

ELECTRONIC SUPPORT MATERIAL 3

Multi-SH workshop questionnaire

Journal of Nanoparticle Research

From Risk Perception to Risk Governance in Nanotechnology: A Multi-Stakeholder Study

Andrea Porcari¹ (1), Elisabetta Borsella (1), Christina Benighaus (2), Khara Grieger (3), Panagiotis Isigonis (4), Somik Chakravarty (5), Pete Kines and Keld Alstrup Jensen (6)

(1) Italian Association for Industrial Research, Italy

(2) Dialogik, Gemeinnützige Gesellschaft für Kommunikations- und Kooperationsforschung mbH, Germany

(3) Genetic Engineering and Society Center, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, U.S.A.

(4) Department of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics Ca Foscari University Venice, Italy

(5) Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies GmbH, Germany

(6) National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Lersø Parkallé 105, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark.

¹Corresponding Author

E-mail address: porcari@nanotec.it

Appendix 3

Venice Workshop¹ : Break out groups discussion questions

The set of indicative questions used for steering the discussion are reported below:

GROUP 1: RISK GOVERNANCE ISSUES RELEVANT FOR INSURANCE

- Who should be involved in risk identification-assessment-management-monitoring chain? How can we ensure that we do not have a gap in this chain?
- How can the limit values of the “nano-risks” be established due to “chronical” lack of data especially on long-term effects/impacts?
- How the “nano-risks” should be mapped on the Renn’s “participation map”? Which of these are to be considered as simple, complex, uncertain and ambiguous?
- Who is in-charge of a new (nano or other) risk? In a company, in the society, in insurance sector?

GROUP 2: RISK GOVERNANCE ISSUES RELEVANT FOR INDUSTRY

- Which are the actual bottlenecks and barriers to use/diffusion of web-tools to support industry in decision-making processes for safe production/use/disposal of nanomaterials ?
- Which features should a new support web-tool possess to be effectively integrated by industry in decision-making processes for safe production/use/disposal of nanomaterials (functionalities, data base, certifications, etc.)?
- Which type of decisions-making processes within a company could most benefit most from a web-based tool? (management/strategy, research, safety and quality, legal, etc).

GROUP 3: RISK GOVERNANCE ISSUES RELEVANT FOR USERS/CSOs

- For end-users and consumers it is important to get clear information about products containing nanotechnology. How can consumers and citizens find consistency in the information on the use of nanomaterials in products available on the market?
- How can they sustainably contribute to innovation choices by bringing societal concerns into the decision-making metabolism?
- How can CSOs benefit from a decision support system giving an overview of available knowledge in one place and which features for safe use and disposal NM products can it contain?

GROUP 4: RISK GOVERNANCE ISSUES RELEVANT FOR REGULATORS

- What role can the safe-by-design concept and tools play in helping enforcing regulation? How do you envisage the role of safe-by-design in the future regulatory governance?
- How can EU NanoSafety Cluster project-data support the EU regulatory framework applicable to nanomaterials?
- How can cross-border collaboration on regulatory frameworks help support efficient governance and create a favourable environment for innovation to thrive?
- In your view how should nanotechnology governance evolve to better address nanosafety while maintaining a favourable environment for European innovation?

ADDENDUM TO GROUP 1

How the “nano-risks” should be mapped on the Renn’s “participation map”? Which of these are to be considered as simple, complex, uncertain and ambiguous?

