

**IN CONFIDENCE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE BIOSCIENCE FOR SOCIETY STRATEGY PANEL  
22 and 23 MAY 2013**

**MEETING: BIOSCIENCE FOR SOCIETY STRATEGY PANEL  
19 SEPTEMBER 2013**

**ACTION**

The Panel is invited to:

**APPROVE** the minutes as a true record of the meeting

**DISCUSS** any matters arising (the actions and progress are detailed in Annex I)

IN CONFIDENCE

MINUTES of the Bioscience for Society Strategy Panel Meeting held on 22 and 23 May 2013 at Malmaison, Charterhouse Square, London

Those attending:

Panel Members

Sir Roland Jackson (Chair)  
Ms Wendy Barnaby (on 23 May)  
Professor Kenneth Boyd  
Dr Jane Calvert  
Professor Mark Hankins  
Professor Christine Hauskeller  
Professor Brian Ilbery  
Dr Sandra Knapp  
Mr Patrick Mulvany  
Dr Erinma Ochu (on 22 May)  
Dr Gene Rowe (from 3pm on 22 May)  
Dr Kate Weiner

BBSRC Office

Mr Matt Goode  
Dr Emma Longridge  
Dr Patrick Middleton

Apologies:

Dr Richard Dyer (Dr Dyer has resigned from the Panel with immediate effect. Sir Roland updated BSS during the meeting and noted that Dr Dyer will be missed)  
Dr Patrick Sinnott-Smith  
Professor Russell Foster (observer from BBSRC Council)

**Item 1**

**Chair's welcome and introduction**

1. Sir Roland welcomed the Panel to the meeting and introduced the programme; 22 May - a business meeting, followed by a presentation from Professor Richard Owen on Responsible Innovation, a dinner discussion on the relevance of this to BBSRC, 23 May - a horizon scanning workshop.
2. In preparation for the meeting Sir Roland reminded the Panel of their terms of reference and the five key areas they cover.
3. Mr Goode gave an overview of three current activities that are significant for BBSRC – the ongoing triennial review of the research councils, the spending review for budgets in 2015-16, and the recruitment process for a new BBSRC Chief Executive.

**Item 2**

**Minutes of last meeting**

4. With two adjustments the minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.
5. Arising from these adjustments were two actions:

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore BBSRC's involvement in briefing for the DEFRA Secretary of State's speech at the Oxford Farming Conference, particularly in relation to information provided about the range of options beyond GM.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore whether JIC had provided information or evidence, directly or indirectly, to the European Commission process leading to the Communication on, among other things, the amalgamation of regulations regarding seeds ([http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health\\_consumer/pressroom/docs/communication-com-council-ep\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/docs/communication-com-council-ep_en.pdf)). Also to explore whether, if a submission was made, it can be made available to BSS.

*Matters arising*

6. Sir Roland described his interactions with Institute Directors about public dialogue and Dr Middleton updated the Panel on a successful workshop held with a wider group of Institute staff to explore public dialogue.
7. Sir Roland asked that meeting actions be reported in the minutes in table format to allow greater clarity about completed and ongoing actions

**ACTION:** Secretariat to present actions in table format in meeting minutes

**Item 3**

**Round table of issues**

8. The Panel combined highlighting topics of interest to the group with reviewing the updates from other Strategy Panels.
9. Professor Hankins drew the Panel's attention to the ongoing discussions about the future of the Royal Institution, including the potential for it to become a valuable platform for public engagement.
10. Dr Knapp noted that a number of organisations are merging to become Future Earth (<http://www.icsu.org/future-earth>) whose agenda relates to some of BBSRC's priorities, including food security. NERC are involved and Dr Knapp suggested that BBSRC may also consider linking in.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore how BBSRC is/could be involved with Future Earth

11. Professor Boyd raised a question about BBSRC funding in Northern Ireland. BBSRC do fund research in Northern Ireland but on a comparatively small scale given the smaller research base.
12. Dr Ochu noted a number of activities and articles relating to DIYBio and citizen science that may be of interest to the Panel:
  - 29 May 2013 - Future direction of citizen science event <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/events/citizen-science-wkshp-2013-05/>
  - DIYBIO crowdsource funding <http://bamh1.com/2013/05/22/the-renaissance-of-citizen-science-and-the-emergence-diy-bio-start-ups/>
  - GM policy debate, California @biocurious (hackerspace) <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1itjoMIjJvpdqSBX1nxMxF0zw7AG32R9eHcbAJ6tBeoc/mobilebasic?pli=1>
  - Going rogue [http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career\\_magazine/previous\\_issues/articles/2013\\_05\\_17/credit.a1300107](http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_magazine/previous_issues/articles/2013_05_17/credit.a1300107)
  - Biohackers the politics of openscience <http://www.plutobooks.com/display.asp?K=9780745332802>
  - New citizen science paper:

