



European Commission



SIXTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME



Participatory Science and Scientific Participation

**The role of Civil Society Organizations
in decision-making about novel
developments in biotechnologies**

FINAL REPORT

PSx2

Participatory Science and Scientific Participation

The role of civil society organizations in decision-making about novel developments in biotechnologies

Protocol for interview on Participatory Science and Scientific Participation

PSx2 is a project that explores the participatory role of civil society organisations in new scientific and technological developments, with particular reference to experiences in the development of agricultural biotechnology (GM plants, food and feeds). Five civil society organisations¹ and four scientific institutions² are working together in this project funded by the DG research of the European Commission.

The overall objective is to increase the social relevance of scientific research through the promotion of public participation in European research activities.

It is hoped that the project outcomes can be used to improve communication between civil society organisations and scientific research institutions. In order to enhance communication and exchanges between research and society in Europe we would like to ask your help in compiling information about what you consider to be effective practice. This information will then provide the basis for putting together guidance, or a 'Manual' of effective practices for a 'Participatory Science and Scientific Participation'.

We will be contacting you personally and would be grateful if we could discuss the following questions. We estimate that this may take between 30 – 45 minutes of your time.

DISCLAIMER:

by answering this interview you authorize the PSx2 project partners to share your answers with other Civil Society Organizations, research institutions and other stakeholders who may be interested in the project outcomes. You may ask at any moment to verify how your interviews has been transcribed and claim for any amendment or modification.

¹ CDG - Genetic Right Council (Italy); GENET - European NGO network on Genetic Engineering (Switzerland); GeneWatch (UK); CRII GEN - Committee on Research and Independent Information on Genetical Genie (France); ELF - Estonian Fund for Nature (Estonia).

² ZERP - Centre for European Law and Politics at the University of Bremen (Germany); Caen University, Institute of Fundamental and Applied Biology, Oestrogen and Reproduction Laboratory (France); University of Perugia, Department of Plant Biology and Agro-environmental and Animal Biotechnologies, Section of Genetics and Breeding (Italy); CSIC - Higher Council for Scientific Research, Department of Compared politics (Spain).

Contact Persons:

ITALY (Project Coordinator) Alberto Merolla [merolla@consigliodirittigenetici.org]
ESTONIA Nastja Pertsjonok [nastja@elfond.ee] FRANCE Gilles-Eric Séralini [criigen@unicaen.fr] GERMANY Maria Paola Ferretti [ferretti@zerp.uni-bremen.de] OTHER COUNTRIES Antje Lorch [coordination@genet-info.org] SPAIN Vincenzo Pavone [vincenzo.pavone@ieasm.csic.es] UNITED KINGDOM Sue Weldon [sue.weldon@genewatch.org]

1. How long has your organisation been involved in issues relating to the development of agricultural biotechnology (GM plants, food and feed)?
2. What are your main aims and objectives related to technological developments such as these (*for instance, are you trying to affect policy, change the direction of the research or campaign for alternative agricultural methods*)?
3. What methods do you consider have been most effective in trying to achieve these goals and why (*e.g. public information, press work, involvement in political processes, legal work, dialogue with scientists, doing/publishing your own research, boycotts, etc.*)?
4. What methods have you found to be ineffective and why?
5. What does public participation in developments such as agricultural biotechnology (GM plants, food and feed) mean to you?
6. In your view, what are the main difficulties/limitations in achieving public participation in science?
7. What does 'participation in science' mean to you and who do you think should be able to participate, at what stages (*e.g. setting the research agenda, product regulation, patenting*)?
8. Do you know of any examples of effective public participation in the development of agricultural biotechnology (GM plants, food and feed)?
9. If not, what has prevented effective participation?
10. Have you been involved in any official/academic processes of public participation in science (*e.g. consultations, stakeholder dialogues, advisory committees*)?
11. What do you think about them?
12. Have these included any processes run by European institutions (*e.g. DG Research, DG SANCO, DG Environment, EFSA*)? If so, what was your experience of them?
13. What could/should scientific and political institutions, including the European Commission, do to improve public participation in science?
14. In general, is your organisation more active at local, national or international level?
15. Can we contact you again?
16. Do you have any additional comments?

 **Contact Persons:**

ITALY (Project Coordinator) Alberto Merolla [merolla@consigliodirittigenetici.org]
ESTONIA Nastja Pertsjonok [nastja@elfond.ee] **FRANCE** Gilles-Eric Séralini [crigen@unicaen.fr] **GERMANY** Maria Paola Ferretti [ferretti@zerp.uni-bremen.de] **OTHER COUNTRIES** Antje Lorch [coordination@genet-info.org] **SPAIN** Vincenzo Pavone [vincenzo.pavone@ieasm.csic.es] **UNITED KINGDOM** Sue Weldon [sue.weldon@genewatch.org]