

# Maintaining scientific integrity in Canadian regulatory protocols: Using strategic thinking to facilitate innovation and enhance engagement and transparency



Policy Brief No. 10  
May 2015

## Editor's Preface

Launched in 2009, GPS: Where Genomics, Public Policy and Society Meet is a series hosted by Genome Canada to facilitate a dialogue between federal policymakers and researchers exploring issues at the interface of genomics and its ethical, environmental, economic, legal and social aspects (or GE<sup>3</sup>LS).

Overarching themes for the series and specific topics are selected on the basis of their importance and timeliness, as well as the “ripeness” of the underlying scholarship. Accordingly, the series focused on “Genetic information,” whereas in year two, attention shifted to “Translational Genomics”. The third series, “The Innovation Continuum” broadens the discussion by casting the process of innovation in a broader societal context. The 2014 series focuses on the bioeconomy. The concept of the bioeconomy is meant to capture economic activities, and their related products and services, which result from new discoveries in the biosciences, including genomics.

At the core of these exchanges is the development of policy briefs that explore options to balance the promotion of science and technology while respecting the many other considerations that affect the cultural, social, or economic well-being of our society.

Co-authors of the briefs are leaders in their field and are commissioned by Genome Canada to synthesize and translate current academic scholarship and policy documentation into a range of policy options. The briefs also benefit from valuable input provided by invited commentators and other experts who participate in GPS events. Briefs are not intended to reflect the authors' personal views, nor those of Genome Canada. Rather than advocating a unique recommendation, briefs attempt to establish a broader evidence base that can inform various policymaking needs at a time when emerging genomic technologies across the life sciences stand to have a profound impact on Canada.

**Karine Morin**  
Former Director,  
National GE<sup>3</sup>LS Program

## Authors:

Lisa F. Clark, University of Saskatchewan

Michele Mastroeni, Conference Board of Canada

Cami Ryan, University of Saskatchewan

## Executive Summary

Canada is not immune from controversies over the approval and use of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) in its food system. Stakeholders in the agricultural biotechnology policy sphere need access to relevant, independent and reliable information. The provision of such information, and whether objectives are being met, requires a balanced process that is both top-down and bottom-up.

This brief takes a systems approach to explore how Canadian regulation protocols for Genetically Modified (GM) crops and foods can maintain scientific integrity while encouraging effective engagement by stakeholder groups. Discussed are the challenges faced by the regulatory system for GM crops and foods in the context of broader science and technology policy initiatives in Canada. The suggestions in this brief are not a one-size-fits-all solution to the challenges of engagement and transparency in the governance of GM crops and foods. Instead, the policy options presented will hopefully lead to a set of explicit first principles upon which the majority of stakeholders can agree to use as a foundation for a regulatory system that provides high levels of safety, encourages beneficial innovation and approves products and/or processes that are socially acceptable. Policy options include the incorporation of science and technology councils into current decision-making platforms, integrating mechanisms for deliberation into regulatory protocols, and strategies to mobilize scientific knowledge. All options encourage stakeholders to rethink how uncertainty is perceived within regulatory environments in order to foster transparency in decision-making, strengthen constructive engagement and dialogue amongst stakeholders, while applying consistent and reliable standards of evidence.

**Acknowledgements:** Genome Canada would like to thank co-authors Lisa Clark, Michele Mastroeni and Cami Ryan as well as invited commentators Alexandra Grygorczyk, Consumer Science Vineland Research and Innovation Centre; Éric Montpetit, Political Science Department University of Montreal; Luc Bourbonnière, Novel Foods Section, Food Directorate at Health Canada; and Neil Hibbert, University of Saskatchewan for editorial comments, and all of the participants of the May 28, 2014 GPS event held during the 2014 Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

## About the Authors

**Lisa Clark** is a political scientist and is currently working on a Global Institute for Food Security (GIFS) project at the University of Saskatchewan. Her research focuses on food and trade policy and she is interested in the politics of food labels and regulatory standards.

Dr. Clark has worked on the VALGEN and international barcoding of life projects, investigating governance issues pertaining to GM and organic foods and food technologies.

Dr. Clark holds a Ph.D. in political science from Simon Fraser University.

**Michele Mastroeni** is a Senior Research Associate of Industry and Business Strategy at the Conference Board of Canada, Ottawa, Canada. He was a Senior Analyst at RAND Europe and worked in the area of innovation and technology policy. His expertise includes national, regional, and sector-based innovation systems. Before joining RAND Europe, he was an Innogen Research Fellow at the University of Edinburgh where he worked on projects to develop innovation policy approaches and strategy, innovation in the life sciences, and developing new business models and value chain analysis for emerging technologies. His projects included work on the regulation of GM crops in Europe, as well as the development of the bioeconomy. He has also conducted research on skills policy and R&D strategy in knowledge-based industries, and venture capital and risk finance for high technology start-up and spin-off firms.

Before moving to the UK, Mastroeni was a senior policy advisor for the Ministry of Research and Innovation in Ontario, Canada, where he managed research funding programs targeting local universities and research institutes, as well as provided policy advice on various issues.

Mastroeni has a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Toronto.

**Cami Ryan** (B.Comm., Ph.D.) has worked in agriculture for over 20 years and for most of that time as a public sector researcher. Her research interests cover the gamut from exploring agricultural policy to examining how science is communicated and perceived by the public. In addition to her current role as a social sciences expert working in industry, Dr. Ryan is a Professional Affiliate of the College of Agriculture and Bioresources at the University of Saskatchewan (Canada). She holds a Bachelor of Commerce (Major in Biotechnology Management) and a Ph.D. in Interdisciplinary Studies (agricultural economics, business and sociology). Dr. Ryan is an avid blogger and tweeter and enjoys dialoguing about agricultural policy and food production.

She holds a Bachelor of Commerce (Major in Biotechnology Management) and a Ph.D. in Interdisciplinary Studies (agricultural economics, business and sociology).

