75]. Therefore, it seems that the contribution of non-guideline studies from peer-reviewed scientific literature to regulatory risk assessments needs to be substantially strengthened.

The EU ban on neonicotinoids was based on a post-authorisation review by the EFSA that included an extensive updated literature search (instead of primarily relying on the dossier provided by the industry). It thus was largely based on non-guidance academic peer-reviewed studies. In the court case that followed, Bayer CropScience argued that inclusion of such scientific literature in the risk assessment was illegal. However, the EU Court of Justice disagreed with Bayer CropScience and endorsed that knowledge from non-standardised studies not only may be used by the EFSA but must be used: 'account is to be taken of the best scientific and technical knowledge available'[76], and: 'in the context of the review of the approval of an active substance, the conclusion that the approval criteria laid down in Article 4 of Regulation No 1107/2009 are no longer satisfied may be based on any new knowledge, in so far as it is scientific or technical, regardless of the source or document from which it comes.'[77]

Another challenge seems to be how to interpret evidence produced through peer-

reviewed studies and weigh it against guideline-compliant studies. In EFSA's 'Guidance on the use of the weight of evidence approach in scientific assessments'[78], reliability, relevance and consistency are considered the three basic considerations when weighing evidence. In environmental and health risk assessments, it is important that both the relevance and the reliability of the studies are taken into consideration, which in turn depends on the efficient integration of findings from academic research studies[79]. Risk assessments have, however, been criticised for favouring reliability (reproducibility) over relevance.[80] A reason for this may be that reliability is easier to test in studies that follow Good Laboratory Practice (GLP)[xxxv] – because this ensures that the information is available for checking reliability (note that GLP does not warrant reliability).

GLP has been criticised because it does not address the quality of the experimental set–up, nor does it address the question of statistical power. Indeed, the initial market authorisation of neonicotinoids in Europe was based on the findings of flawed field studies, because the only criterion for inclusion or exclusion was whether the study had a GLP certificate and not whether the experimental set-up was correct or whether the experiment had sufficient statistical power to prove absence of ecologically relevant effects[81]. The assessment of reliability in academic studies is much more complex than what is covered by the OECD guidelines and the GLP, and it is clearly more difficult to assess the reliability of novel research contributions[82]. Whereas academic studies are often reviewed as part of risk assessment studies, guideline compliant studies are routinely – but unduly – assigned greater weight because they are considered reliable by default[83]. However, guideline studies can still be unreliable for reasons other than those covered by the guidelines and/or may score lower on relevance, as they do not always represent the most relevant testing approaches and cannot investigate all relevant adverse effects.

By contrast, academic studies are often found to be more sensitive **to key uncertainties and emergent threats** (e.g., in the identification and evaluation of endocrine–disrupting chemicals).[84] In order to enhance the understanding and assessment of the reliability and relevance of academic studies, several more comprehensive tools and guidelines have been developed for the regulatory assessment of chemicals. *Box 6* shows a selection of such tools.

xxxv The aim of GLP is to ensure the quality of the laboratory practices by specifying standard operational laboratory procedures and extensive requirements for data reporting.

© unsplash.com / Drew Hays

Box 6: Tools and guidelines for understanding and assessing the reliability and relevance of academic studies for chemicals regulation

SciRAP (Science in Risk Assessment and Policy): Bridging the gap between academic research and chemicals regulation and policy

A web-based reporting and evaluation resource developed to facilitate and increase the use of academic toxicity and ecotoxicity studies in regulatory assessment of chemicals. SciRAP provides criteria for the evaluation of the reliability and relevance of studies used by regulators and risk assessors. The intention is to bridge the gap between academic research and chemicals regulation and policy (compared to NUSAP, see Box 7, this tool deals more with internal validity than external validity): *http://www.scirap.org/*

Qualichem in vivo: Improving quality assurance of in vivo studies that may or may not be following standardised guidelines

An academic paper has proposed using a tool called 'Qualichem in vivo' that is designed to systematically and transparently assess the quality of in vivo studies used in chemical health risk assessment. It is intended to provide a balanced, common framework for assessing the quality of studies that may or may not be following standardised guidelines: Maxim, L., & Van der Sluijs, J. P. (2014). Qualichem in vivo: A tool for assessing the quality of in vivo studies and its application for Bisphenol A. PLOS one, 9(1), e87738.

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0087738

Qualichem_epi: Improving the management of uncertainty through in-depth mapping of heterogeneity in expert judgement

An academic paper has proposed using a method called 'Qualichem_epi' for in-depth mapping of heterogeneity in expert judgement when evaluating the quality of epidemiological studies used in regulatory chemical risk assessment. The method provides an easily understandable colour-based picture of the majority and minority opinions in a scientific advisory group. Its aim is to improve the management of uncertainty by taking full account of the heterogeneity of scientists' judgements about the quality of epidemiological studies: Maxim, L., & Van der Sluijs, J. (2018). Quality of epidemiological studies: Procedural rules for uncertain science for policy, a case study on bisphenol-A. Environmental Science & Policy, 84, 80-87.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1462901117313114

4.4.2.3 Diverse scientific disciplines and knowledges

As we have seen above, the regulatory system routinely privileges some ways of knowing, types of knowledge, and source of knowledge over others. Guideline–compliant research (e.g., industry studies) is often judged to be more actionable and more reliable than academic studies. Natural sciences as such do not have privileged access to decision-making processes; a narrow selection of scientific approaches does. The same process of privileging and silencing is at work in the assessment of broader societal impact too. In assessing the social impact of decision-making, contributions that give rise to seemingly clear-cut, quantitative estimates of the social and economic consequences of given policy choices, legislative actions or regulatory interventions are often privileged[85]. The work of Andy Stirling[86] and others has demonstrated that the inclusion of other perspectives tends to provide more holistic appreciation of the costs and benefits of given courses of action and can contribute to a broader policy menu. Secondly, as noted in the recent SAPEA report on science for policy[87], decision-makers should look **beyond economics** when thinking about the future.

In European science for policy advice, there has been some movement towards an appreciation of a plurality of perspectives when resolving pressing social and ecological issues. Recently, the Group of Chief Scientific Advisors to the European Commission underlined the importance of considering '... all good science from all scientific disciplines and perspectives that could contribute to the issue at hand. This includes natural sciences, engineering, medicine, social sciences and humanities'[88]. There is still much work to be done, not least in the domain of risk assessment and management.

4.4.2.4 Local and experience-based knowledges (extended peer communities)

Early warnings or observed effects of new technologies are crucial for initiating precautionary measures, and such warnings do not necessarily come from regulatory science or academic science. Rather, they may emerge from citizens and practitioners in the field. Non-experts, including citizens, lay-persons and/or practitioners who are close to emergent problems, may have specific local knowledge that is relevant for risk management, particularly in the identification of unrecognised threats[89]. Examples include the beekeepers who gave early warnings on the effects of neonicotinoids on bees in the early 1990s, which initiated the long process of restricting neonicotinoids in France[90]. Also illustrative is the case of Dichlordiphenyltrichlorethan (DDT), in which birdwatchers' observations and knowledge proved instrumental[91]. Other well-documented cases of official experts being proven wrong by others' knowledge or by folk knowledge that was initially silenced and ignored are the Cumbrian sheep farmers after the Chernobyl nuclear accident[92] and the citizen Lois Gibbs in the Love Canal chemical pollution scandal[93]. Relevant non-expert knowledge can also emerge from research using co-production methods including local knowledge[94] and by using 'extended peer communities'[95].

Local and experience-based knowledge may be particularly relevant in scoping and framing phases. As explained by a Norwegian physicist and philosopher[96] 'extended peer communities imply an extension of the traditional scientific community to include non-experts as well. However, this does not mean that laypeople should invade the research laboratories and carry out research. It does mean, though, that laypeople should take part in discussions of priorities, evaluation of results, and policy debates'.

It is recommended that 'extended peer involvement' takes place at different decision-making stages, from informing or supporting decision-making assessment to finally evaluating the results of those assessments[97]. Guidance on participation more generally can be found in *chapter 5 on Participation of the REC-IPES guidance*, but *Box 7* outlines some resources concerning interpretation and valuation of the diverse and complex knowledges in participatory settings.

The EU needs to develop good practice and build capacity regarding how actionable knowledge for precaution can best be fruitfully pluralised. Identifying and mobilising relevant knowledge-holders and working within a diversity of ways of knowing in the co-creation of actionable knowledge for informing the application of the precautionary principle can be challenging. To pursue pluralisation while attending to power requires preventing corporate capture or misinformation campaigners slipping into spaces of co-creation.

Box 7: Resources for interpreting and valuing different types of knowledge in participatory settings

Maxim, L. (2015). A systematic review of methods of uncertainty analysis and their applications in the assessment of chemical exposures, effects, and risks. International Journal of Environmental Health Research, 25(5), 522-550.

Maxim L. and Van der Sluijs, J. (2011). Quality in environmental science for policy: Assessing uncertainty as a component of policy analysis

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1462901111000128.

Norström, A. V., Cvitanovic, C., Löf, M. F., West, S., Wyborn, C., Balvanera, P., ... and Österblom, H. (2020). Principles for knowledge co-production in sustainability research. Nature Sustainability, 3(3), 182-190.

OECD (2020). Addressing societal challenges using transdisciplinary research. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers, OECD Publishing, Paris, doi:10.1787/0ca0ca45-en.

Renn, O. (2015). Stakeholder and public involvement in risk governance. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science, 6(1), 8-20.

Tengö M. et al. (2017). Weaving knowledge systems in IPBES, CBD and beyond—lessons learned for sustainability. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 26, 17-25.

Van der Sluijs, J. (2017). The NUSAP Approach to Uncertainty Appraisal and Communication. In: Spash, C.L. (ed.), Routledge Handbook of Ecological Economics: Nature and Society. Routlegde: London, pp. 301-310. ISBN-13: 978-1138931510.

4.4.3 Learning within and across regulatory domains

The European regulatory system is highly fragmented and characterised by limited contact between assessors and managers in neighbouring regulatory domains[98]. For this reason, products, substances and processes that have been recognised as harmful in one regulatory domain may nonetheless be considered tolerable within others[99]. Thus, for example, the 3 most problematic neonicotinoids are no longer authorised for use as plant protection products owing to their harmful effects on bees and other pollinators. Threatened species are nonetheless still exposed to neonicotinoids because they are persistent in the environment, emissions continue because they are still authorised for use as biocides and in veterinary medicine, and in addition, some member states have granted exceptions from the ban for certain crops[100].

Limited learning and information sharing across regulatory domains weakens the system's overall capacity to identify, understand and manage plausible threats[101]. Ongoing reforms towards a holistic approach to chemical authorisation and regulation at the EU level could lead to improved outcomes. Part of the EU's European Green Deal agenda, the proposed 'one chemical, one assessment' (OC-OA) strategy for the assessment of chemicals in Europe has the potential to reduce risk migration from regulated to un(der)regulated jurisdictions and regulatory domains. At present, the available strategy documents highlight the potential efficiency gains involved in streamlining the European assessment processes.[102] The emphasis on efficiency might be politically expedient, but regulators and decision-makers should continue to prioritise the system's overall capacity to identify and assess threats with varying degrees of scientific certainty and severity, and to learn across both individual assessment processes and different regulatory domains. Thus, for example, steps must be taken to ensure that efforts to streamline research and assessment methodologies across agencies and issue areas do not create **new blind spots**[103]. In short, the reform process should be informed by **enhanced efficacy, not efficiency in a narrow sense** (cost savings).

A second, widely recognised regulatory problem is the issue of **regrettable substitution** *(see Box 8)*. Regrettable substitution takes place when the imposition of controls on one harmful substance or process is replaced by an equally or even more harmful substance or process. The danger of regrettable substitution is often invoked to warn against the imposition of controls on harmful substances, processes and interventions and to warn against using the precautionary principle more generally. Risky activities, the argument goes, tend to give way to even more risky activities. It seems that regrettable substitution tends to arise from a lack of foresight and non-contextual, substance-centric thinking[104] *(see Sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.4)*. It can also arise from the institutional silencing of pertinent knowledge (e.g., relevant academic studies and other knowledge-holders), and from an inability to draw important lessons from previous assessment processes[105]. The aforementioned OS-OA process aims to move past substance-centric thinking towards the regulation of classes of substances, once again with an emphasis on efficiency (speedier authorisation processes with less repeated work). This could help avert some cases of regrettable substitution, but it can also lead to new vulnerabilities. Because the European regulatory system has a track-record of ignoring early warning signs and of stalling in the presence of controversy, the potential for incremental learning through repeated assessments of similar substances may be a strength and not a weakness.[xxxvi]

xxxvi The move towards the assessment and authorisation of classes is likely to raise the stakes, and will potentially lead to even more politicised, even more controversial regulatory processes.

Box 8: Regrettable substitution – the bisphenol-A case[106]

A prominent example of **regrettable substitution** – the introduction or adoption of chemicals that may not be safer and potentially worse - is the **bisphenol-A case**:

'The hormone-disrupting chemical bisphenol-A (BPA), has been banned for use in baby bottles and other plastic products. However, this may not have completely removed risks for consumers, because BPA may have been replaced by bisphenol-S (BPS), a similar chemical which may be even more harmful to children's health. … Substitution is occurring because BPS has similar technical properties to BPA. Although there is not full scientific certainty and evaluations are ongoing, it is not unreasonable to expect that BPS may exhibit similar ED effects as BPA. In summary, manufacturers of the above-mentioned products may be taking advantage of the lack of information and the lower regulatory pressure on BPS compared to that on BPA, which may result in potentially regrettable substitution of BPA. **This is a clear example of substitution with the least regulated alternative**.'*

* See also: Health Council of the Netherlands (2014). The health risks of Bisphenol A analogues. Advisory letter. Publication 2014/06E. https://www.healthcouncil.nl/documents/advisory-reports/2014/03/18/the-health-risks-of-bisphenol-a-analogues. Groen, A., & Neuhold, C. (2020). Endocrine disruptors. RECIPES case study report https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-11/CS3_Endocrine%20Disruptors.pdf.

In order to work, the regulatory system must be **agile** enough to **learn** continuously and be **permeable** enough that externally produced knowledge can influence and modify routinised assessment processes. Too often, it is necessary to 'break the script' of routinised assessment and management processes in order to recognise key uncertainties and the potential for serious harm to human and environmental health. In the domain of chemical regulation, precautionary moments appear to arise on an ad-hoc basis and without fostering changes to institutionally sanctioned assessment and management protocols.[107]

4.4.4 Promoting early risk research and anticipatory and foresight processes in risk and innovation governance

The European regulatory system has a long history of ignoring or responding belatedly to early warning signs[108]. Failure to take timely action often stems from failure to engage in anticipatory research into early warning signs. As a result, regulators and policymakers have often failed to take timely action on identified, but poorly understood hazards and threats caused by new technologies and products[109]. Moving forward, the EU policy-making institutions should ensure that funding and incentive schemes for research, development and innovation are accompanied by a strengthened emphasis on **anticipatory risk research and monitoring.**[xxxvii] The case of nanotechnologies shows that the European innovation ecosystem has come some way in appreciating not just the potential opportunities of emergent technologies, but also their potential risks *(see Box 9).*[110] Anticipation is a cornerstone in **responsible innovation** (RI)[111]. RI obliges researchers to remain sensitive to the plausible social and ecological impacts in ongoing research and development processes, and in the development of emergent and potentially future-shaping technologies. From an RI perspective, precaution is essential to help ensure responsive, adaptive and integrated management of the innovation process[xxxviii]

xxxvii What are the conceivable, possible, plausible and probable threats associated with nascent and emergent technologies? Which social and environmental systems, processes and practices may be threatened or disrupted by them?

xxxviii It should be noted that concerns have been raised about the effectiveness of RI and other forms of decentred governance in disciplining and directing the overall course of science and technology (Åm, 2019). When implementing RI through funding policies, there is a risk that responsibility, ethics and anticipation will be reduced to the ticking of boxes. Many scientists and engineers in emergent technologies simply do not construe of anticipation and responsibility as their department, partly because their contributions to the emergence are frequently so minute and so diffused in large scientific-industrial innovation networks (Åm et al., 2021). Moreover, RRI has limited reach beyond publicly funded research.

Box 9: Early risk research on nanosciences and nanotechnologies

'In the Code of Conduct [for responsible nanosciences and nanotechnologies research], the principle appears in the call for risk assessment before any public funding of research (a strategy currently applied in the 7th Framework Programme for research). Rather than stifling research and innovation, the precautionary principle acts within the Code of Conduct as a focus for action, in that it calls for funding for the development of risk methodologies, the execution of risk research, and the active identification of knowledge gaps.'

Neither precaution nor anticipation can be left to science, research and development; they need to be a widely shared and a systemic responsibility. In the regulatory system, anticipation needs to be routinised in formal risk assessments and management processes. Thus, for example, the decision to ban or restrict the use of a chemical (e.g., bisphenol A or neonicotinoids) should consider which substances are likely to take its place (e.g., bisphenol S or sulfoxaflor) *(see Box 9)*. If likely substitutes share properties (e.g., mode of action, potential impact on human health or the environment) that informed the original ban, steps should be initiated to discourage substitution from taking place.[xxxix] **Substitution**, in short, should be **informed rather than accidental**[112].

The European regulatory system has a relatively poor track record in identifying and tackling threats in the presence of scientific and political controversy.[113] Moreover, the tendency for bans and use restrictions to give rise to highly similar hazard profiles highlights weaknesses in the European approach to chemicals regulation[114]. It has long been suggested that the European regulatory system needs to move beyond the substance-centric, incremental approach to risk management, and towards a system that more effectively encourages the adoption of **safer alternatives**[115]. Although precautious and anticipatory action is often said to be at odds with innovation, regulatory forbearance on harmful or potentially harmful chemicals does not encourage innovation. To the contrary, regulatory inactivity can lead to damaging technological lock-ins. At present, substance-centric regulatory incrementalism favours equally substance-centric incremental adaptation over much needed fundamental innovation and change[116]. Current efforts to move towards a more **class-oriented approach** to chemical assessment and management may prove helpful and can be used to spur on research on and the development of safer alternatives, whether chemical or non-chemical.

Importantly, the search for safer alternatives is not only a question of risk assessment and risk management. The search for less harmful alternatives needs to inform the broader array of public and private research and innovation infrastructures (e.g., research and education funding). The European polity should target its substantial legal and financial capacity towards the definition of more ecologically sustainable and societally beneficial innovation pathways. To achieve this, the use of the precautionary principle as a compass is essential. Technology assessment, anticipatory risk research, foresight and scenario processes can be used for **proactively engaging with uncertain risks**. Researching, acknowledging, and communicating about these risks and adjusting the technology or innovation accordingly early on is a way to support the development of new and creative ways of living that do less harm to the health of humans and the environment.

xxxix This could take the form of a new assessment and risk management procedure, directed at closing predictable gaps in the regulatory landscape.

© pexels.com / ThisisEngineering RAEng

In order to be able to make good use of the knowledge generated from anticipatory projects such as foresight processes, **knowledge assessment procedures** should be used or further developed *(see Box 7)*. Such procedures should allow assessment of the quality of knowledge that is mobilised and used within the innovation policy process. This is especially important in areas in which scientific risk assessments contradict each other, or in the case of serious knowledge gaps[117].

Both the use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard and as a compass can contribute to technologies, innovation, and lifestyles that do less harm to humans and the environment. It is important that knowledge collection and generation of the two ways of using the precautionary principle are well interlinked and the results from both processes acknowledged as forming a body of actionable knowledge. Knowledge from risk research, for example, can inform the application of the precautionary principle as a safeguard, while knowledge produced from the assessment of uncertain risks in risk regulation can stimulate or boost risk research and other anticipatory projects such as technology assessment or foresight processes.

4.4.4.1 Precaution-related knowledge for responsible innovation

Current frameworks of 'responsible innovation' attempt to build capacity for anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness in the governance of science, technology and innovation[118]. Both the use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard and its use as a compass can serve as important mechanisms in this attempt.

Approaches of responsible innovation (RI) address the issue of a responsible design and governance of research and innovation processes. The idea is to transform the research and innovation systems in such a way that innovation and the science and research intended to lead to it, are more anticipatory, more reflexive, more inclusive and deliberative, and, in total, more responsive[119]. This change should make it easier to raise, discuss and respond to questions about the intended and unintended impacts of science and technology[120]. It should facilitate directing or re-directing science and technology towards societally beneficial outcomes such as sustainability goals or maintaining high levels of protection of human and environmental health. Using the precautionary principle as a safeguard is a mechanism that helps policy

and regulation to respond to **improved anticipation**. Use of the precautionary principle as a compass is a mechanism that helps innovation systems to **deliver improved anticipation**. The knowledge generated by using the precautionary principle as a compass (e.g., via technology assessment, foresight processes or risk research) can help promote a timely and more broadly informed application of the precautionary principle in EU risk policy and regulation.

