

International Workshop
Joint-Fact Finding for the Future: Applying lessons to the
practice of policy-making

Short Comment

Hideyuki Hirakawa

平川秀幸

Osaka University

1. Willingness, Incentives

- From presentations:
 - Dr. Adler: Willingness to participate by key stakeholders and technical experts
 - Prof. Rip: There must be something at stake to create incentive for joint inquiry..
- How to attract interests of stakeholders including policy makers in joint inquiry?
 - They sometimes have rather negative incentives, not open to further questions about the facts.
 - Difficulties in changing the political process.
(Matsuura-san)

2. Narrative/scenario

- This issue raise the question how to realize the experimental governance, which is unfamiliar for traditional political culture of government that has been captured by the fallacy of infallibility.
- Need “commitment” to the future scenario: not “prediction” but “setting out” the future.

2. Narrative/scenario

- How to cope with and to maintain the openness to errors, unintended consequences, surprises, indeterminacy, learning ...?
 - raising question how to (re)build/maintain the public trust of government, scientific institutions, or mutual trust among stakeholders.
 - Key:
 - In relation to knowledge: "repertoire learning"
 - In relation to trust: legitimacy of purpose/intention
- Question of responsibility, differentiation, allocation among stakeholders, policymakers and experts.

3. Generic in RRI

- The questions of who to do that? and where?
 - Prof. Rip: “Who will actually put effort into realizing all this?”:
- How to realize active and meaningful engagement of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH)?
- Who is the “stakeholders”?
 - Explicit/implicit, present/future
 - Elaborate stakeholder analysis
 - Everyday practice of “curatorial work” to find stakeholders.