## I. Context

One of the most important components for fostering the growth of technological innovation is an effective and efficient regulatory system with the capacity to evaluate technologies based on safety, usefulness and commercial potential. In Kline and Rosenberg's (1986) seminal mapping of the innovation process, they note that innovation

is messy, uncertain and complex. The "process of innovation must be viewed as a series of changes in a complete system not only of hardware, but also of market environment, production facilities and knowledge, and the social contexts of the innovation organization" (Kline and Rosenberg, 1986: 275). Uncertainty is an inherent component of complex systems, and it comes from the technological side as well as the socio-economic dimensions (Cooke, 2011; Metcalfe, 1995). If one takes the view that innovation occurs in a system as Kline and Rosenberg describe, then the regulatory structure adds to its complexity by adding a component to the innovation process where the technology is tested and where stakeholders can alter its composition or reject it altogether. An objective lens on the regulatory process requires "a recognition of its complexities and dynamic fluctuations" and that "a clear, resolute path in any phase of regulation" is not realizable or achievable (Massel, 1961: 202). A focus strictly on what is procedural only serves to distract from complicated policy issues associated with technology. It also negates the importance of the politics of incorporating innovative technologies into existing systems and the role values play in policy controversies surrounding innovation. While accepting that a functioning regulatory structure is complex means that it may be more difficult to implement, accepting its complexity and considering the politics of innovation, control of information (intellectual property) and other resources in the policy process also means that it could be more transparent, fair and legitimate.

The current regulatory system for approving and commercializing technologies adheres to the principle that decisions must be based on scientific evidence generated through reproducible and repeatable sets of rules and standard operating procedures (Doern and Phillips, 2012). Using rigorous scientific methods to calculate the probability of harm upon which to base risk assessment and management arguably produces optimal outcomes free of value-laden conceptions of risk. Increasingly within deliberative democracies, however, this assumption is being challenged as varying perspectives drawing on different evidence-bases are considered in decision-making. The uncertainty regarding unknown, future environmental risks and potential socio-economic impacts associated with the commercialization of innovative technologies is often cited by certain stakeholder groups as grounds to contest and challenge the evaluative 'science-based model' that establishes safe use of the technology. An exclusively evidence-based approach is also argued to erode the normative basis of policy-making and effectively undermines the capacity to developing appropriate policy aligned with broader social values (Sanderson, 2009). Consideration of the way in which perceptions of uncertainty function within policy spaces designated to govern technology and risk is vital to understanding the role of politics in the design of the regulatory system, and also how innovations are regulated and managed within the system.

In this brief, we take a systems approach to exploring how Canadian regulation protocols for Genetically Modified (GM) crops and foods can maintain scientific integrity while encouraging effective engagement by stakeholder groups. We discuss the challenges faced by the regulatory system for GM crops and foods in the context of broader science and technology policy initiatives in Canada. The suggestions in this brief are not a one-size-fits-all solution to the challenges of engagement and transparency in the governance of GM crops and foods. Instead, the policy options presented will hopefully lead to a set of explicit first principles upon which the majority of stakeholders can agree to use as a foundation for a regulatory system that provides high levels of safety, encourages beneficial innovation and approves products and/or processes that are socially acceptable. Policy options include the incorporation of science and technology councils into current decision-making platforms, integrating mechanisms for deliberation into regulatory protocols, and strategies to mobilize scientific knowledge. All options encourage stakeholders to rethink how uncertainty is perceived within regulatory environments in order to foster transparency in decision-making, strengthen constructive engagement and dialogue amongst stakeholders, while applying consistent and reliable standards of evidence. The goal is to facilitate the delivery of beneficial innovations while maintaining high levels of food safety.

## II. The Issue

Within deliberative democracies like Canada, patterns of political engagement are largely dependent upon the policy issue at hand. They often but not always draw from established 'best practices' and standards developed in other jurisdictions (e.g., the US) that function based on similar decision-making structures for the regulation and domestic use of innovative technologies. In policy issues concerning the approval and commercialization of a technology that has no prior use beyond the lab, scientific expertise plays a heightened role in identifying hazards of interaction between the technology's usage and its detectable effects on human, animal and environmental health and safety. Stakeholders, including members of the scientific community, are consulted to determine what constitutes a tolerable level of risk to the safety of humans and the environment, what is defined as a 'hazard' to maintaining health and safety, and what types of evidence should be included in regulatory decision-making to determine what is 'safe'. Decisions regarding whether an innovative technology is safe enough, and the role it will play within broader society, are often dominated by discussions regarding the appropriateness of evidence. This is especially the case when dealing with 'contentious' technologies

commonly associated with future, unknown risks like GM crops (Goncalves, 2004; Beck, 1992).

In situations of complexity, knowledge is always evolving and it is not possible to foresee or predict how it will evolve, shape, or be shaped by socio-technical factors. As a result, whenever a policy mix is introduced into an economy, the likelihood of it meeting all of the immediate needs of a situation tends to be low, particularly if the economic system is undergoing change (Uyerra, 2010). This concern is especially true for regulatory systems; they may not adequately meet all needs, especially considering the shifting scientific benchmarks of the products regulated and the tools used to assess such products. Uncertainty of future risk cannot be eliminated but it may be reduced through appropriate information gathering and analysis that is translated into careful policy design. Uncertainty can also be reduced by periodically revisiting risk assessments to determine if any new risks have emerged over time as knowledge of how a technology behaves in relation to other technologies, human health or the environment is accumulated.

What is fundamental to understanding why and how 'science-based' systems of regulatory approval for GM crops and foods do not always perform as expected has a lot to do with how perceptions of uncertainty surrounding risk intersect with the way 'issues' (such as the safety of a technology and its potential hazards to human health and the environment), values and knowledge are packaged in political debates over regulation (Clark, 2013). Gold (2009) distinguishes multiple pathways through which information may be utilized in policy making. These pathways emphasize different strategies, stakeholders and motivations, which may help or hinder movement along the pathway (Ryan et al., 2013). Scientific approaches can still differ depending on what stakeholders are involved in shaping the regulatory system. Understanding how stakeholders perceive technology-related uncertainties from their particular vantage point is crucial to facilitating productive stakeholder engagement.

Canada is not immune from controversies over the approval and use of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) in its food system. In response to growing public concerns over uncertainties related to GMOs' role in the food system and their potential impacts on human and environmental health, the Canadian government launched the Canadian Biotechnology Strategy (CBS) taskforce in 1998. The findings of the taskforce were published in a document entitled *Biotechnology Transforming Society – Report on Biotechnology 1998-2003*. With a focus on engagement and public consultation, the taskforce reported that Canadians wanted "an independent advisory body that would operate at arm's length from government, to provide

independent and comprehensive advice on crucial policy surrounding biotechnology” (Industry Canada, 2014a). The formal response to the concerns noted in the report was the creation of the Canadian Biotechnology Advisory Committee (CBAC). The intent of CBAC was to provide independent advice to the Biotechnology Ministerial Coordinating Committee (BMCC) on biotechnology topics that cut across the mandates of various federal departments and agencies, and act as an ongoing forum for Canadians to voice their views and participate on relevant social and ethical issues related to biotechnology in the Canadian food system. Yet, as CBAC proceeded with its activities, several key problems were identified as barriers to its effectiveness: 1) lack of engagement on the part of federal officials; 2) budget constraints limited public consultation events and potential impacts; 3) communication of information to and from Canadians were primarily limited to its website and public documents / reports, and limited public opinion polling; and 4) there were questions regarding the committee’s composition that indicated that the ethical and societal aspects of biotechnology may not have been fully represented (Industry Canada, 2005: v-vi).