Use of the precautionary principle as a compass has value, even when it occurs independently from the precautionary principle formally included in policies or regulations. It can help when proactively shaping the future in terms of collectively acting 'in the service of new and creative ways of living that do less harm to the health of humans and nature, and it can sustain the viability of the biosphere'[121]. Use of the precautionary principle as a compass can **stimulate 'responsible innovation'**, e.g., technologies supporting new ways of living that better protect humans and the environment.

In line with the idea of responsible innovation, technological development needs to be seen in the light of achieving widely supported public values. The Treaty on European Union provides such values and some normative anchor points for how to define a 'responsible' innovation in terms of positive outcomes or the right impacts of innovation. These include, for example, sustainable development, promotion of scientific and technological advance, quality of life and a high level of protection of human health and environment, the principle of equality and the precautionary principle itself. Nonetheless, given complexities, uncertainties, and ambiguities regarding impacts, risks and benefits, what counts as 'responsible' in a concrete case in a pluralistic society is rarely self-evident, often hotly contested and needs to be deliberated by a broad range of societal actors. The precautionary principle is a tool for dealing responsibly with complexities and uncertainties in research and innovation in order to achieve **widely supported public values**[122].

4.4.5 Implications for scientific practice

It is important to emphasise that the use of the precautionary principle as a safeguard and compass requires some more profound changes in **scientific practice**. Action points in this regard are listed in *Box 10*. UNESCO's World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) has highlighted them in its 2005 report on the precautionary principle.

© pexels.com / ThisIsEngineering

Box 10: The precautionary principle and implication for scientific practice[123]

- Enhance the role of vulnerability science by systematically searching for surprises and ways to constrain them, e.g., by learning from examples of surprises and non-linear system behaviour from the past or constructing plausible scenarios by which unlikely undesirable future events might be realised.

- Enhance the role of systematic monitoring of observable effects on occupational, public or ecosystem health and the role of empirical research into outstanding questions or anomalies in our understanding of particular hazards

- Be more realistic about the role and potential of science in the assessment of complex risk. Scientific and technical evidence and analysis remain essential. However – under a precautionary approach – scientific analysis is seen as a necessary but not exclusive basis for effective policy choices.

- For sustainable development and to develop precautionary measures, build knowledge partnerships with other knowledge holders. To meet the challenges of quality control in the assessment of complex risks, the science for policy in the face of uncertainty requires new transdisciplinary contacts and integration (internal extension of the peer community) and also new contacts with policymakers, NGOs, industry, media and the public (external extension of the peer community).

- Ensure whistle-blowers are protected. Vested interests and the high stakes involved in new technologies can lead to tendencies to hide uncertainties and evidence that may indicate risks because public knowledge of these risks might hamper the further competitive development of that technology. The ethics and the legal framework of whistle-blowing need more careful attention than is currently the case.



5 GUIDANCE FOR PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES SUPPORTING THE APPLICATION OF THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE



5.1 Executive summary

EU policymakers and advisory bodies can use the precautionary principle both as a safeguard and as a compass to guide responsible innovation and thus cope with the most pressing current and future societal problems. Participatory processes need to reflect whether the precautionary principle is applied as a safeguard or as a compass.

Participatory processes should be implemented, aiming for the meta-criteria of fairness and competence to foster good governance and adaptive policy-learning. In this way, an inclusive and adaptive risk governance framework supports policymakers and advisory bodies in enhancing institutional and societal risk governance towards sustainable development.

Conflicts of values, knowledge and interests need to be managed better because they contribute to an inconsistent application of the precautionary principle. Results from the RECIPES project indicate that the inconsistent application of the precautionary principle is the result of unresolved conflicts between European stakeholders concerning values, knowledge and interests.

Participatory processes can uncover and help resolve conflicts of knowledge and values and thus improve the application of the precautionary principle. Empirical and theoretical argumentation justifies strengthened deliberative practices to further establish the science-society-policy interface and improve understanding and acceptance between stakeholders despite their differing claims to knowledge and values.

Fair and competent participatory processes are vital for the European Union to uphold their commitment to good risk governance. While ongoing European deliberative activities such as the Conference on the Future of Europe or the Competence Centre on Participatory and Deliberative Democracy are excellent starting points, participatory practices need to be improved further to enable policy- and decisionmakers to cope with the multiplicity of risks and uncertainties associated with the most pressing societal problems and to learn to navigate in a multi-risk world aiming for more resilient and sustainable societies.

Inclusive and reflexive participatory processes are essential for good governance. Deliberative processes are useful for uncovering the plurality of public interests and enabling engagement with a greater diversity of relevant knowledge holders. Risks associated with high levels of complexity and social ambiguity require inclusive risk assessment processes and decision-making processes that consider public concerns and interests.

Participatory processes should meet the meta-criteria of fairness and competence. Because participatory processes can and should take many shapes and forms, it may be difficult to assess their quality. Scholars recommend applying the meta-criteria of fairness and competence to ensure good governance.

Choosing the right methodology for participatory processes relies on sound expertise with regards to deliberative methods and analysis of situational factors. Tools like Action Catalogue should be applied as a database of methodologies for deliberative practices. Decision-makers must be aware of the given stage of the assessed innovation, risk governance arrangements, situational and institutional factors, the objective of stakeholder engagement, transparency of the participatory process, as well as power asymmetries among stakeholders in order to choose an appropriate method.

Inclusive and reflexive participatory processes on complex topics require **buy-in and follow-through from policymakers and regulators**. This demand should be reflected in the **allocation of resources** in project calls, regulation processes and decision-making. Ensuring fair and competent participation requires that policymakers and regulators are able and expected to prioritise good governance practices and adaptive policy-learning. Such a prioritisation should be facilitated through the allocation of resources as a basic practice of regulation and decision-making.

5.2 Introduction

This document aims to provide guidance on why and how to support the application of the precautionary principle through participatory approaches. It is aimed primarily at European Union (EU) policymakers and public authorities in the fields of risk and innovation governance.[xl] It also addresses EU-level and European scientific institutions that are concerned with this issue.[xli]

The contents of this document, however, may be of great interest and value to non-governmental organisations, civil society organisations, industry and businesses and other stakeholders that are participating in current debates concerning precaution and innovation.

The guidance is based on the research from the Horizon2020 project RECIPES[xlii] and is part of a three-part series. For questions on when to apply the precautionary principle, and what to bear in

xl Examples are the various Directorates-General (DGs) e.g. CLIMA, ENER, ENV, CINEA and the respective executive agencies and service departments e.g. IDEA.
xli Examples include the Group of Chief Scientific Advisors and Science Advice for Policy by European Academies (in short: SAPEA) (both part of the European Commission's Scientific Advice Mechanism, in short: SAM) and the European Federation of Academies of Sciences and Humanities (in short: ALLEA).
xlii See appendix I for more information.

mind when doing so, please refer to the document on the scope of application. For questions specifically related to the sources of expertise and their role in the policy cycle of the precautionary principle, please refer to the document on *organisation of expertise*. The three documents are connected and build on each other. It is therefore recommended that all three documents are read by the intended target group.

The precautionary principle is an anticipatory instrument that the EU uses to ensure that new technologies are introduced and applied in ways that do not violate fundamental EU rights, values and principles The EC Communication on the precautionary principle presents the principle primarily as a **safeguard** that may protect human health and the environment. In addition to this, however, the precautionary principle is applicable beyond regulatory science and the assessment and management of risks. It can be used proactively as a general policy approach and **compass** that helps decision-makers to develop and promote an integrated policy for addressing major challenges such as conserving biodiversity,[125] managing climate risks[126] and responsibly developing new technologies such as synthetic biology or nanotechnology [127], especially when such challenges or technologies are associated with high levels of complexity, uncertainty and societal controversy.[xliii]

In the European Union, the precautionary principle provides an important instrument for the management and proactive regulation of uncertain and serious threats. However, precautionary measures are frequently taken too late, and often in a restrictive and piecemeal fashion. In other instances, the management of uncertain threats may result in *societal conflict, public controversies, regulatory loopholes and regrettable substitution*. In view of these shortcomings, it is necessary to understand the application of the precautionary principle as a continuing learning process. Several case study analyses[128] suggest that it is important to deal with the following question in such a learning process:

> *How could participatory processes be organised in ways that improve the management and regulation of uncertain risks, as well as reduce the likelihood of shortcomings such as those mentioned above?*

The project mandate hinges on the Responsible Innovation (RI) approach, which is geared towards building effective co-operation between science and society by ensuring that innovation is always accompanied by social awareness and responsibility. [129] A constituting element of the RECIPES project is thus co-creation based on the inclusion of stakeholders for the advancement of precautionary policymaking. Through participatory workshops conducted in RECIPES, relevant stakeholders have indicated a need that concretises the above question and the aim of this document:

"Clarity on procedures and practice of participation in decision-making e.g., in agenda setting, policy development and innovation processes as a whole"[130] is desired. In short, stakeholder needs, academia and empirical examples in the EU form the foundation that shapes the aim of this document.

xliii The document on scope of application explores and further justifies the use of precaution-based policymaking as a compass that guides innovation.

Thus, this document aims to demonstrate why and how the application of the precautionary principle should be informed by robust knowledge and promote risk governance that is informed and contextualised by participatory processes. In the second chapter, RECIPES research and normative arguments are explored to argue that strengthened participation is essential when applying the precautionary principle. The third chapter shifts from exploring the why to showing how participatory processes may be used to improve and strengthen the application of the precautionary principle both in the role of safeguard and of compass *(see guidance on scope of application)*.

The strengthened application of the precautionary principle through participation, it is argued is a useful guide for responsible innovation by helping to cope with the most pressing current and future societal problems. For such improvements to take place, meta-criteria such as fairness and competence should be upheld in participatory policymaking, thus fostering good governance and adaptive policy-learning. In short, the last chapter tangibly shows how participatory processes may be used to move towards comprehensive, inclusive and adaptive risk governance that enhance institutional and societal risk handling. [131]

Box 11: Precaution, participation and innovation

The EU Commission acknowledges the strong link between precaution, innovation and participation as it asks for the implementation of participation in governance processes e.g., by referring to Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) and declares *"participation"* one of the principles of good governance*.

The European commitment to participatory processes in risk governance is heavily supported and called for by researchers, pointing to an evident potential contribution to improved risk governance**. In fact, most empirical meta-studies on the link between public participation and risk governance point to strengthened decision-making as a result of deliberation, concluding that future risk governance should be inclusive and participatory***.

The IRGC risk governance framework illustrates such a future for risk governance practices, in which participatory processes as well as risk communication are attributed an important function. Depending on the characteristics of the risk issue and the given stage of risk governance, appropriate participatory methods may be determined. This guidance integrates these notions to provide suggestions for a deliberative future risk governance.

Like the stages of risk governance, this guidance stresses the role of innovation in relation to precaution and participation. The concept of responsible innovation (RI) is a tenet of the reasoning behind this guidance. Von Schomberg**** establishes how RI *"marks the paradigm shift from a justification in purely macro-economic terms towards a justification of the purpose and direction of innovation in terms of broadly shared public values"*. In the last chapter of this guidance, the innovation cycle is exemplified, showing how deliberative methods can express public values.

The guidance document thus adds itself to a range of arguments that identify and call for the strong link between precaution, participation and innovation.

* Renn, O. (2008). Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World. London; Rutledge, Earthscan.
** Renn, O. (2008). Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World. London; Rutledge, Earthscan.
*** Klinke, A., & Renn, O. (2012). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research 15(3), 273–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.
**** Schomberg, R. v. (2015). Responsible innovation: The new paradigm for science, technology and innovation policy, A. Bogner, M. Decker and M. Sotoudeh, Responsible Innovation: Neue Impulse für die Technikfolgenabschätzung, Baden-Baden, Nomos. 47–70.

5.3 Rationale of participatory processes in application of the precautionary principle

In this chapter, the rationale behind participatory processes in the application of the precautionary principle is explored and the strengthening of deliberative practices is justified. The chapter approaches the rationale from two angles: (1) lessons learned from RECIPES research and (2) theoretical and democratic arguments for strengthened participation.

5.3.1 Two major lessons derived from RECIPES research

The RECIPES project has facilitated a range of case studies from which common emerging themes have been identified.[xliv] From these themes, it is suggested that conflicts around the precautionary principle often stem from controversies between claims of knowledge and claims of values. This indicates that issues regarding the precautionary principle may be relieved through greater participatory deliberations on the normative assumptions of knowledge and values.

5.3.1.1 Two major lessons

Based on the findings of inter-case study analysis, this report derives the following two points relevant to the precautionary principle and its link to participation:

1. Inconsistencies in the application of the precautionary principle may be linked to conflicts over claims of knowledge, values and interests.[132] An implicit challenge in these conflicts occurs when conflicting claims over knowledge and/or values arise at the same time. Therefore, value conflicts and competing problem framings need to be addressed in decision-making, mainly because the articulation of values and alternative perspectives guide the selection and interpretation of evidence and help to identify decision alternatives. In other words, besides the evidence gained from scientific research, risk and uncertainty assessment, the knowledge and dialogue with stakeholders in participatory processes can contribute to a better understanding and a higher quality of the process of problem scoping at science-policy interfaces.

2. Clarifying values, knowledge and interest conflicts is essential to improve the interaction of all actors involved. The aim of mitigating value/knowledge claims through deliberation is heavily embedded in frameworks for responsible innovation (RI). As such, RECIPES research calls for a strengthening of the RI approach, which *"is critical of the dominant global economic paradigm, highlighting that there are market deficits in delivering innovations on societally desirable goals"*.[133] Responsible Innovation marks the *"paradigm shift from a justification in purely macro-economic terms towards a justification of the purpose and direction of innovation in terms of broadly shared public values"*.[134]

xliv Case studies range from GMO through neonicotinoid insecticides to AI and are available via https://www.recipes-project.eu/results/analysis-case-studies.

In short, RECIPES research first and foremost indicates that the inconsistencies in the application of the precautionary principle are linked to conflicts over claims of knowledge, values and interests.[xlv] It follows that such conflicts should be clarified in line with the basic principles of RI, accepting that innovation should be given direction (and be regulated) on a basis of broadly shared public values. Identifying such values requires carefully thought-out deliberative processes. Additionally, these conflicts must be explored and addressed through deliberation among a broad range of societal actors, in line with the basic principles of RI.

5.3.1.2 Linking the lessons learned with a RECIPES needs assessment

If carefully thought-out participatory practices are necessary to minimise inconsistencies in the application of the precautionary principle, the crucial questions to address in this guidance are:

> *At what stage(s) in the cycle of precaution-based policymaking are participatory processes appropriate? How should the kind of participatory process be determined and carried out?*

These questions were reflected explicitly in RECIPES research, when a range of stakeholders were engaged to discuss the central issues (and their subsequent needs) of the application of the precautionary principle. In this needs assessment of the RECIPES project, stakeholder needs in relation to participation were clustered and named as the following themes: transparency, facilitation, asymmetries, public engagement and public interest.

The central questions established above link naturally to the themes of facilitation and public engagement, pertaining to when and how relevant stakeholders should be involved, as well as who to select for inclusion. The themes of transparency and asymmetries delve more into the practical facilitation of participatory processes, calling for guidance on specific considerations that are required to achieve fair and competent practices. Last, the need for clarity on the public interest links directly to the second main lessons learned from RECIPES research, as participatory processes inherently bear the objective of identifying broadly shared public values.

5.3.2 Theoretical foundations for strong participatory processes

As established above, RECIPES research clearly calls for a strengthening and improvement of participatory procedures in the application of the precautionary principle. This objective is reflected in academic literature and may be justified through normative, substantive and instrumental argumentation. This chapter thus strengthens the message of the sub-chapter above, showing why policymakers need to move towards a framework of good governance through a strengthening of participatory methods.

Drawing on previous work by a variety of authors, Bidwell and Schweizer[135] differentiate between three main arguments for participation: (1) normative, (2) substantive and (3) instrumental:

- **Normative** arguments for participation are typically based on philosophical principles of democracy and citizenship. Participation in this sense

xlv The distinction between knowledge and values is also among the 12 lessons cited in the European Environmental Agency Report Late lessons from early warnings (2013, p. 12): Lesson 8 "Ensure use of 'lay' and local knowledge, as well as relevant specialist expertise in the appraisal" and Lesson 9 "Take full account of the assumptions and values of different social groups".

stems from the democratic ideal that members of the public have a right to influence the decisions that affect them, the things they value and the type of knowledge they consider relevant to include in scientific assessment of the issue at hand. In this line of argument, the normative ideal of citizen engagement and empowerment is the overriding goal.

- Following **substantive** argumentation, the quality of information in a process improves through the addition of a variety of perspectives on both the cognitive and the normative dimensions of a complex issue. Inclusion of knowledge from non-experts (engagement of other knowledge-holders, including citizens) leads to better decisions. From the substantive perspective, the goal of participation is to improve outcomes by bringing a wider range of relevant knowledge into the decision-making process, whether the knowledge is about local context, technical data or public values and preferences. As such, strengthening participatory procedures is imperative in the approach towards good governance.

- The **instrumental** arguments emphasise that participation is used to gain more legitimacy of and acceptance for decisions and ease their implementation. Four main forms of instrumental argumentation are that participation serves: a) to gain "legitimacy or support"; b) as a way to confirm a draft decision; c) to educate both experts and the public regarding aspects of the problem they might be ill-informed about (mutual learning process); or d) to meet legal obligations. In this sense, participation also links to a strengthened science-society-policy interface *(see box 12)*, ensuring greater acceptance between these three major stakeholder groups.

Box 12: Science-society-policy-interfaces for the governance of sociotechnical transformations to sustainability

Environmental research responds to an increasing demand by public and private decision makers for actionable knowledge. The growing demand for expertise reflects the extent to which policy has become evidence-informed in fields such as global warming, biodiversity, ozone depletion, air pollution, forest conservation and sustainability policy in general, all of which are increasingly linked to issues such as food security, development and fair and inclusive economic growth. At the same time, environmental research and policy advice also face novel challenges such as meeting the scientific credibility, delivery on time, and societal *"usefulness"* under scientific uncertainties and contested values and political interests.

These challenges are the starting point for research on science-society-policy-interfaces. It aims to contribute to the analysis of the design of research and assessments as well as their interactions with society. It asks what knowledge about risks, uncertainties and socio-political ambiguities of a particular issue is necessary to help to deal with the challenges?

Research at the science-society-policy interfaces has contributed to a variety of practical attempts to integrate insights into recent research and stakeholder activities, including recent intergovernmental negotiations on the IPCC reform process, the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Biodiversity Knowledge network. By combining scientific analysis and practical engagement, this approach tries to generate concepts, criteria and guidelines for the handling of risks under conditions of complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity, and by evaluating and exploring design options and procedures in fields such as water, energy and ecosystem services.*

* Beck, Silke, Sheila Jasanoff, Andy Stirling, and Christine Polzin (2021). „The Governance of Sociotechnical Transformations to Sustainability". Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 49 (April 2021): 143–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2021.04.010.

EEAC (2020). „A new science-policy-society interface for the 2030 Agenda: the role of European Advisory Councils on the Environment and Sustainable Development". European Environment and Sustainable Development Advisory Councils, 2020. http://eeac.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/EEAC-Network-contribution-to-the-UN-Global-Sustainable-Development-Report-2019.pdf.

The three points of argumentation illustrate a holistic justification for participatory approaches to precaution-based policymaking. The points made above may be supplemented with a conclusion proposed by the IRGC[136] arguing that effective stakeholder involvement helps risk managers in several ways, by:

1. Providing fair, accurate and appropriate information to ensure that stakeholders are aware of the risks and benefits associated with technologies, products, activities or situations;

2. Assessing stakeholders' opinions and preferences regarding risks, risk technical assessment and risk management decisions, so that this information can be incorporated into the decision-making process;

3. Creating the conditions for informed consent, behaviour change and building public confidence in appropriate risk management decisions; and

4. Contributing to mutual understanding that helps to resolve ambiguities and conflicts about trade-offs and preferences among and between stakeholders, regulators and society.

