



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Osman, M., Ayton, P., Boudier, F., Pidgeon, N. & Lofstedt, R. (2019). Evidence based uncertainty: what is needed now?. *Journal of Risk Research*, 24(5), pp. 622-628. doi: 10.1080/13669877.2019.1646316

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/22898/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2019.1646316>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk



Evidence based uncertainty: What is needed now?

Journal:	<i>Journal of Risk Research</i>
Manuscript ID	RJRR-2019-0191
Manuscript Type:	Comment/Commentary
Keywords:	uncertainty, risk communication, EFSA

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title: Evidence based uncertainty: What is needed now?**
4
5
6
7

8 Magda Osman ^a, Peter Ayton^b, Frederic Boudier^c, Nick Pidgeon^d, Ragnar Lofstedt^e,
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

- 19 a) Biological and Experimental Psychology Group, School of Biological and Chemical
20 Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK. Department of Geography,
21 Kings College London, London, UK
22
23 b) City University, London, UK.
24 c) University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway.
25 d) University of Cardiff, Cardiff, UK.
26 e) Department of Geography, King's College London, London, UK.
27
28

29 Correspondence to: Ragnar Lofstedt, e-mail: ragnar.lofstedt@kcl.ac.uk
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Title: Evidence based uncertainty: What is needed now?**
4
5
6
7

8 **Abstract:** This short commentary is a response to recent published work by the European
9 Food Safety Authority (EFSA). EFSA is an independent regulatory body that provides scientific
10 evidence to decision-makers in order to advise on what constitutes food safety in Europe. As
11 a consequence, they set the tone for the conceptualisation of risk and uncertainty for those
12 involved throughout the entire risk analysis process, as well as all the stake holders involved
13 throughout the food chain. The aim of this piece is to summarise some of the key points that
14 came out of a meeting held at the Royal Society (UK) in March 2019. The meeting brought
15 together researchers and practitioners from across the world to consider ways of making
16 improvements in the future to the development of guidance documents, such as the ones put
17 together by authorities such as EFSA (2018, 2019) that detail how to carrying out risk
18 assessment, how to analyse uncertainties, and how to communicate risk and uncertainty
19 across the risk analysis process.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The value of social sciences in understanding how experts and non-experts conceptualise,
4 interpret and communicate risk and uncertainty is most evident in the applied world of risk
5 assessment (for a recent review of the issues see, van der Bles et al, 2019). We cannot escape
6 the reach of risk assessment, since without being able to establish what constitutes a risk (as
7 well as potential benefit) and how sure, or not, the assessor is in establishing that risk, many
8 aspects of our daily lives such as the roads we drive on, the home appliances we buy, the
9 pharmaceuticals we take to relieve our health ailments, and the food we consume, would be
10 a lot less safe.
11
12
13