In another effort to respond to growing public concern over the use and commercialization of GM crops and foods, the Royal Society of Canada’s Expert Panel Report issued in 2001 requested that transparency between government decision-making and the public be improved. In response to the Royal Society’s requests, several new pieces of legislation were added to existing regulatory frameworks for GM crops and foods. These efforts include the public release of Decision Documents, which provide interested parties with information about the biological traits of the GM crop or food, how the plant is used and its potential to come into contact with other species. Decision Documents are written and issued by the original applicants which are primarily private biotech firms, but also public research and development institutions seeking approval for their product to be sold as food or feed in Canada (Hibbert and Clark, 2014). The Notices of Submission feature of the approval system in Canada allows for the government to respond to environmental petitions presented to the Auditor General by a member of the public (CFIA, 2014). These strides towards addressing transparency have provided the public with access to information about GM crops and foods in the Canadian food system, but the formal decision-making structures regarding the approvals of GM crops and foods has not been fundamentally altered. It continues to be defined as a ‘science-based’ system of management and approval with decision-making responsibilities horizontally distributed across governmental departments and agencies (Canadian Food Inspection Agency and Health Canada).

### III. Policy Background

Traditionally, the safety of innovative technologies like GM crops have been evaluated based on the well-established Risk Analysis Framework (RAF). The RAF is based on manuals published by the US National Research Council on how to best assess and manage products or processes that carry a degree of risk, and how to best communicate those risks to the public (NRC, 1983; 1996). Yet, innovative technologies present some challenges to this method of safety assessment. As noted by Phillips (2009), the RAF frames all technologies as equally hazardous in the same way, which can contribute to negative perceptions of some technologies as similarly ‘risky’ to others that have gone through the RAF despite scientific evidence proving otherwise. The framework also faces some difficulty because of its lack of flexibility to accommodate the possibility that as new information emerges the definition of the problem in need of solving may change. Though the most recent RAF manual stresses the importance of deliberation amongst stakeholders to determine how uncertainties can be collectively addressed within the risk assessment processes, this has not fully dealt with some concerns stakeholders have over the transparency of how information is used in the approvals process (Wolt and Peterson, 2000: 42). With varying degrees of success, the RAF continues to be the primary approach guiding the design and function of science-based regulatory systems for innovative technologies in Canada and the US.

One of the core principles of the approval system for GM crops and foods is that a ‘novel’ plant<sup>1</sup> must be put through a rigorous set of risk-assessment and biosafety procedures before it is declared ‘safe’ for unconfined environmental release and commercialization (Doern and Phillips, 2012; VALGEN, 2010). Although Canada’s Plants with Novel Traits (PNT) regulatory system for innovative crop-based technologies is generally deemed to be efficient in minimizing risks (Smyth and McHughen, 2013), challenges remain to this approach.

Challenges to effective and efficient policy to manage the use of GM crops and foods in the food system are closely linked to broader issues facing science and innovation policy in Canada, as described above regarding knowledge flows and transparency of decision-making. Some steps were taken to try to address these issues, such as the government science and technology strategy in 1996. One of the goals of the strategy, released by the Government of Canada in March 1996, was to ensure that the government was well positioned to respond to challenges through availability of scientific advice (Government of Canada, 1996). Within the document, a new Council of Science and Technology Advisors (CSTA) was created, which issued several reports between the late 1990s and the mid 2000s.<sup>2</sup> The reports and activities of the CSTA were intended to provide external expert advice on

<sup>1</sup> Plants with Novel Traits (PNTs) refers to all plants that undergo some form of modification (e.g., mutagenesis, cell fusion, and traditional breeding) that have no previous use in the Canadian environment.

<sup>2</sup> For full list of CSTA authored documents see: <http://artsites.uottawa.ca/sca/en/council-of-science-and-technology-advisors/reports/>

internal federal government science and technology issues that require strategic attention with the hope that, “more effective use of science advice will reduce science-related crises of public confidence... issues facing governments are increasingly complex and require decisions that have profound impacts on societies and economies” (CSTA, 1999: 1-3).

The CSTA devised a list of recommended actions to be taken by the Government of Canada, including consulting a wide-range of sources with diversity in schools of thought on science policy matters and to strive for openness and transparency in government decisions concerning policy change. However, a change in the Canadian government in 2006 led to the absorption of the CSTA into the newly formed Science, Technology and Innovation Council (STIC) in 2007. STIC is an independent advisory body mandated by the Government of Canada to provide advice on science, technology and innovation policy issues. The content of the correspondence between the two bodies remains confidential. It is unclear at this point whether the STIC has operationalized the objectives outlined by the CSTA but the CSTA did establish guidelines regarding the direction science and innovation policy must take in order to maximize its commercial potential and be responsive to broader questions regarding the appropriate use and acceptability of particular innovations in society.

In view of the stated government goals issued in the 1996 strategy and CSTA recommendations, the STIC shift towards confidential correspondence is a step back from transparency. The current federal government has been criticized for allegedly “muzzling scientists” for political reasons (Gibbs et al., 2012; Fitzpatrick, 2012). An investigation by the Information Commissioner suggests that the level of trust between the government and Canada’s research community has been damaged. A public consultation process, affiliated with the federal initiative *Seizing Canada’s Moment*, ended in early February of 2014 (Industry Canada, 2014b). The process, however, has been criticized for its lack of transparency and accountability (Stewart, 2014).

## IV. Policy Options

Besides transparency, accountability means that governance structures for GM crops and foods need to be inclusive and to consider socio-economic concerns, as well as questions regarding the management of, and contingency plans for, addressing uncertainty in future outcomes in the decision-making process. These are essential components to a platform of responsible governance focused on developing policy outcomes that are ‘acceptable’ to stakeholders as opposed to a universally ‘agreed’ upon option, which is typically difficult to attain in a complex system with multiple stakeholders. Emphasizing strategies to enhance transparency and engagement to help move towards developing acceptable outcomes that all stakeholders can support is the central tenet of this approach. Faults in the governance structure and changing levels of transparency mean that stakeholders lose a source of information that can help them cope with uncertainty. As a result, the legitimacy of the system may be negatively impacted.

