

Stakeholder consensus and perspectives for ecological modeling in the pesticide regulatory process

A.D. Hunka,

A. Palmqvist, P. Thorbek, V. Forbes



“Prediction
is very difficult,
especially about
the future.”

Niels Bohr



Academia



Regulators



Industry

Stakeholders

Acceptance of models

Risk communication

Changes in regulatory framework



Where do ecological models fit?

Methods

Semi-structured interviews

Snowball sampling

Data saturation

Readability analysis



Methods: interviews

Flesch-Kincaid readability tests

Used for transcribed interviews


F-K Grade Level and Flesch Reading Ease

Readability analysis

Modellers and non-modellers

10 countries

Experienced
and new stakeholders



Methods: participants

Results

Academia

11

4

Regulators

13

1

Industry

12


3

■ Positive

■ Sceptic

Who believes in ecological models?

Word frequency



V for Validation

INDUSTRY - Grade: 11, RE:49


ACADEMIA - Grade: 12, RE: 43

REGULATORS - Grade: 11, RE: 45

EFSA & SETAC
Journals

TIME
Magazine

Comic
books



Language of ERA

Realistic is:



Ecologically
relevant



Worst-case
Conservative



Aiding
decision-making

Differences between groups

Communication



Educate
Explain



Understand



Talk
Discuss

Differences between groups

Conclusions

Did it work?



SETAC advisory group
MODELINK workshops
15 (at least) modelling
case studies



Wind of Change

We Can Do It!



J. Howard Miller

POST FEB. 15 TO FEB. 28



WAR PRODUCTION CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

- Simple, but complex
- Specific, but generic
- Probabilistic, but binary

Expectations or reality?

Matter of time

Protection goals and models

Advisory groups and workshops

Conclusions

Feedback wanted!

Guidance documents
for modelling



Conclusions



Thank you
very much!

This research has been financially supported by the European Union under the 7th Framework Programme (project acronym CREAM, contract number PITN-GA-2009-238148.)