Among the many examples in the environmental domain, the Aarhus Convention (Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters),[137] establishes that sustainable development can be achieved only through the involvement of all stakeholders and focuses on interactions between the public and public authorities in a democratic context.[138] Following the argumentation of Bidwell & Schweizer,[139] seeing the conclusion by the IRGC, and noting the European commitments such as the Aarhus Convention, participation is essential when facing uncertain and ambiguous risks. Dealing with the questions derived from RECIPES research is thus fully justified since good governance practices rely on clarifying values, knowledge and interest conflicts.

The arguments of this chapter fall in line with the three central principles of governance presented by the IRGC:[140] communication and inclusion, integration and reflection. It is useful to explicitly state that risk communication is a vital and ongoing part of effective risk governance. It is a cross-cutting function at the centre of the risk governance framework. It is the continuous process of sharing or exchanging risk-related information, data and knowledge among the diverse groups involved in risk governance, such as scientists, policymakers, regulators, industry, consumers, workers and the general public. Without risk communication, there cannot truly be any successful stakeholder involvement. Effective and early communication is the key to creating long-term trust in risk management when knowledge about a risk is complex, uncertain and/or ambiguous. Stakeholder involvement then goes beyond communication by ensuring that stakeholder knowledge, interests, values and worldviews are incorporated and given their due in the governance process. In addition, stakeholders are important agents for disseminating the results of the risk governance process and facilitating outreach throughout. These points are all reflected in the illustration on the next page, highlighting the most important features of good risk and uncertainty governance as developed by the IRGC.

© unsplash.com / Headway

Figure 3: The IRGC risk governance framework[141]




© unsplash.com / Isabela Kronemberger

5.4 Choosing participatory methods and tools

In the second chapter it was argued that the identified inconsistencies in the application of the precautionary principle are to a large extent the result of conflicting views on values and knowledge. Policymakers and regulating agencies need to assess and consider societal values, public interests and knowledge claims for evidence-informed policymaking. Public participation plays a prominent role in this regard. Results from the RECIPES project and academic literature point to participation as being the primary approach to illuminate and process claims of knowledge and claims of values. Chapter 5.3 thus already delved into central considerations that are required to improve governance procedures in the EU. In this final chapter, the previously established essential question is addressed: Which form of participation needs to be applied at what stages of precaution-based policymaking? In other words: *"What are the challenges when choosing participatory methods?"* While there is not simple answer to this question, the chapter provides input on the five themes from the RECIPES needs assessment. The immediate need that is addressed in this chapter is that of facilitation. By considering distinct phases of innovation, we help to choose who to include and how to do so. This is further related to the precautionary approach, being either that of a guiding compass, or that of a safeguard. This last chapter thus moves from the previous chapters' policy level of ideal risk governance and normative argumentation to a rather practical level of methodological considerations.

Strict rules may prove too inflexible in volatile situations. Guidelines for participation in general, and especially participation in risk estimation, need to be problem-oriented and adaptive to changing conditions. Participation cannot be theory-based because the outcome of practices always will be uncertain.[142] Therefore, the guidelines and tools provided in this guidance should not be applied in an arbitrary manner. Rather, it should be considered carefully how they might aid in ensuring greater transparency and inclusivity as well as earlier participation. This guidance takes the stakeholder need for facilitation and applies it as an entry point to provide concrete guidance in participatory processes at all stages of the innovation cycle. The discussion on facilitation sheds light on the stakeholder need of the public interest as well. From there, the topics of *public engagement*, *transparency* and *power asymmetries* will be nuanced and discussed. These stakeholder needs are addressed in a broad-

er manner and should thus be considered for each participatory process, regardless of the innovation phase that policymakers and regulators may be facing.

5.4.1 Participation in the innovation cycle

Facilitating participatory approaches to define precautionary decision-making is a difficult task. As this document emphasises, however, participation is extremely important to prioritise if the wicked problems that require precautionary measures are to be solved. As established in the EU project PACITA, **"Whenever societal decision making is disconnected from the perspectives of those that feel its consequences in their daily lives, alienation and dissatisfaction enters the relationship between governments and citizens"**.[143] While difficult to facilitate, it is essential to get participatory procedures right. One major lesson from the TAMI project on methodology in technology assessment is that the relationship between method and outcome is complex and requires great consideration. In line with the basic principles of RI, participation in precautionary decision-making should be held to a high standard of inclusion, responsiveness, reflexivity and anticipation.[144] In this section, participation is examined from three perspectives: (1) Where in the innovation process are you? (2) Is the precautionary approach that of a compass or that of a safeguard? (3) What are the goals of this participatory process? On the basis of & Ladikas,.[145] Burgess and Chilvers,[146] and Arnstein[147] these questions are answered in the following model and section.

Figure 4 illustrates a normative typology of the distinct phases in innovation (bottom row), the immediate role of policymakers and public authorities in relation to the innovation phase (middle row), and the precautionary approach to the innovation phase (top row). While the reality of innovation is more fluid, [xlvi] the distinction allows us to establish some considerations and criteria for participatory processes in the specific innovation phases. This will improve the integration of knowledge, and at the same time create more fairness for formerly unheard voices. The result in general should end with more competence in governing processes both in innovation and risk analysis. The following section delves into each of these phases and their implications for precaution-based participatory processes.

Figure 4: Normative typology of the innovation governance cycle and its relation to precautiont



1. Developing innovation system

In the early stages of innovation governance, the concept of situation appreciation is especially important. Innovation evolves (and may be governed) within societal, political and scientific boundaries. During the situation appreciation, biases and motivations that affect innovation may be identified.

xlvi Innovation processes are in reality non-linear, reiterative, and considerably more complex than the figure illustrates.

To achieve some sort of anticipation, an innovation system may therefore be developed that aids our understanding of innovations and their evolution. In other words: what is our society calling for currently? What scientific areas are seen as the frontiers of innovation? What current political proceedings are expected to affect European innovation?


© unsplash.com / drmakete lab

Early stages of the innovation governance cycle are, as the questions above indicate, inherently future oriented. **Participatory methods at this stage should thus reflect the need to acquire contextualised knowledge of current trends and future expectations.** Because no innovations pose any tangible threat at this stage, a precautionary principle should only be used as a compass, steering the development of the innovation system. In practical terms, this would entail anticipatory inclusion of the very values that the precautionary principle aims to protect: human health and the environment.[xlvii] As such, **citizens and representatives of societal stakeholder groups, such as environmental NGOs and labour unions, as well as industry should be included in these early participatory processes, alongside researchers** who may provide knowledge on the frontiers of science. Due to the future-oriented nature of this innovation governance phase, the participatory process should not be given an unlimited mandate; **the stakeholder engagement should be kept around the level of dialogue, consulting, joint scenario building and foresight, and collaboration**. An example of a suitable method for a situation like this could be CIVISTI.[148]

2. Seeking goals

Having mapped out the innovation system, the task is to set the innovation goals within that system. In this phase, it should be clear what the societal, political, and scientific boundaries and trajectories are. What follows is the decision on where to go from here.

xlvii The guidance document on scope of application presents and establishes the use of precaution as a compass.

The phase thus continues to be future oriented yet increases in its ability to affect change. As indicated by the RECIPES needs assessment, the notion of the public interest has proved a complex entity. While participatory processes at all stages of the innovation cycle shed light on the public interest, the specific aim at this stage is to explore this very topic. **Participatory methods at this stage should thus aim for collaborative and broad decisions being made on a basis of anticipation and foresight.** In other words, the aim is again to guide innovation, by exploring and seeking general goals for future technologies. It goes without saying, that this stage also requires a precautionary principle that acts as a compass, since anticipation and foresight lie at the very core of this stage. This again means that stakeholders who are usually not embraced by research and innovation activities should be prioritised at this stage. If basic rights of European citizens are to be protected from potentially harmful technologies, it is evident that citizens should be included (and prioritised) when deciding on directions for future innovation. **Participatory processes at the stage of goal setting should, in short, ensure that the voices of the citizens are heard.** As the aim of this stage is closer to decision-making, the mandate of the participatory process should be rather high, without reaching the level of direct decisions; **the stakeholder engagement should reach levels of collaboration and empowerment.** Because some groups (e.g., minorities or future generations) may be more vulnerable to potentially harmful technologies, and because this phase increases the participatory mandate, this phase in particular should emphasise fair and inclusive procedures. An example of a suitable method for a situation like this could be consensus conferences[149] or the Conference on the Future or Europe.[150]

3. Socio-Technical strategies

Technologies being developed within the defined boundaries and with the aim of collectively setting goals will eventually meet the social system. The interaction between a technology and the social system is understood as partly linear, and partly non-linear in the sense that some aspects of the interrelation may be affected and anticipated, while some are harder to identify.[151] Considering the social system in the development of technologies is the primary approach to avoid unforeseen and unwanted side-effects of the socio-technical system.

Thus, participatory processes during technology development may considerably improve the eventual implementation of a technology.

This phase relates the social world to a tangible technology. **The aim of the participatory process is therefore to bring together the various actors that define the socio-technical system and take their various perspectives into account.** Consensus should not be the primary goal, as the task is to map the various inputs to anticipate the potential meeting between technology and the social system. As argued throughout this document, participation may help us explore the conflicting views on values and knowledge. At this stage, these conflicts become more influential and should thus be pursued through participatory processes. **The ability to anticipate in this regard requires niche input from knowledge holders (e.g., researchers, policymakers, industry representatives, workers) who should be included in participatory processes. These should, however, be accompanied by spokespeople of the social system who are holders of other relevant forms of knowledge (e.g., CSOs, (potentially affected) citizens, consumers).** This is a crucial stage for policymakers, regula-

tors and developers to identify potential early warnings of threats to human health or the environment and/or to identify potential ways to make the innovation safer, cleaner, more environmentally friendly, healthier and more socially sustainable. As such, **the participatory mandate is again kept at a medium-low level of consulting, involving and collaborating**. An example of a suitable method for this phase of the innovation governance cycle could be stakeholder working groups.[152]

4. Making regulations

Often, it is when a technology reaches the marketplace that the public discussion really starts. Policymakers and regulating agencies may need to assess whether a technology poses a serious threat to human health or the environment. As argued throughout this document, however, such assessments often do not consider early warnings, usually raised by laypeople. Assessments are also affected by scientific disputes and the lack of certainty within the academic community.

In this phase, policymakers and regulators are faced with a tangible technology and an uncertain output of the socio-technical system. **Participatory processes at this stage should therefore aim to vocalise the citizen's concerns and ideas on what to do with technologies.** As Árvai argues: *"risk is a concept that needs to be understood – by laypeople and experts alike – not corrected"*. [153] Having a focus on risk communication is therefore very important in this stage to create good and informed risk management decisions. Citizens' concerns and ideas are influenced by normative assumptions on knowledge and values, which should all be explored. At this stage, the precautionary principle becomes most relevant as a safeguard, justifying regulatory decisions being made to protect human health and the environment. To identify whether a technology poses a serious threat, it is then vital to prioritise the entities that may be threatened. **Thus, this stage calls for great inclusion of (potentially affected) citizens.** Involved participants are used to identify threats and aid decision-making at this stage. Thus, **the participatory mandate should involve a rather high level of collaboration and empowerment**. An example of a suitable method for this situation could be citizens' hearings.[154]

5. Social embedding

As established in this document, innovation is confined by the political, societal and scientific trajectories that define society. Some technologies become deeply embedded in society to reinforce such innovative confinements. A European example of this could be livestock farming, which the technological approach is locked into in several member states. Innovations with the goal of more sustainable and animal-friendly systems struggle with implementation as the existing technologies are too institutionalised. In other cases, the debate on technologies may be furious and deadlocked between relevant stakeholders.

At an innovation phase such as this, participatory approaches may aid the movement from a deadlocked system towards alternative innovation. **The participatory aim is thus to spark dialogue and societal imagination towards new innovation systems.** It is therefore necessary to identify and consider what so-called 'images of the future' are present[155] amongst different societal levels and sectors as well as how action is or

could be embedded in these images. The precautionary principle drives this process as a safeguard, as it calls for action due to the threats that a deadlocked innovation system may pose. **Interfering with an entire innovation system requires input from a broad range of actors, and this phase should thus include citizens, experts, stakeholders and policymakers.** As the aim is focused on dialogue and imagination, **the participatory mandate may at a rather low level of dialogue and involvement**. An example of a suitable method for this innovation governance phase could be scenario workshops.[156]

6. Reshaping tech systems

At times, innovations are seen to potentially reshape the existing tech system. Potentially, their merging into the socio-technical system has had noticeable impacts and the innovation may be forming a technological trajectory. Technologies are bound by the existing socio-technical system, but may very well go on to affect and change the system into something else entirely. A timely response to the early signs of a reshaping tech system may help policymakers point out a direction for the future innovation system.

At this late stage of the innovation governance cycle, a tangible technology has created tangible outcomes in the socio-technical system and may show signs of reshaping the tech system. The aim is thus to explore where the technology might take our society and whether it could pose a threat to human health or the environment. The 'reshaping' of a tech system can be experienced differently at different levels in society. An example of a suitable method for such a situation could be the future search conference.[157]

When going through the guidance above, five conclusions become evident:

1. Participation should play a role in all phases of the innovation cycle to guide innovation and protect the environment and human health from harmful technologies.
2. The precautionary principle (both as a safeguard and a compass) compels us to include stakeholders who have been previously neglected in decision-making processes on innovation.
3. Situational appreciation will help to find appropriate methods for participatory processes.
4. Participatory processes are complex and depend on a great variety of factors. Approaching participation in a routine manner may lead to dismissible results at best, misleading results at worst.
5. Participatory methods spark dialogue that help to identify conflicting claims of knowledge and values.

The five points above all fall in line with the risk governance model as illustrated in *figure 3*. An alternative model of adaptive and integrative risk governance has been developed by Klinke & Renn and can be seen in *figure 5* below. Here the IRGC model is used as a basis and further augmented by organisational requirements, thus reflecting the third conclusion above. Thus, the four stages of risk governance are accompanied by a fifth stage of risk-estimation as well as situational considerations, such as institutional capacity, social capital, resources and more.

Figure 5: Adaptive and integrative risk governance model[160]



The central notion of this guidance is that participatory efforts regarding complex issues characterised by uncertainty need to be strengthened through early inclusion of knowledge claims that traditionally have been undervalued in risk governance. This requires paying attention to organisational capacities in support of knowledge networks that are more inclusive and integrated early in decision-making and innovation. Consequently, the question arises: what counts as *relevant* knowledge?[xlviii] Results from the case study comparison as well as the stakeholder needs assessment indicate that the term *"relevant knowledge"* should be understood in a broader sense, instead of focussing exclusively on scholarly expertise. Concerns of stakeholders and the public need to be taken into account during risk appraisal. Scholars argue that this will lead to more responsive and adaptive risk governance.[161]

xlviii See guidance document on development and organisation of expertise.

Main points on participatory methods

- Depending on the developmental stage of technological innovation, participatory processes may reflect a precautionary approach that acts as a compass or a safeguard.
- Participatory processes may prove useful throughout the innovation cycle and are vital to move towards a framework of integrative and adaptive governance of risk and uncertainty.
- Choosing an appropriate participatory method requires an analysis of the situational context. Depending on the risk problem and societal challenges associated with the risk problem a specific available participatory method should be chosen.[162,163] This approach will enhance the acceptability and effectiveness of participation and ensure that the participation process will contribute to problem solving and support decision making.

5.4.2 Fair and competent participatory processes

One early point of this guidance is that participation is no straightforward task. The beginning of this chapter showed how methodological choices can be approached based on contextual awareness and clear goal setting. In 2019, the EC committed to a renewed and strengthened prioritisation of deliberative democracy.[164] A clear example of this aim is the establishment of the Competence Centre on Participatory and Deliberative Democracy. Webler and Tuler[165] and Renn et al.[166] indicate how policymakers and regulators may embody the EC commitment through the participatory meta-criteria of fairness and competence. It is thus the responsibility of regulating bodies and policymakers to ensure that they have the competence and fair approach that is necessary to move towards a framework of good governance and deliberative democracy. The remainder of this chapter supplements the concrete guidance with important considerations and criteria that may increase institutional competence and fairness in participatory processes.

Box 13: Database of participatory methods

When aiming to choose an appropriate method for participation, the digital tool *Action Catalogue.eu* is of great use. Through the Action Catalogue, facilitators are navigated through well-developed research methods focused on stakeholder and citizen involvement. The tool is not only a database of methods, but also a platform that provokes reflexivity and thoughtfulness.

By guiding the facilitator through different criteria, the Action Catalogue presents the most appropriate participatory methods based on preferred attributes, such as geographical scope, direct participants, the objective of public participation and the objective in applying the method.

Requiring the facilitator to consider these criteria might bring them to make more deliberate decisions on the research method and to be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of a given method, especially in terms of the type of participation. As such, the Action Catalogue should not just be seen as a tool that provides a research method based on input, but also an invitation to be more considerate, self-critical and deliberate in the development of participatory approaches.

© unsplash.com / Timon Studler

5.4.2.1 Public engagement

The above guidance on participatory approaches and methodology choice applies a broad notion of stakeholder categories that may be included and/or prioritised at various stages. The RECIPES needs assessment, however, indicated that there is a need for more clarity regarding stakeholder categorisation and especially, the concept of public engagement. In this section, more light is shed on some of the nuances that should be considered when assessing the need for participatory processes. In other words: What should be considered when involving the public in risk management processes? More deeply, how could the various groups that might be involved in participatory processes be considered? How does the specific type of risk affect methodology choice in participation efforts?

Participation is vital to the precautionary principle because uncertainty calls for public deliberations. When the scientific community cannot make clear-cut assessments of emerging technologies, opinions, needs and rights have to be assigned a bigger role. While decision-making should always be informed by scientific research, public engagement is essential when uncertainty persists. Yet public engagement is a tricky notion requiring the following questions to be considered: Who is the public? At what stage of technological development is public engagement required? How do we meet this increased need for including the public at more stages of technological development while mitigating the perceived possible negative effects of some aspects of public engagement?

Inclusion of the public has been a recurring topic throughout the RECIPES research. The stakeholders' needs assessment consultations made it abundantly clear that a central need in times of uncertainty is earlier and more extensive inclusion of the public. At the same time, public engagement is time-consuming and expensive. Some stakeholders also point to the fact that it may not make sense to discuss some questions with the public.[167] Balancing the clear need for greater public engagement with its potential drawbacks is therefore one of the main themes of this guide.

The case study and needs assessment analyses conducted within the RECIPES project also showcase controversial views on the involvement of the public in risk management processes. The GMO-case study, for example, shows a disagreement about the extent to which the general public should be involved during the application of the PP. It examined the national context in Bulgaria and concluded that general public engagement resulted in pressuring the Government and the Parliament, which led to decisions that seemed to be based on political opportunism. At the same time, in the case studies on nanotechnology and water infrastructure planning in Milan, public engagement has been identified as having a positive effect, leading to more open, transparent and broadly

© pixabay.com / Skitterphoto

supported decision-making.[168] The main conclusions from the case study analysis on public engagement were that participatory processes and methods in decision-making are valuable, but careful consideration needs to be made regarding the eligibility of the questions to be discussed and evaluated and the ones which should not be included. Overall, deliberative methods should be deployed without distracting potential differences in evidence and reasons for conflicts of interests, values and knowledge. It was also emphasised that there is a need for more integrative risk governance approaches, foresight and stakeholder involvement with regard to risk regulation and innovation policy.[169]

To make the most of public engagement processes, the specific role and contribution of each involved stakeholder group, including citizens, should be clarified. The International Risk Governance Council (IRGC)[170] defines stakeholders as *"socially organised groups that are or will be affected by the outcome of the event or the activity from which the risk originates and/or by the risk management options taken to counter the risk"*. It distinguishes four types of stakeholders, based on the organisational structure of stakeholder groups, their proximity and exposure to the risk issue as well as groups that are not always defined as stakeholders, but could have similar influence and will and should be involved sometimes as well. The four stakeholder groups are:

- **Directly affected groups:** these are socially or politically organised formal groups such as official advocacy groups, governments or industries. These groups are or will be affected by the event or activity from which the risk originates and/or by the risk management options taken to counter the risk, or they have a strong interest in all of these aspects.
- **Directly affected public:** this is the group that will experience positive or negative impacts from the events or activities from which the risk originates and/or by the risk management options taken to counter the risk. These might be individuals and non-organised groups, community members or certain marginalised populations. Depending on the specific risk, it could be the case that the entire general public is directly affected.
- **Observing public:** these are groups that may or may not comment on the risk issue or influence public opinion, including scientists, the media, cultural elites and opinion leaders.