14 The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) is an example of a regulatory body that, under its
15 remit, advises on the risks associated with food, by considering the factors that contribute to
16 food safety across the entire food chain (from production – e.g. farming and feed to animals,
17 through to distribution – e.g. the food we order from a take away). EFSA takes a world leading
18 role in setting agendas for the type of practices that risk assessors, primarily, but also other
19 stake holders (e.g., risk managers, risk communicators, industry, consumers, special interest
20 groups) ought to adopt in order to keep up to date with advances in academic research on
21 risk analysis (incl. risk assessment, risk management, risk communication). Keeping up to date
22 with new insights and apply it to practice requires an agile approach that is able to incorporate
23 and synthesis new understandings of how to quantify risk, how best to analyses uncertainties
24 associated with the risk being assessed, and how to package risk and uncertainty in ways that
25 are easily interpreted by a variety of audiences (with varying degrees of familiarity with the
26 concepts), and above all in the most transparent way possible. The focus of this piece is to
27 consider the corollary to this. Once the translation of new insights into guidance for
28 practitioners has been undertaken, as EFSA has done with two recently published guidance
29 documents on uncertainty analyses around risk assessment (EFSA, 2018) and the
30 communication of uncertainty around risk assessment (EFSA, 2019), what factors need to be
31 taken into account to actually put these recommendations into practice? The two guidance
32 documents are clearly related. The former considers the critical factors in formalising a
33 process that enables risk assessors to report on their uncertainties during the process of
34 conducting their assessment, and how to incorporate those uncertainties into the assessment
35 report they prepare (for details on this see Osman, 2016; Osman et al, 2018). The latter is
36 focused on characterising different forms that uncertainties take in the risk assessment
37 process, and how best to communicate them, by being sensitive to the needs of different
38 stake holders across the food chain. The focus on the remainder of this piece is primarily on
39 the latter of the two guidance documents published by EFSA, regarding the communication
40 of uncertainty (EFSA, 2019), though the points made also generalise to guidance on analysing
41 uncertainty (EFSA, 2018).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Over the years there has been multiple conversations on both sides of the Atlantic regarding
51 uncertainty within the policy domain. In particular, the discussions have focused on
52 establishing what meaningful approaches should be taken in making transparent uncertainty
53 analyses associated with risk assessments themselves. The other focus has been on how to
54 best communicate scientific uncertainty in light of the call from some (e.g. EFSA, 2018, 2019)
55 to make the process of conducting uncertainty analyses more transparent to different
56 audiences, with particular priority on the consumer.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 What does transparency mean in this context? Discussions about the greater need to make
4 uncertainty analyses transparent to decision-makers and other stake holders isn't new, and
5 has been made in a variety of contexts (e.g., climate change, Larsen et al, 2013; environmental
6 risks, Lees et al., 2016, Tenney et al., 2006; flooding, Merz, & Thieken, 2005; waste disposal,
7 Jalava et al, 2013). Discussions have shifted away from early work highlighting the fact that
8 risk assessors performing uncertainty analyses often overlooked communicating
9 uncertainties to risk managers and other decision-makers (e.g., Tenney et al, 2006), which
10 then lead to calls for greater level of communication of uncertainties between different actors
11 across the risk analysis process. Instead, the matter of concern in the academic world now is
12 what level of detail is needed in order to convey to different stakeholder, the uncertainties
13 that risk assessors face regarding the input data and the assumptions that they are having to
14 make when conducting their risk analysis, especially when the analysis is required under strict
15 deadlines, with high stakes attached to the outcome of the assessment (for example see
16 Osman, 2016). Though more controversial discussions are still being had about what the
17 function of communicating uncertainty analyses should be beyond those that are required to
18 make decisions based upon this information.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Alongside the need to consider the features that uncertainty analyses should take, and how
25 to formalise the process so that the communication of uncertainties serves a useful purpose
26 in the decision-making of risk managers, regulators such as EFSA, have drawn attention to
27 other stakeholders and their needs. For EFSA, the aim of the new uncertainty approach is to
28 make scientific advice more transparent and robust because of increasing demands from
29 citizens, consumers and representatives of civil society. As Prof Tony Hardy, the chair of
30 EFSA's Scientific Committee commented "We have concluded that EFSA will benefit from
31 applying and adopting the approach across the wider variety of scientific areas and types of
32 assessments it carries out." (Hardy, 2018)
33
34
35

36 This presents an immense challenge to any regulator that has to find a way to capture
37 uncertainties appropriately, and then consider the diversity of opinions that exist amongst
38 research communities, as well as the different ways in which uncertainties from risk
39 assessment are likely to be viewed by policy makers, industry, the media, citizens, and
40 consumers. For this reason, EFSA's pioneering effort on providing guidance documents on
41 uncertainty analyses, and the communication of uncertainties, should be applauded.
42
43
44

45 Evidence based uncertainty: What is needed now? This was considered as part of a themed
46 workshop that took place in March 2019. The workshop assembled a group of distinguished
47 scholars and practitioners at the UK Royal Society with expertise in the area of risk and
48 uncertainty. They were asked to consider and reflect the academic quality of the EFSA 2018
49 and 2019 guidance documents and to put forward suggestions on what regulatory agencies
50 such as EFSA and the UK Food Standards should do now going forward in this space.
51
52

53 The 9 key discussion points were raised in response to the broad title question of the
54 workshop. These are condensed and organised into two categories ([1] making future
55 guidance documents on uncertainty communication maximally persuasive; [2] increasing
56 engagement when developing future guidance documents on uncertainty communication),
57 each of which have a bearing on the recent work by EFSA that have been discussed thus far.
58 The discussion points should be taken as current converging reflections from a highly expert
59
60

and informed community of researchers and practitioners that have considerable experience in risk analysis.