The Strategic Thinking Model (STM) helps to frame policy options. The value of the STM for the governance of science and technology policy frameworks is its prioritization of future uncertainties as valid considerations in decision-making, as well as considering both benefits and risks in policy design (Partidario, 2012; Noble, 2009; Gunn and Noble, 2009). The STM includes the consideration of how normative factors such as values and social acceptability of risk and uncertainty factor into policy development and application. It is also premised on evaluating the information between systems of regulatory decision-making, economic organization and public engagement. By using the STM lens to focus on these aspects of innovation and technology, we are able to discuss ways of enhancing transparency and facilitate knowledge flows among stakeholders in the agricultural biotechnology policy arena. We draw from current efforts to effectively govern broader science and technology sectors, policy options that can be applied to GM crops and foods, and policies specific to the agricultural biotechnology sector. Both levels of policy have several overlapping goals and challenges, and lessons can be drawn from both levels of policy making.

## Option 1: Science and Technology Advisory Councils

There are several countries (USA, UK, Australia) that have formalized informational exchanges between regulators and scientists through the creation of science and technology advisory councils. Structured, scientific advisory councils demonstrate the value of a systems-thinking approach to evidence-based policy making. The formal linkages between regulators and scientists help to build networks and encourage information flows with the goal of establishing a robust tradition of informed decision-making. On October 8 2003, the Jefferson Science Fellows (JSF) program at the US Department of State was launched. The purpose behind its creation was the need for government to have “accurate, timely understanding of rapidly advancing science, technology and engineering issues” (JSF, 2014). The JSF program is administered by the National Academies and supported through a partnership between the US academic community, professional scientific societies, the US Department of State and the US Agency for International Development (USAID). The program is open to tenured, or similarly ranked, faculty from US institutions of higher learning who are US citizens. Fellows spend one year on assignment at the US Department of State or USAID as science advisors on domestic and foreign policy issues and these assignments are tailored to the needs of the hosting office, while taking into account the Fellows’ interests and areas of expertise. At the conclusion of the fellowship tenure year, Fellows continue to serve as a resource to the State Department and USAID for an additional five years (JSF, 2014).

While the JSF brings in only tenured professors for fellowships, the American Academy for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) hosts a Science and Technology Policy Fellowship that provides opportunities for outstanding scientists and engineers from a broad ranges of levels, disciplines and backgrounds to learn first-hand about policy-making and implementation while acting as a knowledge and expert resource for government. The AAAS Science Policy Fellows program is larger and brings in people at all levels to serve in various branches of the US government. The fellowships are highly competitive and employ a peer-review selection process in selection (AAAS, 2014).

In the United Kingdom (UK), ‘pairing schemes’ are designed to bridge gaps between parliamentarians, civil servants and some of the top research scientists in the British Isles. Participating scientists are paired with either a parliamentarian or civil servant and the Royal Society supports them by arranging a ‘Week in Westminster’ and for reciprocal visits (Royal Society, 2014). This program aims to help parliamentarians and civil servants establish longstanding links with practicing research scientists to help them understand political decision-making and its associated pressures. Since 2001, over 250 scientists have been paired with parliamentarians and civil servants to strengthen knowledge flows between researchers and regulators. In addition to pairing schemes, the UK Office of Science and Technology produces a bimonthly briefing for members of parliament to contribute to their scientific literacy around current issues. Bolstering the exchange of information has proven a useful mechanism for achieving greater scientific literacy within governments (Collins, 2012).

The UK also has a non-governmental council, funded by charities and the UK Medical Research Council, that specifically addresses transparency and engagement issues relevant to bio-based technologies. The Nuffield Council on Bioethics engages with the multiple ethical, technical and economic issues and concerns surrounding technologies such as biofuel production. For example, the result of an extensive study of complex socio-economic issues as they relate to technology was the creation of a set of six principles they believed most stakeholders could agree upon. The principles, in the context of biofuels, cover concerns for human rights, environmental sustainability, fair trade practices, attention to climate change and ethical agricultural practices (Nuffield, 2011). While these principles are focused on the question of biofuel development, it is possible to see how they can be applied more generally to other emerging technologies used in the agricultural, environmental and energy fields. The Nuffield Council’s approach is of note because of how technology is discussed in light of each principle and how standards and a regulatory system can be used to facilitate rather than block solutions to the overall challenge. What is particularly important is how uncertainty surrounding innovative technology is accepted, and how principles are designed to allow for flexibility in regulation and governance strategies, adapting and changing to new knowledge and policy solutions.

On a less-formal level, Australia established the 'Parliamentary Friends of Science' group in 2012. The non-partisan group supports science and scientific endeavours to foster dialogue and engagement between scientific leaders and parliamentarians seeking scientific expertise. It started with 50 inaugural members and now has over 76 members (PFS, 2012). As the Academy Secretary for Science policy states, the interest of members demonstrates the "broad recognition among members of all parties that science is relevant and underpins policy in many spheres" and that "constructive debate needs to be founded on a common understanding of the best available science" (AAS, 2012). The group has developed three goals, which cover issues like increasing the frequency of dialogue and engagement between scientific leaders and parliamentarians and building infrastructure to support efforts made by parliamentarians seeking scientific advice on relevant policy issues (AAS, 2012).

While these examples show beneficial exchanges between scientists and policy makers, the scientific council model does not go far enough to expand the mandates to include stakeholders that may not have science backgrounds, but would be useful to consult in order to gain a better understanding of the social acceptability of commercializing innovative technologies like GM crops and foods. However, these examples demonstrate ways of fostering engagement and transparency among a select group of stakeholders that can act as foundational institutions to further bridge knowledge gaps among the broader set of stakeholders.

## Option 2: Enhancing Deliberation in Policy Frameworks

Including or enhancing deliberative elements into decision-making structures for regulating innovative technologies within a 'science-based' system of assessment is challenging, but addressing transparency and engagement issues by including multi-stakeholder deliberation is still possible within current regulatory frameworks. The examples discussed here are drawn from policies in place at the European Union (EU) level of decision-making, the Norwegian approach, and a third not yet realized option for enhancing deliberation is drawn from the Canadian context.