Box 14: Nine major groups essential for participation[171]

Since the first United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro (Earth Summit), it has been recognised that achieving sustainable development would require the active participation of all sectors of society and all types of people. Agenda 21 formalised nine sectors of society as the main channels through which broad participation would be facilitated in UN activities related to sustainable development. These are officially called *"Major Groups"* and include the following sectors:

- Women
- Children and Youth
- Indigenous Peoples
- Non-Governmental Organisations
- Local Authorities
- Workers and Trade Unions
- Business and Industry
- Scientific and Technological Community
- Farmers

- **The general public** are all those individuals who are not directly affected by the risk management activities, but are part of the emerging public opinion on the issue.

In addition, it is of key importance that all major sectors of society (the so-called Major Groups) are included *(see Box 14)*.

Successful stakeholder involvement could facilitate the risk management process in several ways:

- by providing fair and accurate information that ensures involved actors are acquainted with any potential risks and benefits associated with technologies, products, activities or situations;
- by evaluating stakeholders' opinions and attitudes in terms of risk assessment of technologies and risk management decisions, so that this information can be incorporated into the decision-making process;
- by establishing conditions for informed consent, behaviour change and enhanced public confidence in relevant risk management decisions; and
- by contributing to the process of reaching mutual understanding that could resolve ambiguities, trade-offs and conflicts among the various interested groups such as stakeholders, regulators and society.

To develop methodologies for stakeholder participation, risk managers who are in charge of the process need to carefully examine two crucial aspects prior to selecting a specific engagement method, namely the type of risk under scrutiny and the respective phase of the risk governance process.

IRGC developed a flexible framework (in the form of an 'escalator') for suggesting the appropriate level of stakeholder involvement, depending on the knowledge about the risk *(see Figure 6)*. To assess when and how to engage different stakeholders and the general public, IRGC recommends using the dominant characteristic of the risk to decide the appropriate level of stakeholder involvement.

Figure 6: The risk management escalator[172]



Stakeholder involvement, depending on the type of risk

An important factor that needs to be considered to decide when and how to engage stakeholders and/or the general public in any stage of the risk management process is the risk type. Depending on their characteristics, risks can be simple, complex, uncertain or ambiguous[173]. With *simple risks*, the connection between cause and effect is clear. With complex risks, on the other hand, it is difficult to identify and quantify the causal relationship between cause and effect as many intervening factors affect it. Examples of complex risks include health consequences of toxic substances and climate change modelling. Such problems require the involvement of experts who can reliably determine a given risk to explain the respective complexity and clarify dissenting views.[174]

A risk is considered *uncertain* when there is a lack of scientific or technical data, which results in undermined confidence in the cause-effect relationship. An example of this type of risk is natural disasters like earthquakes or floods. There may be uncertainty with regards to when seismic shaking may occur in a given region, but it is clear that the repercussions of seismic shaking should be minimised, e.g., through the enforcement of national building codes. Uncertain risks require the engagement of policymakers, scientists and directly affected stakeholder groups to decide on appropriate trade-offs between different risk management options.[175]

With *ambiguous* risks, the information available is subject to various interpretations, leading to different perspectives regarding the respective risk, including the likelihood of potential adverse effects. Examples of risks with high ambiguity include nuclear power generation as well as genetic modification in agriculture. Ambiguity denotes the variability of interpretations based on identical observations or data assessments.[176] A plurality of viewpoints for evaluating data exists under conditions of ambiguity. Thus, participation must include this plurality of viewpoints, including experts, policymakers, industry, civil society representatives, such as environmental NGOs, as well as the general public. High ambiguity requires the most inclusive stakeholder and public engagement strategy, one which aims to find a consensus regarding the dimensions of ambiguity to address risks and benefits and to balance the existing pros and cons related to the issue in question. Most risks, however, are a mixture of these characteristics. For example, endocrine disruptors are highly complex, uncertain and ambiguous, while nuclear energy is highly complex and ambiguous, but less uncertain.[177]

In short:

The main aim of a comprehensive knowledge about the risks, uncertainties and ambiguities of a particular issue is to enable all actors in society to deal with the risks in a socially and sustainable manner. Therefore, it is important to merge approaches of understanding and deciding about risk phenomena and to enhance institutional and individual capabilities to anticipate and tackle the societally most pressing problems. Here the precautionary principle and participatory approaches have a crucial role to play in the adaptive and integrative governance of risks and uncertainties.[178]



© unsplash.com / Kelly Sikkema

Furthermore, it is difficult sometimes to characterise a risk in terms of its complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity. In these cases, the IRGC advises beginning with a deliberation with the aim of defining and specifying the most suitable path for evaluation and management of the respective risk.[179]

Stakeholder involvement, depending on the phase of the risk governance process

According to the risk governance framework developed by IRGC, stakeholder engagement can have different aims and take different forms depending not only on the given risk characteristics, but also on the respective phase of the risk management process.[180] Each risk management process has four distinct phases, including *pre-assessment* (aiming to frame and define the context), *appraisal* (assessing facts and concerns), *characterisation/evaluation* of the respective risk after confirming the result of the risk appraisal and *management*, when a decision is made. [181] The aim of stakeholder engagement during the *pre-assessment* phase is to frame and define the problem to design the upcoming risk governance phases. The objective of stakeholder involvement during the appraisal stage is to contribute to the information pool or to raise awareness about the limits of existing knowledge as well as the risks under evaluation. Relevant stakeholders in this phase include technical experts, scientists, affected communities, governments, industries and local communities.[182] Renn[183] has identified several engagement instruments that are appropriate for application during the appraisal stage, namely expert panels, expert hearings, meta-analysis and Delphi methods.

During the *risk characterisation and evaluation phase,* the debate depends on the characteristics of the risk. When the issue in question is highly uncertain, but has low to medium ambiguity, the stakeholders from the pre-assessment stage should be reconvened to evaluate new knowledge and draw conclusions about the respective risk to ensure a balanced view of the positive and negative aspects of the problem under scrutiny. If the risk is considered highly ambiguous, stakeholders who will be affected by the risk management decision have to be included as well. Highly uncertain and ambiguous risks require wider stakeholder and public engagement to find the right balance when assessing the acceptability of a given risk. Suitable tools include round tables, stakeholder meetings, mediation, etc.[184]

In the *management* phase, stakeholders are engaged with the aim of identifying and evaluating measures for decreasing and managing unacceptable risks. Suitable measures at this stage include citizen advisory committees, citizen panels, citizen juries, consensus conferences and public meetings.[185]

In addition to the risk type and the phase of the risk governance process, the IRGC framework also discusses the broader context, related to the specifics and available resources of the political, institutional, social and economic environment. It is crucial to recognise the capabilities of key actors as well as the regulatory style, whether the approach towards regulation is authoritarian or permissive[186] Another important factor to be considered is risk culture as it refers to values, beliefs, attitudes and mindsets as this has an influence on the level of risk tolerance and trust in the respective risk governance institutions.[187]

Objectives of stakeholder engagement

Participation processes may categorise their aim as one of the following three main outcomes of stakeholder engagement:

Communication: effective risk governance needs to have proper risk communication, which is defined as the process of sharing/exchanging risk-related knowledge and data among actors engaged in risk management, including experts, scientists, policymakers, industry, consumers, regulators and the general public. The objectives of such communication include: i) improved stakeholder literacy regarding the issue at stake (e.g., provision of information about complex technologies and natural hazards); ii) behavioural change (e.g., communication campaigns about hand-washing and physical distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic)[189].

Consultation: collection of feedback from stakeholders and the general public about their knowledge, attitudes, interests and values in order to include knowledge from other knowledge bearers in the risk assessment and existing concerns in the planning and the risk management process. The objectives are: i) to engage a wide diversity of knowledge bearers and relevant ways of knowing; ii) to focus on public preferences by understanding affected populations' viewpoints (e.g., applied in cases when a decision between similar options has to be made or when scientific arguments cannot resolve conflicts); iii) to ensure informed consent by providing information to stakeholders and the general public about the potential consequences of specific risks and the respective risk management options (e.g., involving citizens in national consultations, related to important future policy changes).

Deliberation: stakeholders are active participants in the decision-making or risk management process. Objectives include: i) stakeholder self-commitment, which aims to ensure the willingness of stakeholders to take responsibility and to modify their behaviour/attitude to participate in a given risk management measure (e.g., homeowners switching to renewable energy as part of the low-carbon energy transition); ii) co-management/co-regulation directly involves stakeholders in designing regulations, risk management measures and programmes for risk monitoring (e.g., action plans for sustainable development)[190].

In summary, stakeholder and public engagement gives all affected and involved parties the chance to participate in the debate about responsible innovation. Thus, engagement may support mutual trust and enhance competence.

Main points on public engagement

- Methodological approaches to public engagement should be informed by an understanding of the characteristics of the potentially affected societal groups.
- A categorisation of risk should inform the methodological choices for participatory processes. Risk problems may be considered simple, complex, uncertain and/or ambiguous.
- Depending on the objective of participatory processes, methodological adjustments may be necessary. General objectives of public engagement are communication, consultation and deliberation.
- Risk and uncertainty communication is intrinsically linked to engagement processes and should be seen as a constant companion throughout all phases of risk governance *(see figure 5)*.
- Communication on risks and uncertainties require competences and capacities to communicate within the agencies (internal communication) and external experts, stakeholder groups, and the public (external communication).

5.4.2.2 Transparency

Appropriate and well-facilitated participation carries with it the challenge of transparency. An ongoing message throughout the RECIPES project is that invocation and application of the precautionary principle are based on notions of uncertainty and acknowledgement of scientific limitations. For precisely this reason, participatory efforts in risk governance should rely on inclusion, diversity and, importantly, *transparency*.[191] Results from the inter-case study comparison and the needs assessment highlight this requirement. However, they also indicated that the practical achievement of transparency is difficult. When is transparency required? What are the standards for transparency?

This guidance aims to address

- transparency in participatory approaches, pointing to merits and;
- the lack of clarity on how transparency may be achieved; and
- specific approaches to transparency, which are distinct for agenda-setting, policy development and the innovation process.

The first RECIPES expert consultation that was organised on 3 June indicated an overall interest in raising transparency standards in participatory procedures. The results of the inter-case study comparison point towards an understanding of transparency as the outcome of timely deliberative processes, in which available information is actively disseminated and discussed[192].

Birkinshaw[193] established the comparable notion that transparency entails not only the timely access to information, but also "conducting affairs in the open, subject to public scrutiny". This means that transparency entails not only dissemination, but also inclusion and consideration of public and expert opinion, e.g., in decision-making and issue-framing. Opposition to such a definition of transparency may likely refer to a potential pandering to irrelevance: high standards for transparency may result in obsessiveness over details and obscure the actual aims, effectively weakening decision-making and innovative processes[194]. However, efforts to foster transparency are assumed to build trust, strengthen public innovation and improve democratic engagement[195].

For transparency to become an operationalisable concept in precautionary approaches, this guidance calls for an active demonstration of timely and deliberative efforts to include and inform relevant stakeholders. In practice, this is reflected in planning and reporting, which should also be released for public scrutiny. Decision-makers and innovators alike should document how they plan to achieve transparency, as well as how their actual transparency efforts were eventually carried out. Documentation on these efforts should be available in open access digital repositories.

The requirements could support the application of the precautionary principle by encouraging decision-makers and policymakers, as well as industry developers, to actively demonstrate their efforts at transparency, rather than meeting a range of established minimum requirements.[196] This requires demonstrating early dissemination and engagement efforts that allow potentially affected citizens and other stakeholders to be informed of future developments. It also requires such inclusion processes to be deliberative, including stakeholders, especially affected citizens, in the development process.



In short:

Transparent participation is more than access to information.[197] It requires transparency in the form of both forced and intentional access to information, the latter consisting of an active release of information as well as a passive release in the form of freedom of information.[xlix] It also requires participatory approaches to provide open access to both formal and informal decision-making arenas.[198] An active demonstration of these features would ensure that participatory approaches to precaution are conducted in a transparent manner, ideally resulting in competent, effective and safe decision-making.

Main points on transparency

- Transparency can be defined as timely and deliberative efforts to include and inform relevant stakeholders to ensure that affairs are conducted in the open or subject to public scrutiny.
- Decision makers need to actively demonstrate the abovementioned meta-criteria of competence and fairness for transparent participatory processes.

5.4.2.3 Power asymmetries

Situations that call for invocation of the precautionary principle are characterised by power asymmetries between affected stakeholders. Be it the developers of a new technology, potential customers, normal citizens or future generations, stakeholders are affected in different ways when a new technology or product enters the EU. Similarly, their ability to voice their rights and needs is currently unequal at various levels of decision-making and innovation steering. Who is included in participatory processes? What questions may participants deal with? Whose voices should be strengthened and how could we contextualise various opinions? Asymmetries of power, comparable to the notion of information asymmetries,[199] cannot be ignored in participatory processes because such processes do not exist in a power vacuum. The need to explicate asymmetries among "included stakeholders in technology development, as well as risk assessment and risk management"[200] has been clearly established as an issue that has to be addressed. What is more, RECIPES identified a need to establish "how to address disagreements on the question of what type, level and to which extent asymmetries exist and which are problematic" [201].

Thus, the guidance on asymmetries aims to illuminate:

- the potential adverse impacts of power asymmetries in participatory approaches to the application of the precautionary principle;
- potential pathways to addressing and explaining power asymmetries among stakeholders in participatory processes;
- the merits and pathways of early inclusion of stakeholders with a heightened focus on under-represented voices.

xlix Meijer et al (2012) distinguish between forced access to information (leaking and whistle-blowing) and intentional access to information (freedom of information or active release of information).

The notion of power transparency is crucial to establish whether potential adverse impacts of power asymmetries in participatory processes exist. As rights, needs and interests of future generations must be fairly and properly represented in participatory processes, technology assessment, risk assessment and risk management could benefit from a greater contextual understanding of the role that (potential) stakeholders play in participation. Participation in the application of the precautionary principle could mirror this approach by requiring a greater effort to map and address the needs and rights of underrepresented and underpowered stakeholders, such as future generations and directly affected citizens. In line with the section on transparency in general, these mapping efforts should be disseminated and scrutinised publicly to ensure the accountability of the facilitators. Similarly, power transparency requires a greater effort to map and address the organised interests[202] that may affect participatory processes and subsequent decision-making. In particular, the opportunities and challenges in including industry representatives require great consideration and care due to the following power asymmetries in participatory processes.[203] The issue of transparency has been usefully addressed by the conceptualisation of *recursive reflexivity*, defined as *"...holding a mirror up to one's own activities, commitments and assumptions, being aware of the limits of knowledge and being mindful that a particular framing of an issue may not be universally held"*.[204] In this way, recursive reflexivity applied to responsible innovation *"can identify and critique dominant knowledge forms concerning innovation, technocracy, and even democracy while enacting the meaningful change it seeks to bring about through its interventions"*.[205]

Although inequalities and asymmetries cannot be completely removed, participatory processes can be conducted in a more neutral manner by means of guiding them towards increased transparency on power asymmetries. Participatory processes may benefit from power transparency in that different framings and presuppositions are contextualised, resulting in a more informed foundation for applying the precautionary principle.

Main point on power asymmetries

- Power asymmetries may be made explicit in participatory processes through an active documentation of existing asymmetries, thus aiming for power transparency.

© unsplash / John Robert Marasigan

© unsplash / Ross Joyner

5.5 Overview of guidance

The EU funded project RECIPES (REconciling sCience, Innovation and Precaution through the Engagement of Stakeholders), aims to ensure an application of the precautionary principle that encourages innovation and promotes precaution as a driving force in shaping and guiding innovation towards societally desirable goals with foresight and anticipation. This guidance adds to this purpose by showing how and why participatory processes should be prioritised to achieve good governance practices in the EU. The document sets out by justifying participatory processes through normative, substantive and instrumental argumentation. It goes on to suggest how adaptive and integrative approaches of risk governance can be operationalised, pointing to the meta-criteria of fairness and competence. The final chapter illuminates how participatory processes may be facilitated through well-informed methodology choices and considerations.

The RECIPES guidance documents have been shaped by a stakeholder needs assessment conducted in the autumn of 2020. Here, it was indicated that three main topics regarding the application of the precautionary principle could be addressed: participation; organisation and development of (scientific) expertise; and scope of application of the precautionary principle. This document thus serves one of three approaches to the central aim of RECIPES, in which the future application of the precautionary principle is to be improved. It is highly recommended that the other two guidance documents are visited to understand the full output of the RECIPES project.

While fruitful engagement and participation is a difficult competence to achieve, the EC has shown its commitment to try with activities such as the Conference of the Future of Europe[206] or the Competence Centre on Participatory and Deliberative Democracy.[207] While such actions are necessary to achieve future good governance practices, this document should aid and stimulate the process in which European deliberative approaches are strengthened and integrated in risk governance and decision-making.

Overview of guidance for participatory approaches supporting the application of the precautionary principle

Rationale for strengthened participation	Theoretical considerations underpin the two main lessons learned from RECIPES research that (1) conflicts of interest and knowledge create inconsistency in the application of the precautionary principle, and (2) strengthened, thought-out participatory processes can help uncover and mitigate such conflicts. Aiming for good governance practice, a strengthening of the science-society-policy interface through participatory processes is justified.
Choosing methods	Awareness of situational factors may aid the selection process when determining the most appropriate methods for participatory processes. Consideration of varying frameworks is important to attain situational awareness. The applicativon of the precautionary principle requires consideration from the perspective of the innovation cycle, as well as that from risk governance.
Fairness, inclusion and competence	While participatory processes may be difficult to assess consistently, the meta-criteria of fairness and competence provide a useful indicator for facilitation choices.
Public engagement	Methodological approaches to public engagement should be informed by the relevant stakeholder group. The public may be considered to be the directly affected groups; the directly affected public; the observing public; or the general public. Similar to the relevant stakeholder group, a categorisation of risk should inform the methodological choices for participatory processes. Risks may be considered simple, complex, uncertain or ambiguous. Depending on the objective of participatory processes, methodological adjustments may be necessary. General objectives of public engagement are communication, consultation and deliberation. Communication on risks and uncertainties require competencies and capacities to communicate within the agencies (internal communication) and external experts, stakeholder groups and the public (external communication).
Transparency	Transparency can be defined as timely and deliberative efforts to include and inform relevant stakeholders to ensure that affairs are conducted in the open or subject to public scrutiny. Decisionmakers need to actively demonstrate the abovementioned criteria for transparent participatory processes. Transparent participatory processes are a non-negotiable part of a change towards good governance and fair and competent deliberations.
Power asymmetries	Power asymmetries may be documented in participatory processes through an active documentation of existing asymmetries, thus aiming for power transparency.

REFERENCES

Chapter 3

Bocchi, M. (2016). 'The Reshaping of the Precautionary Principle by International Court: Judicial Dialogues or Parallel Monologues?', Geneva Jean Monnet Working Paper 2/2016. Available at http://www.ceje.ch/files/2314/5933/0264/Geneva_JMWP_02-Bocchi.pdf.

Case T-70/99, Alpharma Inc. v. Council of the European Union, Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Third Chamber) of 11 September 2002. ECLI:EU:T:2002:210.

Case T-584/13, BASF Agro BV and Others v. European Commission, Judgment of the General Court (First Chamber, Extended Composition) of 17 May 2018. ECLI:EU:T:2018:279.

Case C 499/18 P, Bayer CropScience AG and Bayer AG v. European Commission, Judgment of the Court (First Chamber) of 6 May 2021. ECLI:EU:C:2021:367.

Case C 333/08, European Commission v. French Republic, Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 28 January 2010. ECLI:EU:C:2010:44.

Case C-127/02, Landelijke Vereniging tot Behoud van de Waddenzee and Nederlandse Vereniging tot Bescherming van Vogels v. Staatssecretaris van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 7 September 2004. ECLI:EU:C:2004:482.

Case T-13/99, Pfizer Animal Health SA v. Council of the European Union, Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Third Chamber) of 11 September 2002.

ECLI:EU:T:2002:209.

Case C-157/96, The Queen v. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Commissioners of Customs & Excise, ex parte National Farmers' Union and Others, Judgment of the Court of 5 May 1998. ECLI:EU:C:1998:191.

Case C-180/96, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v. Commission of the European Communities, Judgment of the Court of 5 May 1998. ECLI:EU:C:1998:192.

Commission Regulation (EU) 2018/213 of 12 February 2018 on the use of bisphenol A in varnishes and coatings intended to come into contact with food and amending Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 as regards the use of that substance in plastic food contact materials, C/2018/0685, OJ L 41, 14.2.2018, p. 6–12.

Craig, P. (2018). Proportionality I: EU. EU Administrative Law, Oxford University Press.

EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service) (2016). The precautionary principle. Definitions, applications and governance. European Union.

European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.

European Commission (2017). Science for Environment Policy, Future Brief: The precautionary principle, decision-making under uncertainty, issue 18.

European Union, Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Goldner Lang, I. (2021). "Laws of Fear" in the EU: The Precautionary Principle and Public Health Restrictions to Free Movement of Persons in the Time of COVID-19. European Journal of Risk Regulation, pp. 1-24. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2020.120.

Jonas, H. (1984). The Imperative of Responsibility: In search of an Ethics for the Technological Age, University of Chicago Press.

Myhr, A. I., & Traavik, T. (2002). The precautionary principle: Scientific uncertainty and omitted research in the context of GMO use and release. Journal of agricultural and environmental ethics, 15(1), pp. 73-86.

Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on novel foods, amending Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Regulation (EC) No 258/97 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1852/2001 (Text with EEA relevance), OJ L 327, 11.12.2015, p. 1–22.

Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC, OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1–849.

Renn, O., & Dreyer, M. (2009). Food Safety Governance, Springer.

Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992). Available at https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/rio1992.

Scott, J. (2018). Legal Aspects of the Precautionary Principle, A British Academy Brexit Briefing, November 2018.

Stilgoe et al. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), pp. 1568-1580.

Trescher et al. (2021). D2.5 Comparison of case study analysis with results of WP1. Available at www.recipes-project.eu.

van Asselt, M.B.A., & Vos, E. (2006). The Precautionary Principle and the Uncertainty Paradox. Journal of Risk Research, 9(4), pp. 313-336.

Van Calster, G., & Garnett, K. (2021). The concept of essential use: A novel approach to regulating chemicals in the European Union. Transnational Environmental Law, 10(1), pp. 159-187.

van der Sluijs, J.P., & Turkenburg, W.C. (2006). Climate Change and the Precautionary Principle, In: Elizabeth Fisher, Judith Jones and René von Schomberg, Implementing The Precautionary Principle, Perspectives and Prospects, ELGAR, pp. 245-269.

von Schomberg, R. (2012). The Precautionary Principle: Its Use Within Hard and Soft Law. European Journal of Risk Regulation, 2, pp. 147-156. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1867299X00001987.

von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In Responsible Innovation (eds. R. Owen, J. Bessant and M. Heintz). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118551424.ch3.

Vos, E., & De Smedt, K. (2020). WP1 Report: Taking stock as a basis for the effect of the precautionary principle since 2000. Available at www.recipes-project.eu.

Weimer, M. (2019). Risk regulation in the internal market – lessons from agricultural biotechnology, Oxford University Press.

Wiener, J.B. (2018). 'Precautionary Principle', in Faure M., (ed.) Elgar Encyclopedia of Environmental Law, Vol. VI, Chapter 13.

World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) (2005). The Precautionary Principle, UNESCO.

Chapter 4

Åm, H. (2019). Limits of decentered governance in science-society policies. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 6(2), 163–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2019.1605483

Åm, H., Solbu, G., & Sørensen, K. H. (2021). The imagined scientist of science governance. Social Studies of Science, 51(2), 277–297.

Argyris, C. (2003). The importance of actionable knowledge. In H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of organization theory (p. 423). Oxford University Press.

Bennear L. S., & Wiener, J. B. (2021). Pursuing periodic review of agency regulation. https://www.theregreview.org/2021/11/09/bennear-wiener-periodic-review

Beronius, A., Hanberg, A., Zilliacus, J., & Rudén, C. (2014). Bridging the gap between academic research and regulatory health risk assessment of endocrine disrupting chemicals. Current Opinion in Pharmacology, 19, 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coph.2014.08.005

Bremer, S., Wardekker, A., Dessai, S., Sobolowski, S., Slaattelid, R., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2019). Toward a multi-faceted conception of coproduction of climate services. Climate Services, 13, 42–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2019.01.003

COMEST (World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology) (2005). The precautionary principle. UNESCO.

Demortain, D. (2017). Expertise, regulatory science and the evaluation of technology and risk: Introduction to the special issue. Minerva, 55(2), 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-017-9325-1

Demortain, D. (2021). The science behind the ban: The outstanding impact of ecotoxicological research in the regulation of neonicotinoids. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46, 78–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.02.017

Dooley, K., Holz, C., Kartha, S., Klinsky, S., Roberts, J. T., Shue, H., Winkler, H., Athanasiou, T., Caney, S., Cripps, E., Dubash, N. K., Hall, G., Harris, P. H., Lahn, B., Moellendorf, D., Müller, B., Sagar, A., & Singer, P. (2021). Ethical choices behind quantifications of fair contributions under the Paris Agreement. Nature Climate Change, 11(4), 300–305. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01015-8

Dreyer, M., & Renn, O. (2009). A structured approach to participation. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 111–120). Springer.

Dreyer, M., Renn, O., Ely, A., Stirling, A., Vos, E., & Wendler, F. (2009). Summary: Key features of the General Framework. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 159–165). Springer.

Drivdal, L., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2021). Pollinator conservation requires a stronger and broader application of the precautionary principle. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46, 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.04.005

Drohmann, D., & Hernández, F. (2020). Risk of regrettable substitution under EU REACH: Level playing field in the EU regulatory context. International Chemical Regulatory and Law Review, 3(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.21552/icrl/2020/1/6

Dunlop, T. (1981). DDT: Scientists, Citizens and Public Policy. Princeton University Press.

Dunn, W. N. (1997). Cognitive impairment and social problem solving: Some tests for type III errors in policy analysis. Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh.

Dunn, W. N. (2001). Using the method of context validation to mitigate type III errors in environmental policy analysis. In M. Hisschemöller, R. Hoppe, W. N. Dunn & and J. R. Ravetz (Eds.), Knowledge, Power, and Participation in Environmental Policy Analysis. Policy Studies Review Annual, 12 (pp. 417–436). Transaction Publishers.

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency) (2013). Evaluation under REACH, Progress Report 2013. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13628/evaluation_report_2013_en.pdf/e080ba36-64a6-4dcf-8eca-f9352ddf5e3b

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency) and EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2020, October). In support of the EU chemicals strategy for sustainability: One substance – one assessment. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/21877836/efsa-echa-position-paper-osoa_en.pdf/74b1ae31-290b-a608-85e9-05b340840b34

EEA (European Environment Agency) (edited by Harramoës, P., Gee, D., MacGarvin, M., Stirling, A., Keys, J., Wynne, B. & Vaz, S. G.)(2001). Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/environmental_issue_report_2001_22

EEA (European Environment Agency) (2013). Late lessons from early warnings: Science, precaution, innovation. Publications Office of the European Union. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2010). Application of systematic review methodology to food and feed safety assessments to support decision making, EFSA Journal, 8(6), 1637. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1637

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) Scientific Committee (Hardy, A., Benford, D., Halldorsson, T., Jeger, M. J., Knutsen, H. K., More, S., Naegeli, H., Noteborn, H., Ockleford, C., Ricci, A., Rychen, G., Schlatter, J. R., Silano, V., Solecki, R., Turck, D. & Younes, M. (2017). Guidance on the use of the weight of evidence approach in scientific assessments. EFSA Journal, 15(8), 4971. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4971

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) Scientific Committee (Benford, D., Halldorsson, T., Jeger, M. J., Knutsen, H. K., More, S., Naegeli, H., Noteborn, H., Ockleford, C., Ricci, A., Rychen, G., Schlatter, J. R., Silano, V., Solecki, R., Turck, D., Younes, M., Craig, P., Hart, A., Von Goetz, N., Koutsoumanis, K., … Hardy, A. (2018). The principles and methods behind EFSA's Guidance on Uncertainty Analysis in Scientific Assessment. EFSA Journal, 16(1), 5122. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5122

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Hart, A., Maxim, L., Siegrist, M., Von Goetz, N., da Cruz, C., Merten, C., Mosbach-Schulz, O., Lahaniatis, M., Smith, A., & Hardy, A. (2019). Guidance on communication of uncertainty in scientific assessments. EFSA Journal, 17(1), 5520. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5520

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2021). Technical assistance in the field of risk communication. EFSA Journal, 19(4), 6574. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6574

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2021). Outline of the revision of the Guidance on the risk assessment of plant protection products on bees (Apis mellifera, Bombus spp. and solitary bees) (EFSA, 2013) UPDATED IN NOVEMBER 2021. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2021-11/outline-bee-guidance-revision-2021.pdf

Elliott, K. C. (2019). Managing value-laden judgements in regulatory science and risk assessment (conference article). EFSA Journal, 17(S1). https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.e170709

Ely, A., & Stirling, A. (2009). The process of assessment. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 57–69). Springer.

Ely, A., Stirling, A., Dreyer, M., Renn, O., Vos, E., & Wendler, F. (2009). Overview of the General Framework. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 29–45). Springer.

EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service) (2016). The precautionary principle. Definitions, applications and governance. European Union. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2015/573876/EPRS_IDA(2015)573876_EN.pdf

European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the Precautionary Principle, COM/2000/0001 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A52000DC0001

European Commission (2001). European Governance. A White Paper, COM/2001/428 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM%3Al10109

European Commission (2009). Commission recommendation on a code of conduct for responsible nanosciences and nanotechnologies research & Council conclusions on responsible nanosciences and nanotechnologies research, https://op.europa.eu/de/publication-detail/-/publication/a8b7d91c-a987-4a3d-a7f4-efc864b5cbfd

European Commission (2013). Guidelines on the Prevention and Management of Conflicts of Interest in EU Decentralised Agencies, https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/default/files/docs/body/2013-12-10_guidelines_on_conflict_of_interests_en.pdf

European Commission (2019). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. The European Green Deal, COM/2019/640 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2019%3A640%3AFIN

European Commission (2020). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability. Towards a Toxic-Free Environment, COM/2020/667 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2020%3A667%3AFIN

Fantke, P., Weber, R., & Scheringer, M. (2015). From incremental to fundamental substitution in chemical alternatives assessment. Sustainable Chemistry and Pharmacy, 1(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scp.2015.08.001

Fjelland R. (2016). When laypeople are right and experts are wrong: Lessons from love canal. HYLE - International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry, 22(1), 105–125.

Gazsó, A., & Pavlicek, A. (2020). WP2 case study. Nanotechnologies. RECIPES case study report. https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-11/D2_3_Nanotechnology_Nov.pdf

Grandjean, P. (2018). Delayed discovery, dissemination, and decisions on intervention in environmental health: A case study on immunotoxicity of perfluorinated alkylate substances. Environmental Health, 17(62). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-018-0405-y

Groen, A., & Neuhold, C. (2020). Endocrine disruptors. RECIPES case study report https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-11/CS3_Endocrine%20Disruptors.pdf.

IUCN Council (2007, 14-16 May). Guidelines for applying the precautionary principle to biodiversity conservation and natural resource management, as approved by the 67th meeting of the IUCN. Council. https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/import/downloads/ln250507_ppguidelines.pdf

Hansen, S. F., & Gee, D. (2014). Adequate and anticipatory research on the potential hazards of emerging technologies: A case of myopia and inertia? J Epidemiol Community Health, 68(9), 890–895. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech-2014-204019

Health Council of the Netherlands (2014). The health risks of Bisphenol A analogues. Advisory letter. Publication 2014/06E. https://www.healthcouncil.nl/documents/advisory-reports/2014/03/18/the-health-risks-of-bisphenol-a-analogues

Hernández-González, Y., & Corral, S. (2017). An extended peer communities' knowledge sharing approach for environmental governance. Land Use Policy, 63, 140–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.12.023

Hjorth, R., Hansen S. F., Jacobs, M., Tickner, J., Ellenbecker, M., & Baun, A. (2017). The applicability of chemical alternatives assessment for engineered nanomaterials. Integr Environ Assess Manag., 13(1), 177–187. https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.1762

Ingre-Khans, E., Ågerstrand, M., Beronius, A., & Rudén, C. (2019). Reliability and relevance evaluations of REACH data. Toxicology research, 8(1), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.1039/c8tx00216a

Irwin, A., Rothstein, H., Yearley, S., & McCarthy, E. (1997). Regulatory science - Towards a sociological framework. Futures, 29(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287(96)00063-8

Kaltenhäuser, J., Kneuer, C., Marx-Stoelting, P., Niemann, L., Schubert, J., Stein, B., & Solecki, R. (2017). Relevance and reliability of experimental data in human health risk assessment of pesticides. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 88, 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2017.06.010

Lemus, D., & Kovacic Z. (2021). Precise yet uncertain: Broadening understandings of uncertainty and policy in the BPA controversy. Risk Analysis. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13860

Macnaghten, P., & Habets, G. J. L. (2020). Breaking the impasse: Towards a forward-looking governance framework for editing with plants. Plants, People, Planet, 2, 353–365. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10107

Maxim, L. (2015). A systematic review of methods of uncertainty analysis and their applications in the assessment of chemical exposures, effects, and risks. International Journal of Environmental Health Research, 25(5), 522–550. https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2014.980782

Maxim, L., & Van der Sluijs, J. P. (2007). Uncertainty: Cause or effect of stakeholders' debates? Analysis of a case study: The risk for honeybees of the insecticide Gaucho®. Science of the Total Environment, 376(1-3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2006.12.052

Maxim L., & Van der Sluijs, J. P (2011). Quality in environmental science for policy: Assessing uncertainty as a component of policy analysis. Environmental Science & Policy, 14(4), 482–492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2011.01.003

Maxim, L., & Van der Sluijs, J. P. (2013). Response to the Bayer Cropscience (Richard Schmuck) comments on the chapter. In European Environment Agency (Ed.), Late lessons from early warnings II: bee decline web debate (pp. 8–20). http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2/late-lessons-chapters/bees-insecticides-debate

Millstone, E., Van Zwanenberg, P., Marris, C., Levidow, L., & Torgersen, H. (2004). Science in trade disputes related to potential risks: Comparative case studies. Institute for Prospective Technological studies. https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/16101/1/Millstone%20et%20al%202004%20ESTO%20Science%20in%20Trade%20Disputes.pdf

Molander, L., Ågerstrand, M., Beronius, A., Hanberg, A., & Rudén, C. (2015). Science in risk assessment and policy (SciRAP): An online resource for evaluating and reporting in vivo (eco) toxicity studies. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal, 21(3), 753–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2014.928104

National Research Council. (1983). Risk Assessment in the Federal Government: Managing the Process. National Academy Press.

Norström, A. V., Cvitanovic, C., Löf, M. F., West, S., Wyborn, C., Balvanera, P., Bednarek, A. T., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., de Bremond, A., Campbell, B. M., Canadell, J. G., Carpenter, S. R., Folke, C., Fulton, E. A., Gaffney, O., Gelcich, S., Jouffray, J.-B., Leach, M., … Österblom, H. (2020). Principles for knowledge co-production in sustainability research. Nature Sustainability, 3(3), 182–190.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2020). Addressing societal challenges using transdisciplinary research. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers, No. 88, OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/0ca0ca45-en

Owen, R., Stilgoe, J., Macnaghten, P., Groman, M., Fisher, E., & Guston, D. (2013). A framework for responsible innovation. In R. Owen, J. Bessant & M. Heintz (Eds.), Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society (pp. 27–50). Johny Wiley & Sons.

Owen, R., & Pansera, M. (2019). Responsible innovation and responsible research and innovation. In D. Simon, S. Kuhlmann, J. Stamm & W. Canzler (Eds.), Handbook on science and public policy (pp. 26–48). Edward Elgar.

Petersen, A. C., Janssen, P. H. M., van der Sluijs, J. P., Risbey, J. S., Ravetz, J. R., Wardekker, J. A., & Martinson Hughes, H. (2013). Guidance for Uncertainty Assessment and Communication, second edition. Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. https://www.pbl.nl/en/publications/guidance-for-uncertainty-assessment-and-communication

Raiffa, H. (1968). Decision Analysis. Addison-Wesley.

Renda, A., & Simonelli, F. (2019). Study supporting the interim evaluation of the innovation principle. Final report. Centre for European Policy Studies. https://op.europa.eu/de/publication-detail/-/publication/e361ec68-09b4-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1

Renn, O. (2010). The contribution of different types of knowledge towards understanding, sharing and communication risk concepts. Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies, 2(2), 177–195. https://doi.org/10.1386/cjcs.2.2.177_1

Renn, O. (2015). Stakeholder and public involvement in risk governance. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science, 6(1), 8–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-015-0037-6

Renn, O. (2021) Transdisciplinarity: Synthesis towards a modular approach. Futures, 130, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102744.

Robinson, C., Portier, C. J., Čavoski, A., Mesnage, R., Roger, A., Clausing, P., Whaley, P., Muilerman, H., & Lyssimachou, A. (2020). Achieving a high level of protection from pesticides in europe: problems with the current risk assessment procedure and solutions. European Journal of Risk Regulation, 11(3), 450–480. https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2020.18

Saltelli, A., & Giampietro, M. (2017). What is wrong with evidence based policy, and how can it be improved?. Futures, 91, 62–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.012

SAM (Group of Chief Scientific Advisors, European Commission) (2019, September). Scientific advice to European policy in a complex world. Scientific Opinion No.7. Publications Office of the European Union. https://op.europa.eu/en-GB/publication-detail/-/publication/5cb9ca21-0500-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1/language-en

SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019a). Guidelines on advising policymakers and society; procedures for quality assurance of scientific advice. https://doi.org/10.26356/guidelinesqualityassurance

SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019b). Making sense of science. For policy under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. https://doi.org/10.26356/MASOS

Science for Environmental Policy (2017). The Precautionary Principle: decision making under uncertainty. Future Brief 18. Produced for the European Commission DG Environment by the Science Communication Unit. https://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/precautionary_principle_decision_making_under_uncertainty_FB18_en.pdf

Sgolastra, F., Medrzycki, P., Bortolotti, L., Maini, S., Porrini, C., Simon-Delso, N., & Bosch, J. (2020). Bees and pesticide regulation: Lessons from the neonicotinoid experience. Biological Conservation, 241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108356

Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568–1580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008

Stirling A. (2008). "Opening up" and "closing down": power, participation, and pluralism in the social appraisal of technology. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 33(2), 262–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243907311265

Stirling, A., & Tickner, J. A. (2004). Implementing precaution: assessment and application tools for health and environmental decision-making. In M. Martuzzi & J. A. Tickner (Eds.), The precautionary principle: Protecting public health, the environment and the future of our children (pp. 181–298). World Health Organization (WHO).

Stirling, A. C., & Scoones, I. (2009). From risk assessment to knowledge mapping: science, precaution, and participation in disease ecology. Ecology and Society, 14(2), 14.

Tengö M., Hill, R., Malmer, P., Raymond, C. M., Spierenburg, M., Danielsen, F., Elmquist, T., & Folke, C. (2017). Weaving knowledge systems in IPBES, CBD and beyond—lessons learned for sustainability. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 26-27, 17–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.12.005

Tickner, J. A., Schifano, J. N., Blake, A., Rudisill, C., & Mulvihill, M. J. (2015). Advancing safer alternatives through functional substitution. Environmental Science & Technology, 49(2), 742–749. https://doi.org/10.1021/es503328m

Tickner, J., Jacobs, M. M., & Mack, N. B. (2019). Alternatives assessment and informed substitution: A global landscape assessment of drivers, methods, policies and needs. Sustainable Chemistry and Pharmacy. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scp.2019.10

Van der Sluijs, J. P. (2017). The NUSAP approach to uncertainty appraisal and communication. In C. L. Spash (Ed.), Routledge handbook of ecological economics: Nature and society (pp. 301–310). Routledge.

Van der Sluijs, J. P., & Turkenburg, W. (2006). Climate change and the precautionary principle. In E. Fisher, J. Jones & R. von Schomberg (Eds.), Implementing the precautionary principle, perspectives and prospects (pp. 245–269). ELGAR.

Van der Sluijs, J. P., Foucart, S., & Casas J. (2021). Editorial overview: Halting the pollinator crisis requires entomologists to step up and assume their societal responsibilities. Special Section on Pollinator decline: human and policy dimensions. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.08.004

Van Asselt, M. B. A., & Vos, E. (2006). The precautionary principle and the uncertainty paradox. Journal of risk research, 9(4), 313–336. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870500175063

Van Dijk, J., Gustavsson, M., Dekker, S. C., & van Wezel, A. P. (2021). Towards 'one substance – one assessment': An analysis of EU chemical registration and aquatic risk assessment frameworks. Journal of Environmental Management, 280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111692

Von Schomberg, R. (2012). The Precautionary Principle: its use within hard and soft law. European Journal of Risk Regulation, 3(2), 147–156.