Category 1: Making future guidance documents on uncertainty communication maximally persuasive

	Discussion Point	References
Rhetorical features of persuasive guidance documentation for practitioners	Providing examples: Recommendations as to how to communicate uncertainty to audiences with different expertise and backgrounds require careful use of illustrative examples of how statements should be formulated, for the same illustration, to meet the needs of different audiences. <i>From this it is possible for practitioners to learn from example how to adjust their communication of uncertainties to different audiences</i>	Fischhoff et al 2011; Fischhoff & Davis 2014
	Providing justification: Illustrative example statements that are nuanced for the needs of different audiences requires explanation for why they are constructed in the way that they are. <i>From this it is possible for practitioners to learn to adopt best practices for the communication of uncertainties to different audiences because they understand the rationale behind why and how they need to be adjusted.</i>	Giles, 2002; Fenton & Neil, 2012; Lempert et al, 2004;
	Pre-testing recommendations: Devising and then recommending methodological approaches for constructing messages regarding the communication of uncertainties around risk assessment to multiple audience requires pretesting. <i>Doing so ensures confidence in practitioners in the methods they are using and the statements they are generating containing details about uncertainties. This is because the methods and statements would have already been empirically tested, so that practitioners have advanced knowledge of the likely interpretations and reactions that different audiences will have in response to those statements.</i>	Fischhoff 2013, 2018, 2019
	Post-testing guidance: Devising guidance documents that provide recommendations regarding the methods and practices that should be adopted when conducting uncertainty analyses and communicating uncertainties to multiple audiences should be peer reviewed, and the recommendations regarding messaging containing statements about uncertainties should also be evaluated at regular intervals by multiple stake holders to determine efficacy. <i>From this it is possible for practitioners to feel confident that the guidance they are receiving from regulators has been evaluated and scrutinised by multiple expert communities, so that the most effective and most robustly empirically validated methodologies have been recommended to support the analysis and communication of uncertainties.</i>	Kasperson & Palmlund, 1988
	Scope: Recommendations as to how to communicate uncertainty require contextualisation, which requires the need to present the details of how to implement best practices in communication to	Aven & Renn, 2019; Fischhoff 2015; Graham

	different audiences by identifying the relevance of this process across risk analysis as a whole. <i>From this it is possible for practitioners to see the communication of uncertainties in relation to balancing risks and benefits or achieving risk-risk trade-offs, and to see the value of adopting new recommendations on communicating uncertainties because this is an activity that underpin the whole risk analysis process.</i>	2008; Graham & Wiener 1995; Hohenemser et al, 1983; Renn et al 2007; Renn 2008
	Breadth: Demonstrating the wide applicability of recommendation on the communication of uncertainties requires the provision of illustrative examples of successful practices in the communication of uncertainties from a wide array of sectors and countries ^{1,2} . <i>Doing this makes it possible for the regulator to show their breadth because they can adopt practices elsewhere as well as generalise their own practices beyond their own sector, and share best practices amongst international counterparts.</i>	Cope et al, 2010; Leung et al, 2015

Category 2: Increasing engagement when developing future guidance documents on uncertainty communication

	Discussion Point	References
Developing a strategy for engagement of multiple and diverse expert audiences	Engaging all those in Risk analysis: Maximising engagement requires building opportunities for dialogue between risk assessors, risk managers and risk communicators, though it should be acknowledged that many share multiple roles across the risk analysis process working in the uncertainty space ³ . We feel that forums at the Society for Risk Analysis could help in developing such dialogues. <i>Doing this makes it possible for the regulator to take advantage of developing better engagement of all actors across the risk analysis process by integrating the experiences of both the risk assessors and risk managers, given that both parties need to have established common ground in the way in which they explain and communicate relevant factors that are included and excluded from guidance documents on communicating uncertainties effectively.</i>	Fischhoff, 1995; Osman et al., 2018; Pidgeon, 1991;
	Academic engagement: Maximising engagement between regulators preparing guidance documents on communicating uncertainty and other expert communities requires closer involvement of academic communities in the early development of	Fischhoff 2013, 2015, 2019; Johnson & Slovic 1995, 1998;

¹ One way to achieve this would be to have several mini-summits in cities including Brasilia, Brussels, Tokyo and Washington DC with a range of regulators attending each local summit.

² Key institutional actors involved in further developments of uncertainty guidance documentation could be better supported by clear institutional challenges that are set, either by the Chief Scientific Advisor (as is the norm in the UK policy system) or by the Science Advisory Mechanism (SAM which is the case in the European Commission).

³For instance, with respect to EFSA, there could be greater engagement between them and Directorate General SANTE – this is the directorate general responsible for the implementation of European Union laws on the safety of food and other products. The reason that forging closer associations would help to illuminate areas of possible misunderstanding, as well as identify areas of common practice and best practice in communicating uncertainty from analyses within EFSA’s risk assessments and beyond.

