



Epistemic engagement

- Better decisions
- Stakeholders and experts possess knowledge and have world views
- Epistemic engagement = expert involvement *and* stakeholder engagement
- Inter-disciplinary and intra-disciplinary diversity



EFSA Stakeholder
Engagement Approach

The graphic features a collage of images: a woman eating, a sheep, a beehive, and purple grapes. Below the collage is an orange banner with the text 'EFSA Stakeholder Engagement Approach'.

One expected outcome:

“The quality of EFSA’s scientific assessments will be improved thanks to access to a wider evidence base and new knowledge or expertise”

The Challenges of Consulting the Public on Science Policy: Examining the Development of European Risk Assessment Policy for Genetically Modified Animals

Ugandan stakeholder hopes and concerns about gene drive mosquitoes for malaria control: new directions for gene drive risk governance

Sarah Hartley^{1*}, Robert D. J. Smith², Adam Kokotovich³, Chris Opien⁴, Tibebe Habtewold⁵, Katie Ledingham¹, Ben Raymond⁶ and Charles B. Rwabukwali⁴

Policy masquerading as science: an examination of non-state actor involvement in European risk assessment policy for genetically modified animals

Sarah Hartley^{1*}, Robert D. J. Smith², Adam Kokotovich³, Chris Opien⁴, Tibebe Habtewold⁵, Katie Ledingham¹, Ben Raymond⁶ and Charles B. Rwabukwali⁴

Disentangling risk assessment: new roles for experts and publics

Recommendations for environmental risk assessment of gene drive applications for malaria vector control

John B. Connolly^{1*}, John D. Mumford², Debora C. M. Glandorf³, Sarah Hartley⁴, Owen T. Lewis⁵, Sam Weiss Evans⁶, Geoff Turner¹, Camilla Beech⁷, Naima Sykes¹, Mamadou B. Coulibaly⁸, Jörg Romeis⁹, John L. Teem¹⁰, Willy Tonui¹¹, Brian Lovett¹², Aditi Mankad¹³, Abraham Mnzava¹⁴, Silke Fuchs¹, Talya D. Ha Wayne G. Landis¹⁵, John M. Marshall¹⁶ and Fred Aboagye-Antwi¹⁷

Why are NGOs sceptical of genome editing?

NGOs' opposition to agricultural biotechnologies is rooted in scepticism about the benefits and solutions, rather than just emotion and dogma

Prescribing engagement in environmental risk assessment for gene drive technology

Sarah Hartley^{1*}, Adam Kokotovich and Caroline McCalman

University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom, 2 GenØk

Public Consultation on Proposed Revisions to Norway's Gene Technology Act: An Analysis of the Consultation Framing, Stakeholder Concerns, and the Integration of Non-Safety Considerations

PERSPECTIVE

Essential Features of Responsible Governance of Agricultural Biotechnology

Sarah Hartley^{1*}, Frøydis Gillund², Lilian van Hove², Fern Wickson²

University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom, 2 GenØk

Knowledge engagement in gene drive research for malaria control

Sarah Hartley^{1†*}, Delphine Thizy^{2†}, Katie Ledingham^{1†}, Mamadou Coulibaly^{3‡}, Abdoulaye Diabaté^{4‡}, Bakara Dicko^{3‡}, Samba Diop^{3‡}, Jonathan Kayondo^{5‡}, Annet Namukwaya^{5‡}

Addressing Socio-Economic and Ethical Considerations in Biotechnology Governance: The Potential of a New Politics of Care

BIOTECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE

Core commitments for field trials of gene drive organisms

Regulating genetically modified crops and foods in Canada and the United Kingdom: Democratizing risk regulation

European Novel Foods Policy at a Critical Juncture:

Journal of Novel Food Governance
Journal of Regulation 258/97

Together is better: Engagement in risk assessment



www.genedrivegovernance.org

