

BRIDGING THE GAP - Using Science to Inform the Development of Policy.

Opening Remarks

Fintan Hurley, IOM Edinburgh

fintan.hurley@iom-world.org



-Thanks for coming to this one-day Workshop...
-In case of fire....
- Overall theme - using science to inform the development of policy
 - Science is only one input into the development of policy
 - But increasingly there is an interest that policy be based in (scientific) evidence
 - And seen to be based in evidence
 - That raises a lot of questions about the evidence base, and how to use it to inform policy development



- How strong is the evidence base? To what extent does it give clear answers to questions that policy makers need to know?
- How can its strengths and weakness - in relation to the policy under consideration - be assessed in a fair and reasonable way?
- What is the degree of consensus about these answers?
- What are the evidence gaps that matter? What can be done to fill them, in what timescale?
 - Maximum Technically Feasible Reduction (MTFR)
 - MTFR of uncertainty?
- How can the scientific evidence be made accessible and available to policy makers, to special interest groups (NGOs, industry...), to the general public, in a way that is
 - Fair and accurate
 - Useful, and used, within the policy process



1. Co-operation between two Integrated Projects under EU FP6: Environment and Health, Global Change and Ecosystems
 - INTARESE - 5 yrs; 33 partners; will finish 31 October 2010
 - HEIMTSA - 4 years; 21 partners; will finish 31 January 2011
 - Both developing methods of Integrated Health Impact Assessment for linking science with policy in environment and health
 - Working closely with other FP6 and FP7 projects, e.g. 2-FUN, HENVINET

2. WHO Series of Meetings in preparation for the Ministerial Conference in Parma in March 2010
 - 'Bridging the Gap' Conference in Madrid, October 08
 - Conference here, 28-29 January 2009
 - Thanks to WHO for allowing us to link with them



Morning - Using Science and to Inform the Development of Policy - Indoor Air as an example

- Three talks, to set the scene
- Questions for clarification after each one - 30 mins total
- Three or four Discussion Groups
- And no coffee break - outrageous!

Afternoon

- One talk
- The same groups, looking at a wider set of questions
- Coffee break!
- Panel discussion



Indoor Air as an example

- Why indoor air?
- Indoor where?
 - Homes / Residences; Public buildings; In traffic?
- What do we mean by indoor air pollution?
 - Pollution experienced indoors; or from indoor sources?

Three talks, with time for questions for clarification

Discussion Groups

- Each group focuses on one of the questions
- You choose which group you want to join
- Chair/ Convenor will report back to the Workshop via the Panel
- Rapporteur to capture more detailed thinking for the 2 projects



Some reminders, to help participation

1. Everyone here has a contribution to make - we want everybody's thinking
 - Not just the people who feel confident, or who speak English well
2. Take care with your language!
 - Speak slowly, clearly and distinctly ...and the native English speakers will understand one another for the 1st time
 - No need to change your accent....
 - It's not what you say that matters, it's what people hear and understand
 - Short breaks....
3. Ensure that everybody gets a chance to speak and contribute...
 - Nobody speaks twice until everyone has the chance to speak once
 - Nobody speaks 4 times until everyone has the chance to speak twice
 - After that - everyone is involved



1. Who are the main players affecting indoor air and how do their decisions and actions affect indoor air quality and human health?
2. What types of action are most appropriate in relation to indoor air, and how can these be evaluated and compared?
3. What are the science demands to support effective action on indoor air and human health?



Breakout groups to consider the general question of:

How can we best influence the policy-making process in ways that better protect public health?

Discussions will focus on:

1. What can we learn from the CAFE experience - and how applicable is it to other policy areas?
2. How can we best address the gap between science and policy assessment?
3. How can we improve the use of assessment methods in policy-making?