	<p>guidance documents. For instance, once such discipline is the social sciences, given that they have a long history of investing ways to optimise the communication of uncertainties to a wide range of audiences⁴. <i>Doing this makes it possible for the regulator to take advantage of existing expertise based on the most advanced empirical insights in order to determine best practices amongst academic communicates that could be applied in practice, in conjunction with identifying the needs of those in the risk analysis process</i></p>	<p>Lofstedt & Bouder 2017; Lofstedt et al, 2017; Osman et al, 2018; Pidgeon et al, 1992; van der Bles et al 2019</p>
	<p>Multi-disciplinary and multi-sector engagement: Maximising engagement between regulators and other domains of expertise requires going beyond canvassing view of those with the most direct experience of uncertainty analyses (e.g., risk assessors), and going beyond into areas of expertise that spans multiple disciplines (e.g., psychologists, risk communication, management, statisticians, computer scientists, ethicists) and multiple sectors (incl. industry, special interest groups, media, citizens). <i>Doing this makes it possible for the regulator to take advantage of developing better engagement and facilitate the promotion and uptake policy changes in the area of uncertainty analysis and communication of it.</i></p>	<p>Fischhoff 2013, 2015, 2019;</p>

Conclusions

EFSA should be congratulated for initiating this path breaking work on uncertainty in Europe. This was an important first step to inject transparency into the broader risk assessment process. That said, the group meeting at the Royal Society felt that more could be done including the empirically testing the claims that EFSA made in both the documents, to making a more user friendly shortened version of the document, and finally to evaluate whether stakeholders and consumers actually understand EFSA's various uncertainty measures. As Baruch Fischhoff reminded us a number of years ago:

"One should no more release an untested risk communication message than an untested drug." (Fischhoff 1999, p.70)

⁴ Key institutional actors involved in further developments of uncertainty guidance documentation could be better supported by clear institutional challenges that are set, either by the Chief Scientific Advisor (as is the norm in the UK policy system) or by the Science Advisory Mechanism (SAM which is the case in the European Commission).

Acknowledgements

The views communicated in this piece are a summary of key discussion points from a workshop held at the UK Royal Society “Evidence based uncertainty: What is needed now?” in London on the 6th of March 2019. The workshop was hosted by Dr. Elizabeth Surkovic and Benjamin Konnert and chaired by Professor Dame Anne Glover FRS. We are grateful for comments from Baruch Fischhoff on an earlier draft of this article.

For Peer Review Only

References

- Aven, T., & Renn, O. (2019). Some foundational issues related to risk governance and different types of risks. *Journal of Risk Research*, 1-14.
- Cope, S., Frewer, L. J., Houghton, J., Rowe, G., Fischer, A. R. H., & de Jonge, J. (2010). Consumer perceptions of best practice in food risk communication and management: Implications for risk analysis policy. *Food Policy*, 35(4), 349-357.
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). 2015. Guidance on Uncertainty in EFSA Scientific Assessment-Consultation document. Parma: EFSA
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). 2016. Guidance on Uncertainty in EFSA Scientific Assessment: Revised draft for internal testing. Parma: EFSA
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). 2018. Guidance on Uncertainty in Scientific Assessment. Parma: EFSA
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). 2019. Guidance on communication of Uncertainty in Scientific Assessment. Parma: EFSA
- Fenton, N., & Neil, M. (2012). *Risk assessment and decision analysis with Bayesian networks*. Crc Press.
- Fischhoff, B. (1995). Risk perception and communication unplugged: twenty years of process 1. *Risk analysis*, 15(2), 137-145.
- Fischhoff, B. 1999. Communicate onto others....Reliability Engineering and Systems Safety, Vol.59, p.63-72.
- Fischhoff, B. 2013. The sciences of science communication. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Vol.110 (supplement 3), p. 14033-14039.
- Fischhoff, B. 2015. The realities of risk-cost-benefit analysis. *Science*, Vol.350, p. 527-533.
- Fischhoff, B. 2019. Evaluating science communication. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Vol.116, p.7670-7675.
- Graham, J.D. 2008. Saving lives through administrative law and economics. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol.157, p.395-540.
- Giles, J. (2002). When doubt is a sure thing, *Nature*, 418, 476–478.
- Graham, J.D. and J.Wiener. 1995. *Risk vs Risk*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardy, T. 2018. Comments made in a press release with regard to the publishing of the guidance on uncertainty in scientific assessment. Parma: EFSA.

