



# ***Opening up expertise to civil society: Case-study of ANSES***

**Régine Fraysse-Boutrais**

Sociologist

In charge of developing relationships with stakeholders

***Social Sciences, Expertise and Society Unit  
Science for Expertise Division***


# Access to stakeholders as a core value

## Independence, impartiality

A code of conduct and independent committees which stakeholders can solicit, collegial and multidisciplinary scientific panels, prevention of conflicts of interests, public funding, etc.

## Transparency

Assessment process, minority opinions, publication of opinions, public declarations of interest, public calls for experts and research projects, etc.



Involving stakeholders  
governance bodies,  
dialogue committees,  
charter, etc.

Excellence/scientific expertise  
Selection of experts through open calls for  
applications

# A charter to open up expertise to society

**Signed** by 7 public organisations (ANSES in 2011)  
involved in research and environment/h ealth risk assessment

- **Improving transparency on the results of expertise**  
and methods used to evaluate risks
- **Sharing scientific knowledge and uncertainties**  
(discrepancies, minority positions and controversies)
- **Capacity-building among stakeholders**  
for a better understanding and possible contribution  
to the assessment procedure  
(information, training, public debate, etc.)



# Stakeholders can make requests to ANSES



# Focus on some **priority stakeholders**

- **“Citizen” NGOs** : environment, patients, consumers, sustainable development, science and society, technologies, etc.
  - **Professional organisations** (classified as industrial federations despite their legal status of not-for-profit NGO registered under the French 1901 law)
  - **Trade and agricultural unions**
- 
- To favor the **equity of access to information** and reduce the gap of knowledge between stakeholders
  - **Other interested parties** such as Ministries, elected officials or experts are considered as **institutional and techno-scientific expertise**: difference with the EU approach

# Identifying emerging stakeholders through societal watch

- **Societal watch** of networks and internet sites - national, European and international level (mainly Canada and USA)
- **Identification of emerging stakeholders** and their positions (campaigns, critics, position papers, open letters, petitions....)



Association d'aide  
aux professionnels  
victimes des pesticides.

# A wide range of stakeholders

- ANSES deals with **citizen NGOs , trade/agricultural unions and companies (professional organisations)** involved in many sectors :
- **human health and safety** in the fields of **environment, work and food**
- **animal health and welfare and plant protection**



- **Around 74 organizations regularly involved (184 representatives) and plenty of others depending on the subjects**

# Involvement of stakeholders at various levels

## 1. Governance bodies:

- Board of Directors
- Thematic steering committees

## 2. Dialogue committees on controversial issues:

- Radiofrequencies
- Nanomaterials
- Pesticides

## 3. Along the risk assessment process:

- Hearings by expert groups
- Feedback events to explain opinions
- Training sessions
- Public consultations



# Upstream engagement: hearings before and during the RA process

## ➤ Expert groups interview stakeholders:

- lay-knowledge, field expertise
- grey literature
- additional papers/studies
- positions and expectations
- societal context

## ➤ Framing scope of expertise

## ➤ Internet Public consultations



Perturbateurs  
endocriniens

Synthèse et étude  
des auditions

Rapport d'appui scientifique et technique

Mars 2013 Édition scientifique



Exposition  
aux radiofréquences  
et santé des enfants

Avis de l'Anses  
Rapport d'expertise collective

Juin 2008 Édition scientifique



# Beyond transparency and risk communication conveying opinions to stakeholders



Risques et  
bénéfices relatifs  
des alternatives  
aux produits  
phytopharmaceutiques  
comportant  
des néonicotinoïdes

Tome 1 – Rapport  
du groupe de travail  
Identification des alternatives  
aux usages autorisés  
des néonicotinoïdes

Avis de l'Anses  
Rapport d'expertise collective

Mai 2018 Édition scientifique

- Invitation to **feedback meetings**: explaining RA methodology, uncertainties, gaps of knowledge, results and recommendations
- **Training sessions**, etc.



**Trustworthiness and  
capacity-building**

# Difficulties in keeping up dialogue (for discussion)

- **Financial cost** : time consuming, dedicated person in charge
- **Burden** on the **expertise process**: ex. dealing with public consultations
- **Enquiries and expectancies** go further than RA issues
- **Challenge in maintaining a serene dialogue** between actors with divergent views, no possible consensus

# Positive impacts of openness (for discussion)

- **Sharing of information and improving equity** among stakeholders
- **Capacity-building and empowerment:** Better understanding of Anses opinions and more accurate conveying of information to the public
- Role in **preventing crises and diminishing the degree of controversy**
- **Increase reach** of scientific outputs into the public and **trust in opinions** produced



**Thank you for your attention**

**Regine.Boutrais@anses.fr**