



Feedback from Post-Its; What kind of « consensus » ?

Claire Mays

Social Psychologist, Symlog, France

Process advisor for the IUR symposium

19 November 2015

Post-Its : at least 3, or all 6!

These prompts were addressed individually on the first day of the symposium

- 1. Your main question at start of symposium;**
- 2. Your principle reaction to the former consensus statement, at this point in time;**
- 3. Your main objection to any aspect! Data, consensus, studies, approaches, this symposium;**
- 4. A major 'tension' you see structuring inquiry;**
- 5. The main priority you see for advancing radioecology at this point in time;**
- 6. The main ethical or philosophical value that inspires you in your personal [radioecology] identity today.**

Reaction to the former consensus statement (16)

- *A lot of progress has been made / Amazingly little progress has been made*
- *'Uncertainties and controversy still exist regarding LT consequences of chronic exposure for wildlife'*
- A good starting point – needs to be revisited.
- High level statements, but little advice on practical implementation in different contexts.
- Lacks methodological diversity and not really based on (experimental) studies in nature

Main objection (*on radioecology-type work today*) (9)

- Basic groundwork is missing
 - *‘As a scientist, I like to collect more fact, first’*
 - *‘Lack of account of sublethal effects on physiology, behavior & life history/how effects translate into population-level dynamics’*
- Quality issues
 - Poor exposure characterization in field; data QC; assumptions not transparent, testable scientific hypotheses not specified
- Pressures
 - *‘Tendency of regulator to focus on simplicity even when complexity dominates; inertia created by RAP approach resists change to an ecosystem approach’*

Major 'tension' structuring inquiry (15)

- Trust in (other people's) data /analysis
 - *'What constitutes scientific evidence/ evidence of a real effect?'*
 - Noise ; *'Does uncertainty in dose estimation account for differences between lab vs. field measured effects? '*
 - *'Comfort with with high-level math/stats'*
- Gaps in knowledge
 - From individual to population to ecosystem /dynamics
 - High dose/low dose effects
- Alignment of methods/objects with aims
 - *'Using accidents to regulate daily work contains pitfalls in understanding daily work'*
- Prevailing paradigms excluding contrary evidence/approaches
 - Funding and career effects

Priority for advancing radioecology (25)

- Field realities
 - *‘Going to reality and getting feedback from that, rather than to make a hypothetical framework’*
 - More good quality data from the field/wildlife population, well thought-out approaches/methods
- Linkage between field and lab,
 - Testable hypotheses, focusing on factors contributing most to uncertainties in impact/risk assessment
- **Broad, coordinated, multidisciplinary, sustainably funded study/monitoring effort incorporating more ecological conceptualizations/knowledge in radioecology**
- Reflection on political/societal issues
 - *‘Real biodiversity is not always advantageous to humans’*
 - Communicating understandings to the public

Ethical or philosophical inspiration

(15)

- 7 – Ecocentric
- 3 – Mixed
ecocentric/biocentric/anthropocentric
- 1 – Integrity and humanism
- 4 – Evidence-based, scientific analysis and decision

What kind of « consensus »?

- The Post-Its showed convergences
- And also: **different identities**

Organizers' ambition:

- A statement that can:
 - Contribute to a radioecology with more ecology in it.
 - Foster a better, more complete system of environmental protection.
- A statement that is balanced, that recognizes the different identities and objectives of those who can contribute to this improvement.
- A statement that all participants can/want to sign:
 - We need explicit help with that.
 - Please be sure that your voice is represented.