In contrast to the framework used by Canada and the US to evaluate the biosafety of GM crops and foods seeking regulatory approval, the EU bases its regulatory system on the Precautionary Principle. This principle expresses the need to address future unknown risks, or at the very least have contingency plans in place to deal with any instances of unanticipated harms that may occur as a result of unconfined environmental release of GMOs (UNEP, 1992; Clark, 2013). The European case shows the difficulties of including deliberative elements into decision-making. For example, the European

Commission can vote to withhold the approval of a bioproduct even if no evidence of potential harm to humans, animals or the environment is presented to the European Food Safety Administration (EFSA) (EFSA, 2010; Costa and Novillo, 2012). The result is a system that demands regulatory consensus among EU members that may not share similar levels of risk aversion to potential future, unknown risks associated with GM crops or foods. For example, Germany's anti-GM stance diverges significantly from Spain's more permissive view towards cultivating GM crops within its borders. Some have argued that the EU model of biosafety approval has prioritized deliberative elements over the role of scientific evidence in approvals of GMOs in the food system, which has led to severe restrictions on the cultivation of GM crops (Morris and Spillane, 2008). Others have pointed out that the political decision to restrict GM crop cultivation in Europe is not necessarily democratic. For example, farm and consumer groups have expressed the desire to have the option of purchasing or cultivating GM crops such as maize (Europabio, 2010). The debate, conditioned by the demand for more stringent regulatory protocols in the wake of food safety scares across Europe in the 1990s (e.g., BSE and Hoof-and-Mouth disease), has been shaped by non-governmental organizations and other groups that do not necessarily represent the perspectives of broader society and sometimes over-emphasize the possible future uncertainties regarding biotechnology in order to further political goals. The EU regulatory system based on the precautionary principle was intended to evolve as new information was obtained but has instead ossified (Tait, 2001). This has prompted some within the system to demand a re-thinking of the current consensus-based model. In 2010, the European Commission reviewed existing EU-level legislation pertaining to GMOs and the key findings stated that the regulatory framework is in need of more flexibility on GMO cultivation, the authorization system is in need of streamlining and the risk assessment procedures need further harmonization (EC, 2010).

Norway, which is not subject to the regulatory framework of the EFSA, has devised its own biosafety framework that weaves deliberative elements into its decision-making activities. The Norwegian Gene Technology Act (the Act) introduced in 1993 is an attempt at integrating multiple types of evidence into the assessment of GM crops, as well as cloned animals. Socio-economic considerations and environmental sustainability goals are explicitly included in the approval process of the Act as was the creation of the Norwegian Biotechnology Advisory Board (NBAB). Revised in 2005, the Act is now more precise in terms of what constitutes socio-economic considerations, 'ethics', 'sustainable development' and 'social impact' within regulatory evaluative frameworks. Three features of this Act are worth noting in the context of enhancing transparency and engagement as it relates to GM crops and foods: the elevated role of public consultation, the prioritization of freedom of information and mandatory 'impact assessments'.

Norway has approved very few GM crops for cultivation within its borders, and some point towards the inclusion of socio-economic concerns in the regulatory process as a partial explanation. For example, all applications for unconfined environmental release of GMOs, in addition to providing evidence of safety, must demonstrate that the GMO has a valid use, and contribute to sustainable agricultural practices. The NBAB holds public meetings regarding biosafety and GMOs as part of the deliberative element of the approval process. This has been an important tool in engaging the public in discussions regarding how GM products are used (Husby, 2007). There is special emphasis placed on transparency and public participation in decision-making over GM products used in Norway. Information about the GM product seeking approval is made public before the decision over approval is made. Chapter 2, sec. 12 states, "Notwithstanding the duty of secrecy, the following information shall, however, always be public, unless it comes within the scope of section 6, subsection 1, of the Freedom of Information Act" (Chp. 2, sec. 12, NME, 1993; NDNM, 2011).

While the regulatory burden may increase with the inclusion of deliberative elements, there are lessons to be drawn from the Norwegian experience. Though replicating all aspects of Norway's approach to regulating GMOs may not be appropriate in the Canadian context, it offers some insight into how to include socio-economic and democratic elements in decision-making within policy areas covering technological innovations. It represents an example of how to deepen democratic legitimacy in GM food governance by including deliberation as part of the regulatory process, not only as part of a contingency plan if commercialization of a product generates critiques regarding its social acceptability. It also opens up regulatory spaces to seriously consider how the deep value differences among stakeholders can have significant implications for policy outcomes.

Shifting the public's role in decision-making concerning the approval and commercialization of GM crops and foods has also been suggested for the Canadian regulatory system. The Public Interest Accountability Framework (PIAF) developed by Pal and Maxwell (2004), is an attempt to develop a strategy to address efficiency, accountability and effectiveness in regulatory decision-making for GM foods. It proposes a set of policy processes invoking accessibility,

transparency and public participation as central tenets of a responsive regulatory system (responsible government) (Pal and Maxwell, 2004: 10). By recommending a softening of the 'top down' approach to the regulation of GM foods, Pal and Maxwell argue for a move towards higher standards and penalties for those who fail to meet strict regulations and a more cost-effective system of regulation that can serve to strengthen engagement among stakeholders, primarily the concerned public (Pal and Maxwell, 2004: 14). A more time and cost effective system can also address the concerns of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) within the Canadian system. SMEs often have fewer financial resources to draw upon to fund approval applications compared to multi-national biotech firms. High transaction costs put SMEs at a competitive disadvantage within regulatory systems and may prohibit their involvement in the sector and thus may stifle innovation. Transparency of the decision-making process can help SMEs make informed decisions regarding research and development and how to better navigate the regulatory system.

In practice, the PIAF essentially amounts to prioritizing uncertainty as a factor in decision-making within regulatory frameworks, much like the strategic thinking model suggests. As argued by others, governance structures must move towards being more reflexive and inclusive of multiple perceptions of risk to bolster regulatory legitimacy by seriously considering social acceptability of the risks associated with an innovative technology as part of decision-making (Street, 2006; Weale, 2002). If decisions about commercialization of innovative technologies are made with minimal or no public participation, institutions run the risk of having their legitimacy called into question and risk damaging the public trust (Street, 2006: 114). At the same time, greater inclusion and engagement with the public and/or organizations claiming to represent public interest needs to be moderated so that the regulatory system does not become political and burdensome, as in the European case. Evidence-based decision-making should mean that high standards of evidence should be held for both those trying to demonstrate benefit *and* harm of a product.

