

Message

From: F Boudier [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]
Sent: 10/21/2017 6:56:49 AM
To: Beck, Nancy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=168ecb5184ac44de95a913297f353745-Beck, Nancy]; Joe Arvai [jlarvai@umich.edu]; Terje Aven [terje.aven@uis.no]; robinson@hsph.harvard.edu
CC: Kane, Sally [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]
Subject: Re: plenary panel session SRA Tuesday

Dear Terje ,
Many thanks ! I am looking forward to the plenary panel . I will send my slides early November ,
Kind regards
Frederic

On Fri, 20 Oct 2017 at 12:08, Terje Aven <terje.aven@uis.no> wrote:

Hi all,

Thanks for participating in the panel, it will be great :-)

I will have an introduction to the panel discussion, see enclosed preliminary slides with associated text.

A key point made is the important role risk analysis has and should have in understanding and characterizing the 'humbleness' part of science and clarifying the limits of the 'confidence' part.

After the Introduction Sally will take over, she is the Moderator. She will introduce you.

The idea is that each of you has a prepared introduction of some 5-7 minutes, prepared with slides if you like, with clear statements –linked to the challenges made in the abstract and hopefully inspired by my Intro and comments made by Sally:

«Has RA's role changed over time? How? What are current challenges? What seems easier or more well regarded currently? Can RA help rebuild trust in governance and public decision-making? How? «

We would not like to restrict creativity and what you find most important on this matter, so feel free to angle things as you like. Focusing on some few – one or two – themes is however recommended. To be able to lead the panel discussion in a good way, we think it is wise to have a process in advance – starting now – where we share some of the ideas we have. The aim of this dialogue is to make the panel as interesting as possible by being informed what is coming, so that one can get ideas for comments and questions. We would like to have a lively discussion so the point is not to use this dialogue to obtain some unity or consensus at this stage (rather the opposite ☺)

Looking forward to hearing from you. What we ask from you now is an indication of what type of message – themes- that you would like to highlight - in text or using slides.

We would very much appreciate if we could get some input before 15 November.

Thanks a lot.

Enjoy the weekend.

Best

Terje

Tuesday morning

Evidence and knowledge-based decision-making in a risk analysis setting: Desired reality or Misconception?

How has the post-truth society (in which objective facts are become less influential in shaping public opinion) been able to develop? Has science sought to stretch its domain too widely and denied uncertainties? Or was the truth not comfortable enough for those in power or seeking power? Why are “alternative facts” and “fake news” becoming household names?

As risk analysts we are aware that evidence is not only related to facts but also to beliefs and concerns that need to be taken into account in risk management and regulation. We are also aware that value judgments are equally important as a basis for decision-making as is evidence in the form of data, information and justified beliefs. However, there are clear data-driven insights that one cannot ignore. Climate change is real. And so is the risk of particulate matter for our health.

The panel will discuss the role of science and in particular risk science in keeping the delicate balance between factual statements and acknowledgement of uncertainty and ambiguity.

Introduction Terje Aven

Moderator: Sally M. Kane

Panelists: Joe Árvai, Nancy Beck, Frederic Boudier, Lisa A. Robinson

Terje Aven, University of Stavanger, Norway

Sally M. Kane, Independent Consultant

Joe Árvai, University of Michigan

Nancy Beck, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Frederic Boudier, Maastricht University, The Netherlands

Lisa A. Robinson, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health