Von Schomberg, R. (2012). Prospects for technology assessment in a framework of responsible research and innovation. In M. Dusseldorp & R. Beecroft (Eds.), Technikfolgen abschätzen lehren: Bildungspotenziale transdisziplinärer Methoden (pp. 39–61). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of responsible research and innovation. In R. Owen, J. Bessant & M. Heintz (Eds.), Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society, (pp. 51–74). Johny Wiley & Sons.

Von Schomberg, R. (2014). The quest for the 'right' impacts of science and technology: A framework for responsible research and innovation. In J.v.H Hoven, N. Doorn, T. Swierstra, B.-J. Koops & H. Romijn (Eds.), Responsible innovation 1: Innovative solutions for global issues (pp. 33–50). Springer.

Vos, E., & Wendler, F. (2009). Legal and institutional aspects of the General Framework. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 83–109). Springer.

Vos, E., Athanasiadou, N., & Dohmen, L. (2020). EU agencies and conflicts of interest. Study requested by the PETI committee of the European Parliament. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/621934/IPOL_STU(2020)621934_EN.pdf

Waltner-Toews, D., Biggeri, A., De Marchi, B., Funtowicz, S., Giampietro, M., O'Connor, M., Ravetz, J. R., Saltelli, A., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2020). Post-normal pandemics: Why CoViD-19 requires a new approach to science. Recenti Progressi in Medicina, 111(4). (In Italian. English version of this paper: https://archive.discoversociety.org/2020/03/27/post-normal-pandemics-why-covid-19-requires-a-new-approach-to-science/).

Wynne, B. (1996). May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert-lay knowledge divide. In S. Lash, B. Szerszynski & B. Wynne (Eds.), Risk, environment and modernity: Towards a new ecology (pp. 44–83). SAGE.

Chapter 5

Andersen, P. D., Hansen, M. and Selin, C. (2021) Stakeholder inclusion in scenario planning—A review of European projects, Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 169, p. 120802. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120802.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation, Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35(4), pp. 216–224. doi: 10.1080/01944366908977225.

Árvai, J. (2014) The end of risk communication as we know it, Journal of Risk Research, 17:10, 1245-1249, DOI: 10.1080/13669877.2014.919519

Aven, T. and Renn, O. (2010) Risk Management and Governance: Concepts, Guidelines and Applications. (Risk, Governance and Society, 16). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg; Springer e-books. Available at: https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-642-13926-0.pdf (Accessed: 19 April 2021).

Aven, T. and Renn, O. (2020). Some foundational issues related to risk governance and different types of risks, Journal of Risk Research, 23(9), pp. 1121–1134. doi: 10.1080/13669877.2019.1569099

Beck, Silke, Sheila Jasanoff, Andy Stirling, and Christine Polzin (2021). „The Governance of Sociotechnical Transformations to Sustainability". Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 49 (April 2021): 143–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2021.04.010.

Bell, W and J. Mau (1971) 'Images of the future: theory and research strategies', in Bell and Mau (eds) The Sociology of the Future, Russell Sage Foundation: New York. Pages 1-28

Bidwell, David and Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2020). „Public Values and Goals for Public Participation". Environmental Policy and Governance, 23. September 2020, eet.1913. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1913.

Birkinshaw, P. (2006). Freedom of Information and Openness: Fundamental Human Rights? Administrative Law Review, 58(1).

Böschen, S. (2010). Reflexive Wissenspolitik: die Bewältigung von (Nicht-) Wissenskonflikten als institutionenpolitische Herausforderung, in Feindt, P. H. and Saretzki, T. (eds) Umwelt- und Technikkonflikte. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / GWV Fachverlage GmbH, Wiesbaden.

Burget, M., Bardone, E., and Pedaste, M. (2017). Definitions and Conceptual Dimensions of Responsible Research and Innovation: A Literature Review. Science and engineering ethics, 23(1), 1-19.

Burgess, Jacquelin, and Jason Chilvers (2006). Upping the ante: A conceptual framework for designing and evaluating participatory technology assessments. Science and Public Policy 33, Nr. 10 (1. December 2006): 713–28. https://doi.org/10.3152/147154306781778551.

BVerfG (2021). Order of the First Senate of 24 March 2021 - 1 BvR 2656/18 -, paras. 1-270, http://www.bverfg.de/e/rs20210324_1bvr265618en.html

van Cauwenbergh, N., Ciuró, A. B., & Ahlers, R. (2018). Participatory processes and support tools for planning in complex dynamic environments: a case study on web-GIS based participatory water resources planning in Almeria, Spain. Ecology and Society, 23(2).

Coenen, F., Huitema, D., O'Toole Jr., L., (Eds.), (1998). Participation and the quality of environmental decision making. Environment & Policy, vol. 14. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Collingridge, D., (1982). Critical Decision Making: A New Theory of Social Choice. Pinter, London.

Conley, S. N. & York, E., (2020) Public engagement in contested

political contexts: reflections on the role of recursive reflexivity in responsible innovation, Journal of Responsible Innovation, 7:sup1, 1-12, DOI: 10.1080/23299460.2020.1848335

Davies, H. (2017). The Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015—A Step Change in the Legal Protection of the Interests of Future Generations? Journal of Environmental Law 29, Nr. 1 (March 2017): 165–75. https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqx003.

Von der Leyen, U. (2019). A Union that strives for more. My agenda for Europe. Political guidelines for the next European Commission, 2024, 2019.

Drivdal, L.; & van der Sluijs, J.P. (2021). Pollinator conservation requires a stronger and broader application of the precautionary principle. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 28. April 2021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.04.005.

Drivdal, L., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2020). Neonicotinoid insecticides. D2. 4.1 Intra case study analysis, 120. https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2021-03/D2_3_Neonics_Review.pdf

EEA (2002). European Environment Agency Annual report 2002. ISBN: 92-9167-575-Y ORDER ID (Catalogue Number): TH-AA-03-001-EN-C

EEAC (2020). „A new science-policy-society interface for the 2030 Agenda: the role of European Advisory Councils on the Environment and Sustainable Development". European Environment and Sustainable Development Advisory Councils, 2020. http://eeac.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/EEAC-Network-contribution-to-the-UN-Global-Sustainable-Development-Report-2019.pdf.

van Enst, W.I., Driessen, P.P.J. and Runhaar, H.A.C. (2014). Towards productive science policy interfaces: a research agenda, Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management, 16(01), p. 1450007. doi: 10.1142/S1464333214500070

Escobar, O., Faulkner, W. and Rea, H. J. (2014). Building capacity for dialogue facilitation in public engagement around research, Journal of Dialogue Studies, 2(1), pp. 87–111.

EU Commission (2001). White paper on European Governance. COM(2001) 428 final. Available at: http://aei.pitt.edu/1188/1/european_governance_wp_COM_2001_428.pdf.

EU Commission (2000). Communication from the commission on the precautionary principle. COMNAT: COM_2000_0001_FIN. Available at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/21676661-a79f-4153-b984-aeb28f07c80a/language-en

EU Commission (2010). Consolidated version of the Treaty on the European Union and the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union, (2012/C 326/01). Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C:2016:202:FULL&from=EN.

EU Commission (2013). EUR 25766 – Options for Strengthening Responsible Research and Innovation Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union 2013 — 72 pp — 17.6 x 25 cm ISBN 978-92-79-28233-1 doi: 10.2777/46253

EU Commission (2015). Indicators for promoting and monitoring responsible research and innovation: report from the expert group on policy indicators for responsible research and innovation. Available at: Errore. Riferimento a collegamento ipertestuale non valido.eprints.lse.ac.uk/66576/ 1/__ lse.ac.uk_ storage_ library_secondary_libfile_shared_repository_content_bauer%20m_indicators%20for%20promoting%20and%20monitoring%20responsible_bauer_indicators_for_promoting_and_monitoring_ responsible_ author.pdf.

EU Commission (2018). Horizon 2020 Framework Programme, Work programme part Science with and for Society, Call Science with and for Society, Work programme year H2020 2018-2020

EU Commission (2019). COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS The European Green Deal COM/2019/640 final. Available at https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52019DC0640&from=EN

Fears, R., & Stephan, S. (2004). Technology Assessment in Europe; between Method and Impact (TAMI) – Industry Technology Assessment: Opportunities and Challenges for Partnership. Project Part II – Supplementary Papers. https://tekno.dk/app/uploads/2021/04/TAMI-Part-II-1.pdf

Fisher, E. (2007). Risk Regulation and Administrative Constitutionalism. Portland, Oregon, USA: Hart Publishing. In Funtowicz, Silvio O., and Jerome R. Ravetz (1993). "Science for the post-normal age". Futures 25, Nr., 739–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(93)90022-L.

Gazsó, A. and Pavlicek, A. (2020). WP2 case study. Nanotechnologies. RECIPES report. Available at: https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-11/D2_3_Nanotechnology_Nov.pdf.

Grafe, Fritz-Julius, and Harald A. Mieg (2021). Precaution and Innovation in the Context of Wastewater Regulation: An Examination of Financial Innovation under UWWTD Disputes in London and Milan. Sustainability 13, Nr. 16 (15. August 2021): 9130. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169130.

Grieger, K. D., Felgenhauer, T., Renn, O., Wiener, J., & Borsuk, M. (2019). Emerging risk governance for stratospheric aerosol injection as a climate management technology. Environment Systems and Decisions, 39(4), 371-382. doi:10.1007/s10669-019-09730-6

Habermas, J. (1975) Legitimation Crisis. Boston United States of America, Beacon Press: https://www.ias.edu/sites/default/files/sss/pdfs/Crisis-and-Critique-2018-19/habermas_legitimation_crisis.pdf

Hajer, M. and Wagenaar, H. (2003) Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society, Cambridge University Press, UK

Harremoës, P. et al. (2001) Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle, 1896-2000. Copenhagen Denmark (Environmental issue report). Available at: Errore. Riferimento a collegamento ipertestuale non valido. www.eea.europa.eu / publications/ environmental_ issue_ report_ 2001_ 22/ Issue_ Report_ No_ 22.pdf.

Hernández, Ariel Macaspac (2014). Strategic Facilitation of Complex Decision-Making: How Process and Context Matter in Global Climate Change Negotiations. 1st ed. 2014.

Holm, N-K.T. et al. (2021). Task 3.1 – Needs Assessment. Available at: https://recipes-project.eu

Horlick-Jones, T. et al. (2006). On evaluating the GM Nation? Public debate about the commercialisation of transgenic crops in Britain. New Genetics and Society, Vol. 25, No. 3, December 2006. Available online at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247498271_On_Evaluating_the_GM_Nation_Public_Debate_about_the_Commercialisation_of_Transgenic_Crops_in_Britain

International Risk Governance Council (IRGC) (2005). Risk governance: Towards an integrative approach. In White Paper No. 1; Renn, O., Graham, P., Eds.; IRGC: Geneva, Switzerland, 2005.

IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center.

IRGC (2017). Introduction to the IRGC Risk Governance Framework, revised version. Lausanne: EPFL International Risk Governance Center.

Innes, Judith E., and David E. Booher (2004). Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century. Planning Theory & Practice 5, Nr. 4, 419–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350420002 93170.

Jasanoff, S. (2003). Technologies of humility: citizen participation in governing science, Minerva, 41(3), pp. 223–244. doi: 10.4324/9780203113820-15

JICA (2008). Capacity Assessment Handbook – Project Management for Realizing Capacity Development –. JICA Research Institute, Japan International Cooperation Agency. http://www.jica.go.jp/jica-ri/index.html.

Jirotka, M., Grimpe, B., Stahl, B., Eden, G., & Hartswood, M. (2017). Responsible research and innovation in the digital age. Communications of the ACM, 60(5), 62-68.

Karapiperis, T., & Ladikas, M. (2004). Organised Interests in the European Union's Science and Technology Policy – The Influence of Lobbying Activities. TAMI Part II – Supplementary Papers.

Klinke, Andreas, and Ortwin Renn (2002). „A New Approach to Risk Evaluation and Management: Risk-Based, Precaution-Based, and Discourse-Based Strategies 1". Risk Analysis 22, Nr. 6 (December 2002): 1071–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/1539-6924.00274.

Klinke, Andreas, and Ortwin Renn (2011). "Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty". Journal of Risk Research 15, Nr. 3, 273–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.201 1.636838.

Klinke, Andreas, and Ortwin Renn (2010). „Risk Governance: Contemporary and Future Challenges". In Regulating chemical risks; European and global challenges, 9–27, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9428-5_2.

Klinke, Andreas, and Ortwin Renn (2004) systemic risks: A new challenge for risk manegment. EMBO Reports 5 Spec No(S1):S41-6. DOI:10.1038/sj.embor.7400227.

Löfgren, K.-G., Persson, T., & Weibull, J. W. (2002). Markets with Asymmetric Information: The Contributions of George Akerlof, Michael Spence and Joseph Stiglitz. Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 104(2), 195-211.

Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: connecting vision and voice. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 78(1), 10-29

Meadowcroft, J. (1999). The Politics of Sustainable Development: Emergent Arenas and Challenges for Political Science, International Political Science Review, 20(2), pp. 219–237. doi: 10.1177/0192512199202006.

Randles, S., Gee, S., & Edler, J. (2015). Deliverable D3.6. Governance and Institutionalisation of Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe: Transversal lessons from an extensive programme of case studies: Stakeholder Report. ResAGorA Project

Rask, M., Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė, S., Tauginienė, L. Dikčius, V., Matschoss, K., Aarrevaara, T., d'Andrea, L. (2018). Public Participation, Science and Society: Tools for Dynamic and Responsible Governance of Research and Innovation, Routledge

Renn, Ortwin (2022). „The Systemic Risk Perspective: Social Perception of Uncertainty and Tipping Points". In Strategies for Sustainability of the Earth System, herausgegeben von Peter A. Wilderer, Martin Grambow, Michael Molls, and Konrad Oexle, 15–31. Strategies for Sustainability. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74458-8_2.

Renn, Ortwin & Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2020), Hrsg. The role of public participation in energy transitions. Waltham: Elsevier.Renn, Ortwin, Manfred Laubichler, Klaus Lucas, Wolfgang Kröger, Jochen Schanze, Roland W. Scholz, and Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2020). "Systemic Risks from Different Perspectives". Risk Analysis, 16. December 2020, risa.13657. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13657.

Renn, Ortwin, and Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2019). „Inclusive risk governance: concepts and application to environmental policy making". Environmental Policy and Governance 19, Nr. 3 (Mai 2009): 174–85. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.507.

Renn, O., & Schweizer, P. J. (2009). Inclusive risk governance: concepts and application to environmental policy making. Environmental policy and governance, 19(3), 174-185

Renn, O., (2015). Stakeholder and Public engagement in Risk Governance. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science (2015) 6:8-20. Available online at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13753-015-0037-6

Renn, O. (2019). Die Rolle(n) transdisziplinärer Wissenschaft bei konfliktgeladenen Transformationsprozessen. https:doi/10.14512/gaia.28.1.11.

Renn, O., (2015). Stakeholder and Public engagement in Risk Governance. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science (2015) 6:8-20. Available online at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13753-015-0037-6

Renn, O., and K. Walker (2008a). Lessons learned: A re-assessment of the IRGC framework on risk governance. In The IRGC risk governance framework: Concepts and practice, ed. O. Renn and K. Walker, 331–67. Heidelberg and New York: Springer.

Renn, O. and Walker, K. (2008b). "White Paper on Risk Governance: Toward an Integrative Framework". In Global Risk Governance: Concept and Practice Using the IRGC Framework, p. 3–73. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6799-0 1.

Renn, Ortwin (2008). Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World. London; Rutledge, Earthscan.

Renn, Ortwin, Thomas Webler, and Peter Wiedemann (1995). „The Pursuit of Fair and Competent Citizen Participation". In Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation, herausgegeben von Ortwin Renn, Thomas Webler, und Peter Wiedemann, 339–67. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1995. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0131-8_20.

Rini, J. (2019) Conceptual framework for comparative multiple case study analysis. Deliverable WP2.1 Report. RECIPES Project. Available at: www.recipes-project.eu.

Rittel, Horst WJ, and Melvin M. Webber (1973). „Dilemmas in a general theory of planning". Policy sciences 4, Nr. 2 (1973): 155–69.

Rosa, E.A. (1998). Metatheoretical foundations for post-normal risk, Journal of Risk Research, 1(1), pp. 15–44. doi: 10.1080/136698798377303

SAPEA (2019). „Making sense of Science for policy under conditions of complexity and uncertainty". Berlin: Science Advice for Policy by European Academies, 2019. https://doi.org/10.26356/MASOS.

Saurugger, S. (2010). The social construction of the participatory turn: The emergence of a norm in the European Union, European Journal of Political Research, 49(4), pp. 471–495. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.01905.x

Von Schomberg, R. (2019) „Why responsible innovation?" In International handbook on responsible innovation. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Von Schomberg, R. (2015). Responsible innovation: The new paradigm for science, technology and innovation policy, A. Bogner, M. Decker and M. Sotoudeh, Responsible Innovation: Neue Impulse für die Technikfolgenabschätzung, Baden-Baden, Nomos, pp. 47–70.

Von Schomberg, R. (2013). A Vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In: Owen, R., Bessant, J. & Heintz, M. (eds.) Responsible Innovation. Managing the Responsible Emergence of Science and Innovation in Society. Chichester: Wiley.

Von Schomberg, R. (2006), 'The precautionary principle and its normative challenges', in E. Fisher, J. Jones and R. von Schomberg. (eds) (2006), Implementing the Precautionary Principle: Perspectives and Prospects, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, US: Edward Elgar, chapter 2. p19-42.

Von Schomberg, R. (2001). „The Objective of Sustainable Development: Are We Coming Closer?" SSRN Electronic Journal, EU COM Foresight Working paper series N°1. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2436402.

Schweizer, Pia-Johanna (2019). Systemic Risks – Concepts and Challenges for Risk Governance. Journal of Risk Research, 11. November 2019, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2019.1687574.

Sirajuddin, Z., & Grudens-Schuck, N. (2016). Bridging Power Asymmetries in Facilitating Public Participation. In J. Goodwin (Ed.), Confronting the Challenges of Public Participation: Issues in Environmental, Planning and Health Decision-Making (pp. 217-226): Charleston.

Sluijs, Jeroen van der, and Wim Turkenburg (2006). Climate Change and the Precautionary Principle. In Implementing the Precautionary Principle. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2006. https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:elg:eechap:4075_12.

SRA (2018). Society for Risk Analysis Glossary. Available at: https:// www.sra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SRA-Glossary-FINAL.pdf

Stirling, A. (2004). Opening up or closing down: Analysis, participation and power in the social appraisal of technology, in M. Leach, I. Scoones and B. Wynne (eds) Science, Citizenship and Globalisation, Zed, London, UK, pp218–231

Schuurbiers, D. (2011). What happens in the lab does not stay in the lab: Applying midstream modulation to enhance critical reflection in the laboratory. Science and Engineering Ethics, no. 17(4).

Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568-1580.

Stirling, A. (2001). Inclusive deliberation and scientific expertise: precaution, diversity and transparency in the governance of risk. Participatory Learning and Action, 40, 66-71.

Stirling, A. (2003) Risk, uncertainty and precaution: some instrumental implications from the social sciences. In: Berkhout, F., Leach, M., Scoones, I. (Eds.), Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Trescher et al. (2021). D2.5 Comparison of case study analysis with results of WP1. Available at www.recipes-project.eu

Trescher et al. (2020). D2.4.2 Inter-case study analysis: D2.4.3 Identification of issues cutting across case studies. Available at www.recipes-project.eu

Trescher, D. (2014). Handling uncertainties and risks in society requires all actors to cooperate. The Euroscientist, 11. Juni 2014. http://euroscientist.com/2014/06/handling-uncertainties-risks-society-requires-actors-cooperate/.

Vos, Ellen, und Kristel de Smedt (2020). Report: Taking stock as a basis for the effect of the precautionary principle since 2000. Deliverable. RECIPES Project - REconciling sCience, Innovation and Precaution through the Engagement of Stakeholders, 1. December 2020. www.recipes-project.eu.

Voss, J.-P., Bauknecht, D. and Kemp, R. (eds) (2006). Reflexive governance for sustainable development. Cheltenham, Glos, UK; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

UN (2002). United Nations, (ed.). Capacity Building for Sustainable Development: An Overview of UNEP Environmental Capacity Development Initiatives. Nairobi.

UN (1992) United Nations Report of the United Nations conference on environment and development. Annex, I., 1992, August. In Rio de Janeiro (3–14 June 1992) A/CONF (Vol. 151, No. 26). Rio. Available at: http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm.