### Option 3: Knowledge Mobilization Strategies

Knowledge mobilization (KM) is a less direct policy option to help address the uncertainties pertaining to GM crops and foods, but it is important to any engagement strategy and paramount to addressing concerns over the uncertainty of future risks associated with GM crops and foods. KM is used to describe a range of strategies and relationships that link upstream scientific research with policy and practice. Ensuring knowledge reaches end-users (e.g., government, the public) requires strategies for knowledge synthesis and exchange. KM pathways are multifaceted, nuanced, dynamic and iterative, indicating the complexity of KM model development (Gold, 2009; Ryan et al., 2013).

Despite their complexity, KM models are crucial in ensuring that views balanced by evidence rather than emotional reaction to uncertainty can be developed by all stakeholders involved. Greater understanding of science, research and the most recent knowledge on a particular issue area can help stakeholders sift through contrasting evidence and judge the merit of often times, over-simplified messages coming from competing interest groups. The implication is wider than simply GM crops. The negative perception of GM technologies amongst large portions of the public despite scientific evidence to the contrary is also worrisome for scientists, industry and government in regards to other emerging technologies. Nanotechnology, for example, is still being defined in terms of its applications, benefits and risks. Potential benefits include new 'smart' materials, nano-robotics and medicinal applications such as cancer treatment or advanced diagnostics. The risks speculated include environmental damage, terrorist use of nanotechnology, and health and safety concerns for consumers and those who work with nanotechnology (Marchant and Sylvester, 2006; Sylvester et al., 2009). Synthetic biology, the ability to build and manipulate biological (e.g. genetic materials) from scratch, is another emerging technology facing similar concerns (Calvert and Martin, 2009). The evidence around these different scenarios is tenuous at best, but the possibility of harm has already prompted calls for early regulation. These calls are motivated by the desire to minimize any potentially harmful effects before they emerge, and also to engage the public early on so that the negative perception and caustic opposition that arose around GM crops would not be repeated. The fact that different groups, both in support of and against these technologies, all want to see regulation developed is understandable given its potential scope: regulation can be permissive, prophylactic or preventive, and it can be used to signal to funders what research to support (Marchant and Sylvester, 2006).

Access to relevant, independent and reliable information on agriculture and science is an ongoing challenge for stakeholders in the agricultural biotechnology policy sphere. For regulators who are responsible for making crucial decisions that impact social and economic welfare of the public, access to knowledge networks populated by a range of expertise is fundamental. Governments require access to the most up-to-date and accurate information related to policy decisions concerning science and technology if they are expected to formulate balanced, informed policy. A process of participation balancing both top-down and bottom-up effects in informing the process and whether objectives are being met and/or changed is required. Because of the complexity present in governance structures, even small interventions might have serious consequences. Therefore, adaptive and reflexive governance principles are needed to monitor the system and delivering non-biased (or at least balanced) evidence about potential risks *and* benefits associated with innovative technologies is central to any KM strategy for GM foods and crops.

A KM strategy is endorsed by Canada's Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and the United Kingdom's National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). KM strategies can extend beyond efforts to inform policy-makers and the public by promoting science literacy in schools to educate students about the roles of science and technology in society. This is an important part of nurturing critical, analytical thinking in the populace. As part of the information revolution, the digital commons serves as an invaluable resource for information about science and technology and their uses and roles in society, but some types of information presented as evidence may lack rigorous assessment and evaluation. Stakeholders, including citizens, need access to tools to help them distinguish between opinion and evidence to inform their own decision-making, and ultimately their risk perceptions regarding innovative technologies and uncertainty. There are, however, some challenges to implementing KM strategy in the current system of information exchange networks existing among stakeholders. Knowledge pathways are often complicated when the facilities and incentive structures to connect experts with other stakeholders through non-traditional outreach activities are under-developed (Ryan and Doerksen, 2013). Communication skills are necessary on both sides in order to share and to receive information. Mobilization models need to be more fully investigated and actualized in order to facilitate goals for transparent and optimized knowledge management strategies.

## V. Future Research Questions

Given the different policy options described above, from advisory councils to knowledge mobilization techniques and mechanisms, several future research questions are in need of further investigation:

- 1) What governance mechanisms need to be developed to facilitate the transfer of science for use by decisions makers?
- 2) What should a deliberative model look like within the Canadian system? What are the lessons learned and models can we draw from?
- 3) How can Canada best implement a *strategic thinking model* approach in its pursuit for best practices?

It is evident that gaps exist within the current Canadian regulatory system that influences its efficacy. We need to step beyond this preliminary analysis of the regulatory 'landscape' of opportunities and challenges and attempt to identify best practices and study how models can be adapted and adopted within a Canadian context. Evidence-based models that integrate the best and most up-to-date scientific knowledge while incorporating more inclusive, deliberative models for stakeholder engagements would go a long way in building trust in the regulatory system. How to accomplish this is an ongoing challenge. Next steps might include a Delphi survey of experts in this issue area in addition to policy and decision-makers, as well as public sector scientists. The ultimate goal is to optimize the innovation process while ensuring health and safety of humans and the environment while considering the social acceptability of useful innovative technologies.

## VI. Conclusion

The challenge facing any regulatory system is that it is not being asked to address simply safety. It is being asked to address the general public's perception of risk and concerns regarding unknown (but possible) negative effects of emerging technologies. It is being asked to address the concerns of industry in terms of facilitating their development of new markets, while providing a mechanism that can help prevent public backlash against their products. It is seen as a mechanism by interest groups to protect their own interests in regard to a technology or industry.

What should the regulation of science and technology actually achieve? Regulation should be seen as a mechanism that provides a balance between safety and facilitating the delivery of a technology's benefits to society. For example, the Nuffield Council on Bioethics not only has several principles protecting human rights and the environment, but they also have a principle that if the benefits of a technology outweigh the potential risks, then there is an obligation to develop it. This requires transparency of information regarding the possible impacts of a technology; and in order to achieve this it is necessary to have a broadly accepted level of scientific grounding and rigour in the research that provides it. Transparency of information also means the provision of information to the general public in a non-technical manner (Lewandowsky et al., 2012).