[http://t.co/AH8fm3Saj9?utm\\_content=buffer8f9a&utm\\_source=buffer&utm\\_medium=twitter&utm\\_campaign=Buffer](http://t.co/AH8fm3Saj9?utm_content=buffer8f9a&utm_source=buffer&utm_medium=twitter&utm_campaign=Buffer)

13. Based on the Basic Bioscience Underpinning Health Strategy Advisory Panel's update BSS briefly discussed epigenetics. There was concern expressed that epigenetics could become framed by the public and others, only in the context of it being a human phenomenon, which of course is not the case.
14. BSS were interested in the stakeholder mapping that the Bioscience for Industry Strategy Panel are undertaking, particularly with respect to how wide the definition of 'stakeholder' will be.
15. It was noted that two documents, from the Food Security Strategy Panel and from the Bioscience Skills and Careers Strategy Panel would be circulated to BSS after the meeting for comment.
16. Dr Calvert updated the Panel on the two Research Advisory Panel meetings she had attended since January. She noted that some of the materials presented to this panel would be useful for BSS to also see; data visualisation work on BBSRC's portfolio and a summary of comments submitted to the consultation on revising the BBSRC Strategic Plan.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore making available to BSS; the data visualisation of BBSRC's portfolio and the summary of comments submitted to the consultation on revising the BBSRC Strategic Plan

17. Dr Calvert also noted two large funding calls (Multidisciplinary Research Centres in Synthetic Biology and Innovation and Knowledge Centres in Synthetic Biology) that BBSRC is involved with that both refer to Responsible Research and Innovation in the call text. She asked how this element of applications was being assessed and BSS expressed a willingness to be involved with this process.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore how applications for Multidisciplinary Research Centres in Synthetic Biology and Innovation and Knowledge Centres in Synthetic Biology are being assessed and offer BSS input

18. Overall, the Panel noted that there is more scope for greater interactions with other Strategy Panels and that they are interested in attending meetings, seeing meeting papers etc. in advance.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore options for greater interactions between BSS and BBSRC's other Strategy Panels

#### **Item 4**

##### **Science communication and public engagement in institutes**

19. Dr Middleton introduced this paper and outlined the two actions for the Panel to focus on – to consider criteria that can be used in ongoing monitoring of institutes' public engagement activities and in the more formal mid-term review as well as looking at the ways in which BBSRC is supporting Institutes and whether there is more that could be done.
20. The overall view was that BBSRC should seek to assess culture and processes with respect to public engagement and science communication rather than individual activities. To do that, BBSRC should assess Institutes against their public engagement embedding plans and provide a guidance document for completing the form.

21. The Panel discussed whether the suggested form is long enough and asks the right questions to be able to assess against the criteria. There was concern expressed that a low word limit on the form does not give the space for meaningful content, although too long was acknowledged to be excessively bureaucratic. Suggestions for supplementary materials included case studies or testimonials (from researchers and participants) that illustrate what has been done and what has been gained from those activities. These could be structured as one each from a senior and junior researcher or a 'best' and 'worst' example.
22. Concerns were raised about the quantitative sections of the form and the implications of asking for absolute numbers rather than proportions. The Panel also wanted to be able to tell whether those partaking in public engagement come from across different grades.
23. The guidance should indicate that Institutes should interpret the questions broadly so that they have enough opportunity for writing about science communication activities and support and training activities should they wish (although in the form these are not explicitly referenced). It should also indicate what 'involved' means.
24. It was noted that it is important that the form be placed in context so that it does not become a bureaucratic 'tick box', tokenistic exercise; it should be an opportunity to reflect. It was also noted that the area of assessment is fairly narrow and does not include reference to how Institutes draw in a wider range of perspectives than the public, including other stakeholders and cross-disciplinary collaborations.
25. It was felt that BBSRC are undertaking a number of activities to support Institutes with public engagement and that at this point those are sufficient. The workshop (paragraph 7) was felt to have been successful and will be followed up with one-to-one contact. This in turn should lead to concrete examples from which all institutes can learn. One institute is considering a business case for a dialogue around industry involvement in publicly-funded research and it was noted that this should be carried out honestly, and not used to further a particular agenda. It was suggested that an opportunity to share best practice between institutes would be valuable.
26. BBSRC Council will be reviewing Institute embedding plans and BSS's comments at their September meeting.