UNECE (1998). (Aarhus) Convention on the access to information, public participation in decision making and access to justice in environmental matters: done at Aarhus, Denmark, on 25 June 1998. Available at: https://unece.org / fileadmin/ DAM/ env/ pp/ documents/ cep43e.pdf (Accessed: 20 April 2021).

Webler, T., and Tuler, S. (2021). „Four Decades of Public Participation in Risk Decision Making". Risk Analysis 41, Nr. 3 (March 2021): 503–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13250.

Tuler, S.P., & Webler, T. (2020). Promises and challenges of citizen engagement in risk and environmental decision making.

Webler, T., and Tuler, S. (2000). „Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Theoretical Reflections from a Case Study". Administration & Society 32, Nr. 5 (November 2000): 566–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/00953990022019588.

Webler, T., and Tuler, S. (2002). „Unlocking the Puzzle of Public Participation". Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society 22, Nr. 3 (Juni 2002): 179–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/02767602022003002.

Zuiderwijk, A., Gascó, M., Parycek, P., & Janssen, M. (2014). Special Issue on Transparency and Open Data Policies: Guest Editors' Introduction. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 9(3), I-IX. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/0718-1876/9/3/15

ENDNOTES

1. Case C-499/18 P, Bayer CropScience AG and Bayer AG, v. European Commission, Judgment of 6 May 2021, ECLI:EU:C:2021:367; para 81.
2. On the science of actionable knowledge as an emerging area of inquiry that "aims to understand and catalyze transitions in scientific knowledge making and use" see: Arnott, J.C., Mach, K.J., & Wong-Parodi, G. (eds.) (2020). Advancing the science of actionable knowledge for sustainability. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 42 (Special Issue), A1-A6, 1-82.
3. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Dec. 12, 2007, Official Journal of the European Union C326, 26.10.2012, p. 391-407.
4. See https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/strategy/strategy-2020-2024_en
5. von Schomberg, R., & Hankins, J. (2019). Introduction to the International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. In: von Schomberg, R., & Hankins, J. (eds.), International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. A Global Resource, Edward Elgar, 1-11, here p. 1.
6. Stilgoe et al. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, Vol. 42, No. 9, pp. 1568-1580.
7. Jonas, H. (1984). The Imperative of Responsibility: In search of an Ethics for the Technological Age, University of Chicago Press.
8. Wiener, J.B. (2018). 'Precautionary Principle', in Faure M., (ed.) Elgar Encyclopedia of Environmental Law, Vol. VI, Chapter 13, p. 175.
9. Weimer, M. (2019). Risk regulation in the internal market – lessons from agricultural biotechnology, Oxford University Press, p. 34.
10. For an overview see M. Bocchi (2016). 'The Reshaping of the Precautionary Principle by International Court: Judicial Dialogues or Parallel Monologues?', Geneva Jean Monnet Working Paper 2/2016 at: http://www.ceje.ch/files/2314/5933/0264/Geneva_JMWP_02-Bocchi.pdf . See also Scott, J. (2018). Legal Aspects of the Precautionary Principle, A British Academy Brexit Briefing, November 2018, p.8.
11. The text of this is available at: https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/rio1992.
12. von Schomberg, R. (2012). The Precautionary Principle: its use within hard and soft law. European Journal of Risk Regulation, 2, pp. 147-156.
13. World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) (2005). The Precautionary Principle, UNESCO, p. 21.
14. EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service) (2016). The precautionary principle. Definitions, applications and governance. European Union, here pp. 6-8.
15. Myhr, A. I., & Traavik, T. (2002). The precautionary principle: Scientific uncertainty and omitted research in the context of GMO use and release. Journal of agricultural and environmental ethics, 15(1), pp. 73-86.
16. Case C 499/18 P, Bayer CropScience AG and Bayer AG v. European Commission, Judgment of the Court (First Chamber) of 6 May 2021. ECLI:EU:C:2021:367, para. 81.
17. van Asselt, M.B.A., & Vos, E. (2006). The Precautionary Principle and the Uncertainty Paradox. Journal of Risk Research, 9(4), pp. 313-336.
18. European Courts of Justice, judgments of 5 May 1998 in case C-157/96 (The Queen v. Ministry of Agriculture, paragraphs 63-64) and case C-180/96 (United Kingdom v. Commission, paragraphs 99-100). Judgments of 11 September 2002 in case T-13/99 (Pfizer, paragraph 444) and case T-70/99 (Alpharma, paragraph 355). Judgment of 7 September 2004 in case C-127/02 (Waddenzee, paragraph 45).
19. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.
20. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.
21. European Commission (2017). Science for Environment Policy, Future Brief: The precautionary principle, decision-making under uncertainty, issue 18.
22. World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) (2005), The Precautionary Principle, UNESCO, p. 13.
23. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the Precautionary Principle, COM/2000/0001 final.
24. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.
25. European Union, Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art. 191, § 2.
26. Commission Regulation (EU) 2018/213 of 12 February 2018 on the use of bisphenol A in varnishes and coatings intended to come into contact with food and amending Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 as regards the use of that substance in plastic food contact materials, C/2018/0685, OJ L 41, 14.2.2018, p. 6–12.
27. Van Calster, G., & Garnett, K. (2021). The concept of essential use: A novel approach to regulating chemicals in the European Union. Transnational Environmental Law, 10(1), pp. 159-187.
28. Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on novel foods, amending Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Regulation (EC) No 258/97 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1852/2001 (Text with EEA relevance), OJ L 327, 11.12.2015, p. 1–22.
29. Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on novel foods, amending Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Regulation (EC) No 258/97 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1852/2001 (Text with EEA relevance), OJ L 327, 11.12.2015, p. 1–22.
30. Vos, E., & De Smedt, K. (2020). WP1 Report: Taking stock as a basis for the effect of the precautionary principle since 2000. Available at: www.recipes-project.eu.
31. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.
32. Case C 333/08, European Commission v. French Republic, Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 28 January 2010. ECLI:EU:C:2010:44, para. 93.

33. Goldner Lang, I. (2021). "Laws of Fear" in the EU: The Precautionary Principle and Public Health Restrictions to Free Movement of Persons in the Time of COVID-19. European Journal of Risk Regulation, pp. 1-24. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2020.120.

34. van der Sluijs, J.P., & Turkenburg, W.C. (2006). Climate Change and the Precautionary Principle, In: Elizabeth Fisher, Judith Jones and René von Schomberg, Implementing The Precautionary Principle, Perspectives and Prospects, ELGAR, pp. 245-269.

35. Case T-584/13, BASF Agro BV and Others v. European Commission, Judgment of the General Court (First Chamber, Extended Composition) of 17 May 2018. ECLI:EU:T:2018:279, paras. 169-171.

36. Case T-584/13, BASF Agro BV and Others v. European Commission, Judgment of the General Court (First Chamber, Extended Composition) of 17 May 2018. ECLI:EU:T:2018:279, para. 171.

37. Craig, P. (2018). Proportionality I: EU. EU Administrative Law, Oxford University Press, pp. 643-644.

38. von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In Responsible Innovation (eds. R. Owen, J. Bessant and M. Heintz). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118551424.ch3.

39. Case T-13/99, Pfizer Animal Health SA v. Council of the European Union, Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Third Chamber) of 11 September 2002. ECLI:EU:T:2002:209, para. 163.

40. Case T-13/99, Pfizer Animal Health SA v. Council of the European Union, Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Third Chamber) of 11 September 2002. ECLI:EU:T:2002:209, para. 410.

41. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.

42. European Commission (2000). Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle, COM/2000/0001 final.

43. Stilgoe et al. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), pp. 1568-1580.

44. Stilgoe et al. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), p. 1570.

45. Stilgoe et al. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), p. 1571.

46. Stilgoe et al. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), p. 1572.

47. von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In Responsible Innovation (eds. R. Owen, J. Bessant and M. Heintz). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118551424.ch3.

48. See for example: Ibo van de Poel, and Zoë Robaey. 2017. "Safe-By-Design: From Safety to Responsibility." Nanoethics 1-10: 1–10. https://doi-org.ru.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11569-017-0301-x.

49. Renda, A., & Simonelli, F. (2019). Study supporting the interim evaluation of the innovation principle. Final report. Centre for European Policy Studies. https://op.europa.eu/de/publication-detail/-/publication/e361ec68-09b4-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1.

50. EEA (European Environment Agency) (edited by Harramoës, P., Gee, D., MacGarvin, M., Stirling, A., Keys, J., Wynne, B. & Vaz, S. G.) (2001). Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/environmental_issue_report_2001_22. EEA (European Environment Agency) (2013). Late lessons from early warnings: Science, precaution, innovation. Publications Office of the European Union. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2.

51. Lemus, D., & Kovacic Z. (2021). Precise yet uncertain: Broadening understandings of uncertainty and policy in the BPA controversy. Risk Analysis. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13860.

52. Millstone, E., Van Zwanenberg, P., Marris, C., Levidow, L., & Torgersen, H. (2004). Science in trade disputes related to potential risks: Comparative case studies. Institute for Prospective Technological studies. https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/16101/1/ , here p. 5.

53. Dunn, W. N. (2001). Using the method of context validation to mitigate type III errors in environmental policy analysis. In M. Hisschemöller, R. Hoppe, W. N. Dunn & and J. R. Ravetz (Eds.), Knowledge, Power, and Participation in Environmental Policy Analysis. Policy Studies Review Annual, 12 (pp. 417–436). Transaction Publishers.

54. SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019a). Guidelines on advising policymakers and society; procedures for quality assurance of scientific advice. https://doi.org/10.26356/guidelinesqualityassurance, here p. 8.

55. SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019a). Guidelines on advising policymakers and society; procedures for quality assurance of scientific advice. https://doi.org/10.26356/guidelinesqualityassurance, here p. 8.

56. SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019b). Making sense of science. For policy under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. https://doi.org/10.26356/MASOS, here p. 121.

57. Dreyer, M., & Renn, O. (2009). A structured approach to participation. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 111–120). Springer, here p. 116.

58. EEA (European Environment Agency) (edited by Harramoës, P., Gee, D., MacGarvin, M., Stirling, A., Keys, J., Wynne, B. & Vaz, S. G.) (2001). Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/environmental_issue_report_2001_22.

59. Vos, E., Athanasiadou, N., & Dohmen, L. (2020). EU agencies and conflicts of interest. Study requested by the PETI committee of the European Parliament. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/621934/IPOL_STU(2020)621934_EN.pdf, here p. 13. See also: European Commission (2013). Guidelines on the Prevention and Management of Conflicts of Interest in EU Decentralised Agencies, https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/default/files/docs/body/2013-12-10_guidelines_on_conflict_of_interests_en.pdf.

60. Van Asselt, M. B. A., & Vos, E. (2006). The precautionary principle and the uncertainty paradox. Journal of risk research, 9(4), 313–336. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870500175063.

61. See e.g.: SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019b). Making sense of science. For policy under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. https://doi.org/10.26356/MASOS , here pp. 29-34.

62. Bennear L. S., & Wiener, J. B. (2021). Pursuing periodic review of agency regulation. https://www.theregreview.org/2021/11/09/bennear-wiener-periodic-review.

63. Ely, A., & Stirling, A. (2009). The process of assessment. In M. Dreyer & O. Renn (Eds.), Food safety governance. Integrating science, precaution and public involvement (pp. 57–69). Springer, here pp. 65-66 (slightly adapted).

64. SAM (Group of Chief Scientific Advisors, European Commission) (2019, September). Scientific advice to European policy in a complex world. Scientific Opinion No.7. Publications Office of the European Union. https://op.europa.eu/en-GB/publication-detail/-/publication/5cb9ca21-0500-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1/language-en. SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019b). Making sense of science. For policy under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. https://doi.org/10.26356/MASOS.

65. Waltner-Toews, D., Biggeri, A., De Marchi, B., Funtowicz, S., Giampietro, M., O'Connor, M., Ravetz, J. R., Saltelli, A., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2020). Post-normal pandemics: Why CoViD-19 requires a new approach to science. Recenti Progressi in Medicina, 111(4). (In Italian. English version of this paper: https://archive.discoversociety.org/2020/03/27/post-normal-pandemics-why-covid-19-requires-a-new-approach-to-science/).

66. Irwin, A., Rothstein, H., Yearley, S., & McCarthy, E. (1997). Regulatory science - Towards a sociological framework. Futures, 29(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287(96)00063-8. Demortain, D. (2017). Expertise, regulatory science and the evaluation of technology and risk: Introduction to the special issue. Minerva, 55(2), 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-017-9325-1.

67. EEA (European Environment Agency) (edited by Harramoës, P., Gee, D., MacGarvin, M., Stirling, A., Keys, J., Wynne, B. & Vaz, S. G.) (2001). Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/environmental_issue_report_2001_22. EEA (European Environment Agency) (2013). Late lessons from early warnings: Science, precaution, innovation. Publications Office of the European Union. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2.

68. Paraphrased from Source: Van der Sluijs, J. P., Foucart, S., & Casas J. (2021). Editorial overview: Halting the pollinator crisis requires entomologists to step up and assume their societal responsibilities. Special Section on Pollinator decline: human and policy dimensions. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.08.004.

69. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2021). Outline of the revision of the Guidance on the risk assessment of plant protection products on bees (Apis mellifera, Bombus spp. and solitary bees) (EFSA, 2013) UPDATED IN NOVEMBER 2021. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2021-11/outline-bee-guidance-revision-2021.pdf.

70. European Commission (2019). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. The European Green Deal, COM/2019/640 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2019%3A640%3AFIN.

71. Kaltenhäuser, J., Kneuer, C., Marx-Stoelting, P., Niemann, L., Schubert, J., Stein, B., & Solecki, R. (2017). Relevance and reliability of experimental data in human health risk assessment of pesticides. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 88, 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2017.06.010.

72. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2009). Submission of scientific peer-reviewed open literature for the approval of pesticide active substances under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, EFSA Journal, 9(2), 2092. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2092 .

73. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2010). Application of systematic review methodology to food and feed safety assessments to support decision making, EFSA Journal, 8(6), 1637. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1637, p. 90.

74. ECHA (European Chemicals Agency) (2013). Evaluation under REACH, Progress Report 2013. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13628/evaluation_report_2013_en.pdf/e080ba36-64a6-4dcf-8eca-f9352ddf5e3b.

75. Robinson, C., Portier, C. J., Čavoski, A., Mesnage, R., Roger, A., Clausing, P., Whaley, P., Muilerman, H., & Lyssimachou, A. (2020). Achieving a high level of protection from pesticides in europe: problems with the current risk assessment procedure and solutions. European Journal of Risk Regulation, 11(3), 450–480. https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2020.18.

76. JUDGMENT OF THE COURT (First Chamber) 6 May 2021, 'Appeal – Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 – Articles 4 and 21 – Criteria for approval – Review of approval – Plant protection products – Implementing Regulation (EU) No 485/2013 – Active substances clothianidin and imidacloprid – Seeds treated with plant protection products containing those active substances – Prohibition of non-professional use – Precautionary principle', point 70 in https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=240844&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=4320499.

77. JUDGMENT OF THE COURT (First Chamber) 6 May 2021, 'Appeal – Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 – Articles 4 and 21 – Criteria for approval – Review of approval – Plant protection products – Implementing Regulation (EU) No 485/2013 – Active substances clothianidin and imidacloprid – Seeds treated with plant protection products containing those active substances – Prohibition of non-professional use – Precautionary principle', point 69 in https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=240844&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=4320499.

78. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) Scientific Committee (Hardy, A., Benford, D., Halldorsson, T., Jeger, M. J., Knutsen, H. K., More, S., Naegeli, H., Noteborn, H., Ockleford, C., Ricci, A., Rychen, G., Schlatter, J. R., Silano, V., Solecki, R., Turck, D. & Younes, M. (2017). Guidance on the use of the weight of evidence approach in scientific assessments. EFSA Journal, 15(8), 4971. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4971

79. Molander, L., Ågerstrand, M., Beronius, A., Hanberg, A., & Rudén, C. (2015). Science in risk assessment and policy (SciRAP): An online resource for evaluating and reporting in vivo (eco) toxicity studies. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal, 21(3), 753–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2014.928104 .

80. Kaltenhäuser, J., Kneuer, C., Marx-Stoelting, P., Niemann, L., Schubert, J., Stein, B., & Solecki, R. (2017). Relevance and reliability of experimental data in human health risk assessment of pesticides. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 88, 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2017.06.010. Ingre-Khans, E., Ågerstrand, M., Beronius, A., & Rudén, C. (2019). Reliability and relevance evaluations of REACH data. Toxicology research, 8(1), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.1039/c8tx00216a .

81. Maxim, L., & Van der Sluijs, J. P. (2013). Response to the Bayer Cropscience (Richard Schmuck) comments on the chapter. In European Environment Agency (Ed.), Late lessons from early warnings II: bee decline web debate (pp. 8–20). http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2/late-lessons-chapters/bees-insecticides-debate .

82. Beronius, A., Hanberg, A., Zilliacus, J., & Rudén, C. (2014). Bridging the gap between academic research and regulatory health risk assessment of endocrine disrupting chemicals. Current Opinion in Pharmacology, 19, 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coph.2014.08.005 .

83. Molander, L., Ågerstrand, M., Beronius, A., Hanberg, A., & Rudén, C. (2015). Science in risk assessment and policy (SciRAP): An online resource for evaluating and reporting in vivo (eco) toxicity studies. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal, 21(3), 753–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2014.928104 .

84. Beronius, A., Hanberg, A., Zilliacus, J., & Rudén, C. (2014). Bridging the gap between academic research and regulatory health risk assessment of endocrine disrupting chemicals. Current Opinion in Pharmacology, 19, 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coph.2014.08.005 .

85. Saltelli, A., & Giampietro, M. (2017). What is wrong with evidence based policy, and how can it be improved?. Futures, 91, 62–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.012 Dooley, K., Holz, C., Kartha, S., Klinsky, S., Roberts, J. T., Shue, H., Winkler, H., Athanasiou, T., Caney, S., Cripps, E., Dubash, N. K., Hall, G., Harris, P. H., Lahn, B., Moellendorf, D., Müller, B., Sagar, A., & Singer, P. (2021). Ethical choices behind quantifications of fair contributions under the Paris Agreement. Nature Climate Change, 11(4), 300–305. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01015-8 .

86. E.g., Stirling A. (2008). 'Opening up' and 'closing down': power, participation, and pluralism in the social appraisal of technology. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 33(2), 262–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243907311265 .

87. SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) (2019b). Making sense of science. For policy under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. https://doi.org/10.26356/MASOS, here p. 125.

88. SAM (Group of Chief Scientific Advisors, European Commission) (2019, September). Scientific advice to European policy in a complex world. Scientific Opinion No.7. Publications Office of the European Union. https://op.europa.eu/en-GB/publication-detail/-/publication/5cb9ca21-0500-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1/language-en.

89. Renn, O. (2010). The contribution of different types of knowledge towards understanding, sharing and communication risk concepts. Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies, 2(2), 177–195. https://doi.org/10.1386/cjcs.2.2.177_1. Fjelland R. (2016). When laypeople are right and experts are wrong: Lessons from love canal. HYLE - International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry, 22(1), 105–125.

90. Maxim, L., & Van der Sluijs, J. P. (2007). Uncertainty: Cause or effect of stakeholders' debates? Analysis of a case study: The risk for honeybees of the insecticide Gaucho®. Science of the Total Environment, 376(1-3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2006.12.052.

91. Dunlop, T. (1981). DDT: Scientists, Citizens and Public Policy. Princeton University Press.

92. Wynne, B. (1996). May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert-lay knowledge divide. In S. Lash, B. Szerszynski & B. Wynne (Eds.), Risk, environment and modernity: Towards a new ecology (pp. 44–83). SAGE.

93. Fjelland R. (2016). When laypeople are right and experts are wrong: Lessons from love canal. HYLE - International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry, 22(1), 105–125.

94. Bremer, S., Wardekker, A., Dessai, S., Sobolowski, S., Slaattelid, R., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2019). Toward a multi-faceted conception of coproduction of climate services. Climate Services, 13, 42–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2019.01.003 .

95. Hernández-González, Y., & Corral, S. (2017). An extended peer communities' knowledge sharing approach for environmental governance. Land Use Policy, 63, 140–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.12.023 .

96. Fjelland R. (2016). When laypeople are right and experts are wrong: Lessons from love canal. HYLE - International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry, 22(1), 105–125.