The provision of information must also be seen as extending from a neutral party; part of the problem (Cobb and Macoubrie, 2004) is that industry and government have been portrayed as biased (and implicitly or explicitly as dishonest) regarding technologies such as GM foods and crops. For this reason, all parties engaging in the regulatory debate should be welcome to provide their evidence, but also expected to adhere to the standards of rigour and transparency, namely explaining the sources of their provided evidence, how their research is funded and who they represent. For example, some anti-GM groups are funded by organic farming organisations, which stand to benefit from market share and improved public perception of their products if GM foods are portrayed as unhealthy or dangerous (Schroeder, 2014; Byrne, 2003; Forrer et al., 2000).

The continued support for basic and applied research in universities from public funds would go a long way in helping build trust in the science and information provided around these technologies; third party funding can be seen as separate from industry other private agendas (e.g. from NGOs, lobby groups). Finally, the structures of a regulatory system should reflect the values broadly representing society, but these should only be the starting point of a regulatory process.

## References

- American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). (2014) The Science and Technology Fellowship Program. Available online at: <http://www.aaas.org/program/science-technology-policy-fellowships>. Accessed on April 18, 2014.
- Australia Academy of Science. (AAS) (2012). Available online at: <http://www.science.org.au/news/parliamentary-friends-science-group>. Accessed on: April 29, 2014.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Byrne, J. (2003) "Deconstructing the Agricultural Biotechnology Protest Industry." In *Let Them Eat Precaution*. Jon Entine (ed). pp: 144-162.
- Calvert, J. & P. Martin. (2009) "The role of social scientists in synthetic biology." *European Molecular Biology Organization* 10 (3).
- Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). (2014) Biotechnology Notices of Submission. Available online at: <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/plants/plants-with-novel-traits/notices-of-submission/eng/1300143491851/1300143550790> Accessed on July 19, 2014.
- Clark, L.F. (2013) "Framing the Uncertainty of Risk: Models of governance for genetically modified foods." *Science and Public Policy* 40: 479-491.
- Cobb, M. & J. Macoubrie. (2004) "Public perceptions about nanotechnology: risks, benefits and trust." *Journal of Nanoparticle Research* (6): 395-405.
- Collins, B. (2012) Panelist (speech) on "How Governments Access Innovation Science for Policy Making." *Canadian Science Policy Conference*. Calgary, Alberta. November 4-7.
- Cooke, P. (2011) *Complex adaptive innovation systems: Relatedness and transversality in the evolving region*. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Costa, J. & C. Novillo. (2012) "Regulatory Approvals of GM Plants (Insect Resistant) in European Agriculture: Perspectives from Industry," in G. Smaghe & I. Diaz (eds) *Progress in Biological Control*, Springer Science and Business.
- Council for Scientific and Technology Advisors (CSTA). (1999) "Science Advice for Government effectiveness (SAGE)." *Canadian Science Council Archives: University of Ottawa*. May 5, 1999. Available online at: [http://artsites.uottawa.ca/sca/doc/SAGE\\_e.pdf](http://artsites.uottawa.ca/sca/doc/SAGE_e.pdf). Accessed on: April 20, 2014.
- Doern, G. B. & P.W.B. Phillips. (2012) "The Genomics "Regulatory-Science" Regime: Issues and Options." GPS Policy Brief No. 6. Available online at: <http://www.genomecanada.ca/medias/pdf/en/GPS-Policy-brief-October2012.pdf>
- European Commission. (2010) "New flexible approach to GMO cultivation in the EU." 13/07/2010. Available online at: [http://ec.europa.eu/unitedkingdom/press/press\\_releases/2010/pr1075\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/unitedkingdom/press/press_releases/2010/pr1075_en.htm)
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). (2010) "Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of genetically modified plants." *EFSA Journal* 8 (11): 1879
- Europabio. (2010) "EU Farmers and GM crops: A Matter of Choice. 29.01.10." *Evaluation of the EU legislative framework in the field of GM food and feed: Final Report*. Brussels.
- Fitzpatrick, M. (2012) Death of scientific evidence mourned on Parliament Hill. *CBC News*. Available online at: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/death-of-scientific-evidence-mourned-on-parliament-hill-1.1218019> Accessed on: May 1, 2014.
- Forrer, G. et al. (2000) "Marketing and the Organic Food Industry: A history of food fears, market manipulation and misleading consumers." September. Available online at: <http://iuccommonsproject.wikispaces.com/file/view/Marketing+and+the+Organic+Food+Industry.pdf>. Accessed on: May 19, 2014.
- Gibbs, K., et al. (2012) "The Death of Evidence' in Canada: Scientists' Own Words." *The Tyee*. Available online at: <http://thetyee.ca/Opinion/2012/07/16/Death-of-Evidence/>. Accessed on May 1, 2014.
- Gold, M. (2009) "Pathways to the Use of Health Services Research in Policy." *Health Services Research* 44 (4): 1111-36.
- Goncalves, M. E. (2004) "Risk society and the governance of innovation in Europe: Opening the black box?" *Science and Public Policy* 31: 457-64.
- Government of Canada. (1996) *Science and Technology: The New Federal Policy*. Available online at: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp414-e.htm>. Accessed on: April 18, 2014.
- Gunn, J.H. & B. F. Noble. (2009) "A conceptual basis and methodological framework for regional strategic environmental assessment (R-SEA)," *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 27(4): 258-270.
- Hibbert, N. & L. F. Clark. (2014) "Democratic legitimacy, risk governance and GM food." *Social Philosophy Today* 30(1).
- Husby, J. (2007) "Chapter 24: Sustainability, social and ethical considerations in regulations." *Biosafety First*. Traavick, T. and L.C. Lim (eds.) Tapir Academic Publishers. <http://genok.no/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Chapter-24.pdf>
- Industry Canada. (2005) "Summative Evaluation of the Canadian Biotechnology Strategy Program." *Final Report. June, 2005*. Available online at: [https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/ae-ve.nsf/vwapj/EvaluationCBSSummative.pdf/\\$file/EvaluationCBSSummative.pdf](https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/ae-ve.nsf/vwapj/EvaluationCBSSummative.pdf/$file/EvaluationCBSSummative.pdf) Accessed on: April 28, 2014.

