Emerging Technologies: What Have We Learned About Governing Risk?

Paul C. Stern,
National Research Council, USA
Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Presentation to Science and Technology Innovation Program
Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars
Washington, DC
December 15, 2011

The Emerging Technologies Project

- Started with NRC committee; completed at ORNL
- Objective: identify ways to address *risks of emerging technologies*, drawing on
  - Experience with technologies now in place (nuclear power, radioactive waste management, DNA manipulation, etc.)
  - Early experience with currently emerging technologies (nano-, bio-, and info-)
  - Deduction from fundamental knowledge of social processes (risk perception and assessment; commons management, international institutions and networks; science communication and utilization)

Some additional, generic lessons

- Technology acceptance is fundamentally a social process
- Social impediments are more likely to arise if risk communication comes late
- Building trust through public participation can increase the likelihood of acceptance
- Persons or sources or organizations that link producers and users of information about risk are important
- Information about benefits often developed more aggressively than about risks, leading to governance challenges later
- Non-governmental "policy networks" can perform important risk governance functions

Reference: P.C. Stern, T.J. Wilbanks, S. Cozzens, and F.A. Rosa, Generic lessons learned about societal responses to emerging technologies perceived as involving risks. ORNL/TM-2009/114. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2009.

Identifying Governance Principles for Risks of Emerging Technologies

- Can the Ostrom governance principles be applied outside the domain of the kinds of commons she studied?
- Can they be extended to:
  - Global natural resources
  - Risks of technology
- New paper addresses these questions

Reference: P.C. Stern, Design principles for global commons: natural resources and emerging technologies. *International Journal of the Commons,* 2011, 5:213-232.

Characteristics of Local Resource Commons: Why the Theory Might not Generalize

- Geographic extent: tens to thousands of km2
- Number of appropriators: tens to thousands
- Commons are degraded intentionally
- Appropriators share an interest in preserving the commons
- Appropriators share common institutional and cultural context
- Resources regenerate on a human time scale, so learning is a feasible management strategy

How Global Resources are Different

Geog scale	Local Resouces	Global Resources
# of users	Thousands	Billions
Salience	Resouce use is conscious purpose	Resource use is a byproduct of intent
Dirstribution of interests, power	Benefits and costs internal among users	Significant externalities; interest and power differentials
Cultures, institutions	Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
Feasibility of learning	Good	Limited
Regeneration time	Less than a generation	More than a generation
Ease of understanding resource	Feasible without scientific training	Scientifically complex, limited predictive ability
Resource dynamics	Stable rules	Changing rules
Learning transfer across places	Possible	Difficult

Applicability of Ostrom's 8 Design Principles

- *Define boundaries for appropriators and resource:* Not applicable
- *Define rules congruent with ecological conditions:* Difficult to identify the conditions, enforce global rules
- *Allow most users to participate:* Size of group, need to understand science make this difficult
- *Hold monitors accountable:* Challenges include need for global monitoring, uncertainty about what to monitor, and diversity of those monitors should account to
- *Apply graduated sanctions:* Sanctioning authority is limited
- *Low-cost conflict resolution:* Disconnects between parties and generations makes difficult
- *External authorities permit local control:* Need to facilitate local control and learning; also limit externalization
- *Nested layers of organization:* same as above

How Emerging Technologies are Different from Resource Commons

- Some are integrated global systems, but some are global only in distribution
- Irreversible processes are endemic
- Scientific complexity, uncertainty, and ignorance are rife
- Strong conflicts of values between developers and affected parties
- Strong conflicts of interest, too
- Nature of the risks incompletely known (including surprises) (including unexpected)

Implications of the Differences

- Need for science is critical
- Need for anticipating risks (not only managing them) is also critical
- Strong interests imply need to insulate science from policy (Red Book model)
- Interests and value differences make that infeasible, calling for analytic deliberation

A Revised Set of Design Principles

1. *Invest in science* to understand resource/technology and its interactions with users and those affected
2. *Establish independent monitoring,* accountable to the interested and affected parties
3. *Ensure meaningful participation* of parties in framing questions, interpreting science, and developing rules
4. *Integrate scientific analysis and broadly based deliberation*
5. *Higher-level actors should facilitate participation of lower-level actors*
6. *Engage and connect a variety of institutional forms,* global to local, in making rules, monitoring, and sanctioning
7. *Plan for instituional adaptation and change* (iterative risk management)

Additional Principles Suggested by Global Commons Problems and Emerging Technologies

- *Invest in science*
- *Integrate scientific analysis with broadly based deliberation*
- *Plan for institutionalized adaptation and change (iterative risk management)*
- *Engage a variety of institutional forms* (not only levels of organization)

Source: Dietz, Ostrom, and Stern, The struggle to govern the commons, *Science,* 302:1907-1912.