1
2
3 Hohenemser, C., R.Kates and P.Slovic. 1983. The nature of technological
4 hazard, *Science*, Vol.220, p.378-384.
5

6
7 IRGC. 2005. Risk Governance-Towards an Integrative Approach. Geneva: IRGC.
8

9
10 IRGC. 2007. An Introduction to the IRGC Risk Governance Framework-Policy
11 brief. Geneva: IRGC.
12

13
14 Jalava, K., Pölönen, I., Hokkanen, P., & Kuitunen, M. (2013). The precautionary principle
15 and management of uncertainties in EIAs—analysis of waste incineration cases in
16 Finland. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 31(4), 280-290.
17

18
19 Johnson, B. and P.Slovic. 1995. Presenting uncertainty in health risk assessment: Initial
20 studies of the effects on risk perception and trust. *Risk Analysis*, Vol.15, p.485-494.
21

22
23 Johnson, B. and P.Slovic. 1998. Lay views on uncertainty in environmental risk
24 assessment. *Journal of Risk Research*, Vol. 1, p.261-279
25

26
27 Kasperson, R. and I.Palmlund. 1988. Evaluating risk communication. In V.Covello,
28 D.McCallum and M.Pavlova eds, *Effective Risk Communication: The role and
29 responsibility of government and nongovernment organizations*. New York: Plenum.

30
31 Larsen, S. V., Kjørnø, L., & Driscoll, P. (2013). Avoiding climate change uncertainties in
32 Strategic Environmental Assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 43, 144-
33 150.
34

35
36 Lees, J., Jaeger, J. A., Gunn, J. A., & Noble, B. F. (2016). Analysis of uncertainty
37 consideration in environmental assessment: an empirical study of Canadian EA
38 practice. *Journal of environmental planning and management*, 59(11), 2024-2044.
39

40
41 Lempert, R., Nakicenovic, N., Sarewitz, D., & Schlesinger, M. (2004). Characterizing
42 climate-change uncertainties for decision-makers. An editorial essay. *Climatic
43 Change*, 65(1), 1-9.
44

45
46 Leung, W., Noble, B., Gunn, J., & Jaeger, J. A. (2015). A review of uncertainty research in
47 impact assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 50, 116-123.
48

49
50 Lofstedt, R. and F. Boudier. 2017. Evidence based uncertainty analysis: What should we
51 now do in Europe? A view point. *Journal of Risk Research*, Vol.xxx
52

53
54 Lofstedt, R., McLoughlin, M., & Osman, M. (2017). Uncertainty analysis: results from an
55 empirical pilot study. A research note. *Journal of Risk Research*, 1-11.
56

57
58 Merz, B., & Thielen, A. H. (2005). Separating natural and epistemic uncertainty in flood
59 frequency analysis. *Journal of Hydrology*, 309(1-4), 114-132.
60

Osman, M. (2016). Making a meal out of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk Research*, 1-4.

1
2
3 Osman, M., Heath, A. J., & Löfstedt, R. (2018). The problems of increasing transparency
4 on uncertainty. *Public Understanding of Science*, 27(2), 131-138.

5
6
7 Pidgeon, N. F. (1991). Safety culture and risk management in organizations. *Journal of cross-*
8 *cultural psychology*, 22(1), 129-140.

9
10 Pidgeon, N.F., C.Hood, D.Jones, B.Turner and R.Gibson. 1992. Risk Perception. In Risk-
11 Analysis, Perception and Management: Report of a Royal Society Study Group. London:
12 Royal Society, p.89-134.

13
14
15 Renn, O. 2008. Risk Governance: Coping with uncertainty in a complex world. London:
16 Earthscan.

17
18
19 Renn, O., P.-J.Schweizer, M.Dreyer, and A.Klinke. 2007. Risiko. Munich: Okom Verlag

20
21 Tenney, A., Kværner, J., & Gjerstad, K. I. (2006). Uncertainty in environmental impact
22 assessment predictions: the need for better communication and more
23 transparency. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 24(1), 45-56.

24
25
26 Van der Bless, A.M., S. van der Linden, A.Freeman, J.Michell, A.Galvao, L.Zaval and D.
27 Spiegelhalter. 2019. Communicating uncertainty about facts, numbers and
28 science. *Royal Society Open Science*, vol.6, 181870

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

www Only