- Industry Canada. (2014a) "Seizing Canada's Moment: Moving Forward in Science, Technology and Innovation." Available online at: [http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/icgc.nsf/eng/h\\_07416.html](http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/icgc.nsf/eng/h_07416.html). Accessed on: May 8, 2014.
- Industry Canada. (2014b) "Summative Evaluation of the Canadian Biotechnology Strategy Program." Available online at: <https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/ae-ve.nsf/eng/03189.html>. Accessed on: May 8, 2014.
- Jefferson Science Fellowship (JSF). (2014) *National Academy of Sciences*. Available online at: <http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/Jefferson/>. Accessed on: April 18, 2014.
- Kline, S. & N. Rosenberg. (1986) "An overview of innovation." In: Landau, R. and N. Rosenberg (eds) *The Positive Sum Strategy: Harnessing Technology for Economic Growth*, pp. 275–305. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Lewandowsky, S. et al. (2012) "Misinformation and its Correction: Continued Influence and Successful Debiasing." *Psychological Sciences in the Public Interest* 13(3): 106-131.
- Marchant, G. & D. Sylvester. (2006) "Transnational models for regulation of nanotechnology." *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics* Winter.
- Massel, M. S. (1961) "The Regulatory Process." 26 *Law and Contemporary Problems* (Spring): 181-202.
- Metcalfe, J. S. (1995) "Technology systems and technology policy in an evolutionary framework." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* (19): 25–46.
- Morris, S.H. & C. Spillane. (2008) "GM Directive Deficiencies in the EU: the current framework for regulating GM crops in the EU weakens the precautionary principle as a policy tool." *EMBO Reports* 9(6): 500-504.
- National Research Council. (1983) *Risk Assessment in the Federal Government: Managing the Process*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- National Research Council. (1996) *Understanding Risk: Informing Decisions in a Democratic Society* Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- Noble, B. F. (2009) "Promise and dismay: The state of strategic environmental assessment systems and practices in Canada." *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* (29): 66–75.
- Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management, *Fact Sheet: the Norwegian Gene Technology Act and Socioeconomic Considerations*. (2011) Available online at: <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/doc/laws/acts/gene-technology-act.html?id=173031>
- Norwegian Ministry of Environment (NME). (1993) *The Act relating to the production and use of genetically modified organisms (Gene Technology Act)*, Act No. 38 of 2 April 1993.
- Nuffield Council on Bioethics. (2011) *Biofuels: Ethical Issues*. Oxford.
- Pal, L. A. & J. Maxwell. (2004) *Assessing the Public Interest in the 21st Century: A Framework*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Policy Research Network.
- Parliamentary Friends of Science (PFS). (2012) *Australia Academy of Science* September 17. Available online at: <http://www.science.org.au/news/parliamentary-friends-science-group> Accessed on: April 18, 2014.
- Partidario, M. R. (2012) *Strategic Environmental Assessment Better Practice Guide – methodological guidance for strategic thinking in SEA*. Portuguese Environmental Agency, Lisbon.
- Phillips, P.W.B. (2009) The kaleidoscope of risk analysis: The state of the art 25 years after the Red Book: Commentary on the proceedings of the 1<sup>st</sup> *International Conference on Risk Assessment*, Brussels, November 18-19.
- Royal Society. (2014) "Pairing Scheme." *Royal Society*, UK. Available online at: <https://royalsociety.org/training/pairing-scheme/>. Accessed on April 18, 2014.
- Ryan, C., et al. (2013) "Mobilizing Agri-Food Knowledge: A Cohesive Approach to a Multi-faceted Challenge." *Paper presented at the ICABR Conference*. Ravello, Italy. July, 2013.
- Ryan, C. & K. Doerksen. (2013) "Apathy and Online Activism: An Impetus for Science and Science Communication?" *International Journal of Technology, Knowledge and Society*. Volume 9, Issue 2. Pps: 81-94.
- Sanderson, I. (2009) "Intelligent Policy Making for a Complex World: Pragmatism, Evidence and Learning." *Political Studies* 57(4): 699-719.
- Schroeder, J. (2014) "Organic Marketing Report." *Academics Review*. Available online at: [http://academicsreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/AR\\_Organic-Marketing-Report\\_Print.pdf](http://academicsreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/AR_Organic-Marketing-Report_Print.pdf). Accessed on: May 10, 2014.
- Smyth, S. & A. McHughen. (2013) "Regulation of Genetically Modified Crops in USA and Canada: Canadian Overview." In A. McHughen and C. Wozniak (eds) *Regulation of Agricultural Biotechnology: The United States and Canada*. Springer Press: New York. pp: 15-34.
- Stewart, K. (2014) "Open Letter to Minister Rickford on Flawed Consultations for Science, Technology, and Innovation Strategy." Available online at: <http://kennedystewart.ndp.ca/open-letter-to-minister-rickford-on-flawed-consultations-for-science-technology-and-innovation-strategy> Accessed on: May 8, 2014.

- Street, P. (2006) "Constructing risk: GMOs, biosafety and environmental decision-making." In: Somsen, H. (ed.) *The Regulatory Challenge of Biotechnology: Human Genetics, Food and Patents*, pp: 95–117. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Sylvester, D. et al. (2009) "Not again! Public perception, regulation, and non-technology." *Regulation and Governance* (3): 165-185.
- Tait, J. (2001) "More Faust than Frankenstein: the European debate about the precautionary principle and risk regulation for genetically modified crops." *Journal of Risk Research* 4(2): 175-189.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (1992). 'The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, held 3–14 June 1992. Annex I.' Available online at: <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm> Accessed on 4 June 2011.
- Uyarra, E. (2010) "What is evolutionary about regional systems of innovation? Implications for regional policy." *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 20(1): 115-137.
- VALGEN. (2010) "Novelty as a Regulatory Trigger for New Bio-Products and Crops" Policy Brief No. 15. Available online at: <http://www.valgen.ca/wp-content/uploads/Policy-Brief-15-December-20101.pdf>
- Weale, A. (2002) "Introduction." In: Weale, A. (ed.) *Risk, Democratic Citizenship and Public Policy* Oxford, UK: OUP. pp: 1–12.
- Wolt, J. D. & R.K.D. Peterson. (2000) "Agricultural bio- technology and societal decision-making: The role of risk analysis." *AgBioForum* 3: 39–46.



OTTAWA  
GE<sup>3</sup>LS SERIES...

...where **G**enomics,  
**P**ublic policy,  
and **S**ociety meet

ISSN 1922-236X

© Genome Canada 2014

This document has been published with the intent that it be readily available for personal and public non-commercial use and may be reproduced, in part or in whole and by any means, without charge or further permission from Genome Canada provided that Genome Canada is identified as the source institution.

**For more information on Genome Canada, see: [www.genomecanada.ca](http://www.genomecanada.ca)**

**For more information on the GPS Series, see: <http://www.genomecanada.ca/en/ge3ls/policy-portal>**