97. Hernández-González, Y., & Corral, S. (2017). An extended peer communities' knowledge sharing approach for environmental governance. Land Use Policy, 63, 140–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.12.023 .

98. Van Dijk, J., Gustavsson, M., Dekker, S. C., & van Wezel, A. P. (2021). Towards 'one substance – one assessment': An analysis of EU chemical registration and aquatic risk assessment frameworks. Journal of Environmental Management, 280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111692 .

99. ECHA (European Chemicals Agency) and EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2020, October). In support of the EU chemicals strategy for sustainability: One substance – one assessment. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/21877836/efsa-echa-position-paper-osoa_en.pdf/74b1ae31-290b-a608-85e9-05b340840b34.

100. Drivdal, L., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2021). Pollinator conservation requires a stronger and broader application of the precautionary principle. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46, 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.04.005.

101. Van Dijk, J., Gustavsson, M., Dekker, S. C., & van Wezel, A. P. (2021). Towards 'one substance – one assessment': An analysis of EU chemical registration and aquatic risk assessment frameworks. Journal of Environmental Management, 280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111692.

102. ECHA (European Chemicals Agency) and EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) (2020, October). In support of the EU chemicals strategy for sustainability: One substance – one assessment. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/21877836/efsa-echa-position-paper-osoa_en.pdf/74b1ae31-290b-a608-85e9-05b340840b34 , here p. 14.

103. European Commission (2020). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability. Towards a Toxic-Free Environment, COM/2020/667 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2020%3A667%3AFIN, here p. 16. In simple terms, reformers must ensure that extant vulnerabilities in a fragmented regulatory regime are not simply generalised across regulatory domains.

104. Demortain, D. (2021). The science behind the ban: The outstanding impact of ecotoxicological research in the regulation of neonicotinoids. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46, 78–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.02.017 .

105. Drivdal, L., & van der Sluijs, J. P. (2021). Pollinator conservation requires a stronger and broader application of the precautionary principle. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46, 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.04.005. Van der Sluijs, J. P., Foucart, S., & Casas J. (2021). Editorial overview: Halting the pollinator crisis requires entomologists to step up and assume their societal responsibilities. Special Section on Pollinator decline: human and policy dimensions. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.08.004 .

106. Drohmann, D., & Hernández, F. (2020). Risk of regrettable substitution under EU REACH: Level playing field in the EU regulatory context. International Chemical Regulatory and Law Review, 3(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.21552/icrl/2020/1/6 , here pp. 29-30, emphasis added.

107. For a summary of how lessons learned from the regulation of neonicotinoids can be leveraged to improve the European risk assessment regime, see Sgolastra, F., Medrzycki, P., Bortolotti, L., Maini, S., Porrini, C., Simon-Delso, N., & Bosch, J. (2020). Bees and pesticide regulation: Lessons from the neonicotinoid experience. Biological Conservation, 241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108356 .

108. EEA (European Environment Agency) (edited by Harramoës, P., Gee, D., MacGarvin, M., Stirling, A., Keys, J., Wynne, B. & Vaz, S. G.) (2001). Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/environmental_issue_report_2001_22. EEA (European Environment Agency) (2013). Late lessons from early warnings: Science, precaution, innovation. Publications Office of the European Union. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2 .

109. Hansen, S. F., & Gee, D. (2014). Adequate and anticipatory research on the potential hazards of emerging technologies: A case of myopia and inertia? J Epidemiol Community Health, 68(9), 890–895. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech-2014-204019 .

110. European Commission (2009). Commission recommendation on a code of conduct for responsible nanosciences and nanotechnologies research & Council conclusions on responsible nanosciences and nanotechnologies research, https://op.europa.eu/de/publication-detail/-/publication/a8b7d91c-a987-4a3d-a7f4-efc864b5cbfd. Gazsó, A., & Pavlicek, A. (2020). WP2 case study. Nanotechnologies. RECIPES case study report. https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-11/D2_3_Nanotechnology_Nov.pdf .

111. Von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of responsible research and innovation. In R. Owen, J. Bessant & M. Heintz (Eds.), Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society, (pp. 51–74). Johny Wiley & Sons. Owen, R., Stilgoe, J., Macnaghten, P., Groman, M., Fisher, E., & Guston, D. (2013). A framework for responsible innovation. In R. Owen, J. Bessant & M. Heintz (Eds.), Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society (pp. 27–50). Johny Wiley & Sons.

112. Tickner, J., Jacobs, M. M., & Mack, N. B. (2019). Alternatives assessment and informed substitution: A global landscape assessment of drivers, methods, policies and needs. Sustainable Chemistry and Pharmacy. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scp.2019.10 .

113. On the subject of perfluorinated alkylate substances (PFASs) specifically, and on the subject of delayed discovery and interventions more generally see Grandjean, P. (2018). Delayed discovery, dissemination, and decisions on intervention in environmental health: A case study on immunotoxicity of perfluorinated alkylate substances. Environmental Health, 17(62). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-018-0405-y .

114. Demortain, D. (2021). The science behind the ban: The outstanding impact of ecotoxicological research in the regulation of neonicotinoids. Current Opinion in Insect Science, 46, 78–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.02.017 .

115. Hjorth, R., Hansen S. F., Jacobs, M., Tickner, J., Ellenbecker, M., & Baun, A. (2017). The applicability of chemical alternatives assessment for engineered nanomaterials. Integr Environ Assess Manag., 13(1), 177–187. https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.1762. Tickner, J. A., Schifano, J. N., Blake, A., Rudisill, C., & Mulvihill, M. J. (2015). Advancing safer alternatives through functional substitution. Environmental Science & Technology, 49(2), 742–749. https://doi.org/10.1021/es503328m. Van Dijk, J., Gustavsson, M., Dekker, S. C., & van Wezel, A. P. (2021). Towards 'one substance – one assessment': An analysis of EU chemical registration and aquatic risk assessment frameworks. Journal of Environmental Management, 280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111692 .

116. Fantke, P., Weber, R., & Scheringer, M. (2015). From incremental to fundamental substitution in chemical alternatives assessment. Sustainable Chemistry and Pharmacy, 1(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scp.2015.08.001 .

117. Von Schomberg, R. (2014). The quest for the 'right' impacts of science and technology: A framework for responsible research and innovation. In J.v.H Hoven, N. Doorn, T. Swierstra, B.-J. Koops & H. Romijn (Eds.), Responsible innovation 1: Innovative solutions for global issues (pp. 33–50). Springer, here p. 47.

118. Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568–1580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008.

119. Owen, R., & Pansera, M. (2019). Responsible innovation and responsible research and innovation. In D. Simon, S. Kuhlmann, J. Stamm & W. Canzler (Eds.), Handbook on science and public policy (pp. 26–48). Edward Elgar. here p. 27.

120. Macnaghten, P., & Habets, G. J. L. (2020). Breaking the impasse: Towards a forward-looking governance framework for editing with plants. Plants, People, Planet, 2, 353–365. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10107 , here p. 359.

121. Guidelines for applying the precautionary principle to biodiversity conservation and natural resource management, as approved by the 67th meeting of the IUCN Council, 14-16. May 2007.

122. Von Schomberg, R. (2014). The quest for the 'right' impacts of science and technology: A framework for responsible research and innovation. In J.v.H Hoven, N. Doorn, T. Swierstra, B.-J. Koops & H. Romijn (Eds.), Responsible innovation 1: Innovative solutions for global issues (pp. 33–50). Springer.

123. COMEST (World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology) (2005). The precautionary principle. UNESCO, here p. 35-38 (summarising main points).

124. EU Commission. (2000). Communication from the commission on the precautionary principle. COMNAT: COM_2000_0001_FIN. Available at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/21676661-a79f-4153-b984-aeb28f07c80a/language-en

125. Drivdal, L. van der, & Sluijs, J.P. (2021). Pollinator conservation requires a stronger and broader application of the precautionary principle. Current Opinion in Insect Science. 46, 95-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.04.005.

126. Sluijs, J. van der, & Turkenburg, W. (2006). Climate Change and the Precautionary Principle. In Implementing the Precautionary Principle. Edward Elgar Publishing. https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:elg:eechap:4075_12.

127. Gazsó, A. & Pavlicek, A. (2020). WP2 case study. Nanotechnologies. RECIPES report. Available at: https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2020-11/D2_3_Nanotechnology_Nov.pdf.

128. Trescher, D., Sikma, T., & Schweizer, P. Inter-case study analysis - Identification of issues cutting across 9 case studies. RECIPES Project, December 2020. https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2021-03/RECIPES_D2.4.2_Inter-case-study%20analysis_2.4.3_Emerging%20issues.pdf.

129. EU Commission (2018). Horizon 2020 Framework Programme, Work programme part Science with and for Society, Call Science with and for Society, European Commission Decision C(2020)6320

130. Holm, N-K.T. et al. (2021). Task 3.1 – Needs Assessment, p. 4. Available at: https://recipes-project.eu

SRA. (2018). Society for Risk Analysis Glossary. 9. Available at: https:// www.sra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SRA-Glossary-FINAL.pdf

131. Funtowicz & Ravetz, (1993), cited in Fisher, E. (2007). Risk Regulation and Administrative Constitutionalism. Portland, Oregon, USA: Hart Publishing. In Funtowicz, Silvio O., and Jerome R. Ravetz (1993). Science for the post-normal age, 25(7), 739–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(93)90022-L.

132. Trescher et al. (2021). D2.5 Comparison of case study analysis with results of WP1. Available at www.recipes-project.eu

133. Schomberg, R. v. (2015). Responsible innovation: The new paradigm for science, technology and innovation policy, A. Bogner, M. Decker and M. Sotoudeh, Responsible Innovation: Neue Impulse für die Technikfolgenabschätzung, Baden-Baden, Nomos. 47–70.

134. Schomberg, R. v. (2015). Responsible innovation: The new paradigm for science, technology and innovation policy, A. Bogner, M. Decker and M. Sotoudeh, Responsible Innovation: Neue Impulse für die Technikfolgenabschätzung, Baden-Baden, Nomos. 47–70.

135. Bidwell, D., Schweizer, P. (2020). Public Values and Goals for Public Participation. Pp. 3-4. Environmental Policy and Governance. 31(4), 257-269. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1913.

136. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

137. UNECE. (1998). (Aarhus) Convention on the access to information, public participation in decision making and access to justice in environmental matters: done at Aarhus, Denmark, on 25 June 1998. Available at: https://unece.org / fileadmin/ DAM/ env/ pp/ documents/ cep43e.pdf (Accessed: 20 April 2021).

138. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. 2. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

139. Bidwell, D., Schweizer, P. (2020). Public Values and Goals for Public Participation. Pp. 3-4. Environmental Policy and Governance. 31(4), 257-269. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1913.

140. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. 4. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

141. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

142. Klinke, A., & Renn, O. (2011). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research, 15(3), 5. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.

143. Decker, M., Ladikas, M., Stephan, S., Wütscher, F. (2004). Bridges between Science, Society and Policy: Technology Assesment and Impacts. Springer. 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-06171-8

144. Burget, M., Bardone, E., and Pedaste, M. (2017). Definitions and Conceptual Dimensions of Responsible Research and Innovation: A Literature Review. Science and engineering ethics, 23(1), 1-19.

Decker, M., Ladikas, M., Stephan, S., Wütscher, F. (2004). Bridges between Science, Society and Policy: Technology Assesment and Impacts. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-06171-8

145. Decker, M., Ladikas, M., Stephan, S., Wütscher, F. (2004). Bridges between Science, Society and Policy: Technology Assesment and Impacts. Springer. 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-06171-8

146. Burgess, J., & Chilvers, J. (2006). Upping the ante: A conceptual framework for designing and evaluating participatory technology assessments. Science and Public Policy 33(10), 713–28. https://doi.org/10.3152/147154306781778551.

147. Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation, Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35(4), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225.

148. For an exhaustive introduction to CIVISTI, please visit http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7412

149. For an exhaustive introduction to consensus conferences, please visit http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7413

150. For more information on CoFE, please visit https://futureu.europa.eu/

151. Klinke, A., & Renn, O. (2011). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research, 15(3), 273–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.

152. For an exhaustive introduction to stakeholder working groups, please visit http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7446

153. Árvai, J. (2014). The end of risk communication as we know it, Journal of Risk Research, 17(10), 1245-1249. https//doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2014.919519

154. For an exhaustive introduction to citizen's hearings, please visit http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7395

155. Bell, W & J. Mau (1971). Images of the future: theory and research strategies', in Bell and Mau (eds.) The Sociology of the Future, Russell Sage Foundation: New York. 1-28.

156. For an overview of scenario workshops, please visit http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7453

157. For an overview of future search conferences, please visit http://actioncatalogue.eu/method/7416

158. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

159. Klinke, A., & Renn O. (2011). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research, 15(3), 273–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.

160. Klinke, A., & Renn O. (2011). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research, 15(3), 279. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.

161. Klinke, A., & Renn O. (2011). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research, 15(3), 279. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.

162. Renn, O., & Schweizer, P. J. (2009). Inclusive risk governance: concepts and application to environmental policy making. Environmental policy and governance, 19(3), 174-185.; Renn, Ortwin & Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2020), Hrsg. The role of public participation in energy transitions. Waltham: Elsevier.Renn, Ortwin, Manfred Laubichler, Klaus Lucas, Wolfgang Kröger, Jochen Schanze, Roland W. Scholz, and Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2020). "Systemic Risks from Different Perspectives". Risk Analysis, 16. December 2020, risa.13657. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13657.; Tuler, S.P., & Webler, T. (2020). Promises and challenges of citizen engagement in risk and environmental decision making.

163. Renn, O., & Schweizer, P. (2019). Inclusive risk governance: concepts and application to environmental policy making. Environmental Policy and Governance, 19(3), 174–85. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.507.; Renn, O. & Schweizer, P. (2020). Hrsg. The role of public participation in energy transitions. Waltham: Elsevier.Renn, Ortwin, Manfred Laubichler, Klaus Lucas, Wolfgang Kröger, Jochen Schanze, Roland W. Scholz, and Pia-Johanna Schweizer (2020). "Systemic Risks from Different Perspectives". Risk Analysis, 16. December 2020, risa.13657. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13657.

164. Leyen, U. v. d. (2019). A Union that strives for more. My agenda for Europe. Political guidelines for the next European Commission 2019-2024. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/political-guidelines-next-commission_en_0.pdf

165. Webler, T., and Tuler, S. (2021). Four Decades of Public Participation in Risk Decision Making. Risk Analysis 41(3), 503–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13250.

Webler, T., and Tuler, S. (2000). Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Theoretical Reflections from a Case Study. Administration & Society 32(5), 566–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/00953990022019588.

166. Renn, O., Webler, T. & Wiedemann, P. (1995). The Pursuit of Fair and Competent Citizen Participation. In Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation. Springer Netherlands, 339–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0131-8_20.

167. Trescher, D., Sikma, T., Schweizer, P. Inter-case study analysis - Identification of issues cutting across 9 case studies. RECIPES Project, December 2020. https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2021-03/RECIPES_D2.4.2_Inter-case-study%20analysis_2.4.3_Emerging%20issues.pdf.

168. Grafe, F.-J., & Mieg, H. A. (2021). Precaution and Innovation in the Context of Wastewater Regulation: An Examination of Financial Innovation under UWWTD Disputes in London and Milan. Sustainability 13(16), 9130. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169130.

169. Trescher, D., Sikma, T., Schweizer, P. Inter-case study analysis - Identification of issues cutting across 9 case studies. RECIPES Project, December 2020. https://recipes-project.eu/sites/default/files/2021-03/RECIPES_D2.4.2_Inter-case-study%20analysis_2.4.3_Emerging%20issues.pdf.

170. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

171. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/aboutmajorgroups.html

172. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

173. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

174. Renn, O., (2015). Stakeholder and Public engagement in Risk Governance. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science, 6, 8-20. Available online at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13753-015-0037-6

175. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

176. Renn, O., Kröger, W., Laubichler, M., Lucas, K., Schanze, J., Scholz, R., & Schweizer, P.-J. (2020). Systemic Risks from different perspectives. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13657 .

177. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

178. Klinke, A., & Renn, O. (2011). Adaptive and Integrative Governance on Risk and Uncertainty. Journal of Risk Research 15(3), 273–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2011.636838.

Von Schomberg, R. (2019) Why responsible innovation?. In International handbook on responsible innovation. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Von Schomberg, R. (2001). The Objective of Sustainable Development: Are We Coming Closer? SSRN Electronic Journal, EU COM Foresight Working paper series, 1. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2436402.

179. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

180. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

181. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

182. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

183. Renn, O. (2015). Stakeholder and Public engagement in Risk Governance. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science, 6, 8-20. Available online at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13753-015-0037-6

184. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

185. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

186. Christian Adam, Steffen Hurka & Christoph Knill (2017) Four Styles of Regulation and their Implications for Comparative Policy Analysis, Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice, 19:4, 327-344, DOI: 10.1080/13876988.2015.1082262

187. IRGC (2017). Introduction to the IRGC Risk Governance Framework, revised version. Lausanne: EPFL International Risk Governance Center. http://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-233739

188. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

189. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

190. IRGC (2020). Involving stakeholders in the risk governance process. Lausanne. EPFL International Risk Governance Center. https://doi.org/10.5075/epfl-irgc-282243

191. Stirling, A. (2001). Inclusive deliberation and scientific expertise: precaution, diversity and transparency in the governance of risk. Participatory Learning and Action, 40, 66-71.

192. Trescher et al. (2020). D2.4.2 Inter-case study analysis: D2.4.3 Identification of issues cutting across case studies. Available at www.recipes-project.eu

193. Birkinshaw, P. (2006). Freedom of Information and Openness: Fundamental Human Rights? Administrative Law Review, 58(1), 189

194. Birkinshaw, P. (2006). Freedom of Information and Openness: Fundamental Human Rights? Administrative Law Review, 58(1).

195. Zuiderwijk, A., Gascó, M., Parycek, P., & Janssen, M. (2014). Special Issue on Transparency and Open Data Policies: Guest Editors' Introduction. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 9(3), 1-9. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/0718-1876/9/3/15

196. Fisher, E. (2007). Risk Regulation and Administrative Constitutionalism. Portland, Oregon, USA: Hart Publishing. In Funtowicz, Silvio O., and Jerome R. Ravetz (1993). Science for the post-normal age. 25(7), 739–755. https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(93)90022-L.

197. Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: connecting vision and voice. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 78(1), 10-29

198. Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: connecting vision and voice. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 78(1), 14

199. Löfgren, K.-G., Persson, T., & Weibull, J. W. (2002). Markets with Asymmetric Information: The Contributions of George Akerlof, Michael Spence and Joseph Stiglitz. Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 104(2), 195-211.

    Sirajuddin, Z., & Grudens-Schuck, N. (2016). Bridging Power Asymmetries in Facilitating Public Participation. In Goodwin, J. (Ed.), Confronting the Challenges of Public Participation: Issues in Environmental, Planning and Health Decision-Making. Charleston, 217-226.

200. Holm, N-K.T. et al. (2021). Task 3.1 – Needs Assessment, p. 5. Available at: https://recipes-project.eu

201. Holm, N-K.T. et al. (2021). Task 3.1 – Needs Assessment, p. 5. Available at: https://recipes-project.eu

202. Karapiperis, T., & Ladikas, M. (2004). Organised Interests in the European Union's Science and Technology Policy – The Influence of Lobbying Activities. TAMI Part II – Supplementary Papers.

203. Fears, R., & Stephan, S. (2004). Technology Assessment in Europe; between Method and Impact (TAMI) – Industry Technology Assessment: Opportunities and Challenges for Partnership. Project Part II – Supplementary Papers. https://tekno.dk/app/uploads/2021/04/TAMI-Part-II-1.pdf

204. Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568-1580.

205. Conley, S. N. & York, E., (2020) Public engagement in contested

206. political contexts: reflections on the role of recursive reflexivity in responsible innovation, Journal of Responsible Innovation, 7(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2020.1848335

207. See https://futureu.europa.eu/?locale=en

208. See https://knowledge4policy.ec.europa.eu/participatory-democracy/about-competence-centre-participatory-deliberative-democracy_en

PARTNERS

Maastricht University

K&I Knowledge and Innovation S.r.l.s

HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITÄT ZU BERLIN

ARC FUND

TEKNOLOGI RÅDET
DANISH BOARD OF TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION

IASS POTSDAM

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Rathenau Instituut

ÖAW ITA INSTITUT FÜR TECHNIKFOLGEN ABSCHÄTZUNG

DIALOGIK
gemeinnützige Gesellschaft für Kommunikations- und Kooperationsforschung mbH

eco logic