### **Items to Note and rapid items**

#### **Item 5**

#### **Update on communications, public engagement and other activities**

27. Dr Middleton noted that BBSRC is also developing a schools engagement strategy.
28. There was some discussion based on the News team update, about coverage of GM animals and recent discoveries about increasing wheat yields. Mr Mulvany asked about BBSRC's position on the potential role of neonicotinoids in bee population declines and noted that a media briefing on GM animal science has the appearance of promoting the technology. Mr Goode responded to say that BBSRC is funding research on pollinators in order to provide an evidence base rather than to support a particular position. He also clarified that the media briefing was not set up to generate stories but so that journalists are aware of the science when a story arises. It therefore focussed on the science involved in GM animals.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to circulate Bioenergy Public Dialogue policy briefing

#### **Item 6**

#### **GFS Communications and Public Engagement update**

29. Mr Mulvany expressed concerns about BBSRC and GFS being set on a specific paradigm of what food security is and how the problem of food security might be solved. He expressed interest in knowing what the Food Security Strategy Panel is doing to advise BBSRC and GFS on options, especially in relation to work in other regions and countries in support of local food providers. He noted that there is much more nuance than is currently portrayed. Dr Middleton described how GFS is a much wider partnership than BBSRC and that the GFS strategy is currently being reframed to take greater account of a spectrum of expertise.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to send Mr Mulvany the link to the GFS public dialogue work

30. Sir Roland noted that the dialogue stream of GFS is moving very slowly and whilst he appreciated the difficulties of working with a large number of partner organisations, he encouraged BBSRC to press for progress.

31. The Panel also queried how GFS defines and uses words such as 'sustainability' and how it incorporates different framings of the issues.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explore inviting Professor Tim Benton (GFS Champion) to attend BSS

#### **Setting the context, Dinner discussion and workshop**

32. The rest of the meeting took the form of a presentation and discussion on responsible Innovation (RI) followed by a dinner discussion exploring what RI means for BBSRC. On 23 May, a workshop was held to explore what the topics and issues are that BSS should focus on in the coming years and how the Panel will work to deliver this. Notes of each of these sessions can be found in Annex II-IV.

**ACTION:** Secretariat to draft and circulate meeting minutes and workshop note as soon as possible

**ACTION:** BSS and Secretariat to develop a workplan and actions before BSS's next meeting

**ACTION:** Secretariat to explain why access to grant applications is restricted for BSS members and clarify how grant applications are made public, including through Freedom of Information

Action	Status	Comment
Secretariat to explore BBSRC's involvement in briefing for the DEFRA Secretary of State's speech at the Oxford Farming Conference, particularly in relation to information provided about the range of options beyond GM.	Complete	Liaised with Council Secretariat. No Ministerial briefings were provided in relation to this speech.
Secretariat to explore whether JIC had provided information or evidence, directly or indirectly, to the European Commission process leading to the Communication on, among other things, the amalgamation of regulations regarding seeds ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/docs/communication-com-council-ep_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/docs/communication-com-council-ep_en.pdf</a> ). Also to explore whether, if a submission was made, it can be made available to BSS.	Complete	Liaised with JIC Director, Dale Sanders who responded 'I can report that the JIC has not provided any evidence, directly or indirectly on the EC process leading to the communication in question.'
Secretariat to present actions in table format in meeting minutes	Complete	
Secretariat to explore how BBSRC is/could be involved with Future Earth	Complete	BBSRC is not currently involved with Future Earth. The Secretariat has passed the suggestion to colleagues in Science Group.
Secretariat to explore making available to BSS; the data visualisation of BBSRC's portfolio and the summary of comments submitted to the consultation on revising the BBSRC Strategic Plan	Complete	The summary of comments has been circulated to BSS. The data visualisation was circulated at the same time as papers were sent out.
Secretariat to explore how applications for Multidisciplinary Research Centres in Synthetic Biology (SBRC) and Innovation and Knowledge Centres in Synthetic Biology (IKC) are being assessed and offer BSS input	Complete	<p>The SBRC applications will be assessed by external peer-review and a specially convened Panel of experts encompassing the full scientific remit of the proposals and including expertise from the social sciences (and BSS). The Panel will assess the proposals using the scope and aims of the call, taking into account the reviewers' comments and the applicants' response.</p> <p>The Panel will also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the excellence of the scientific proposal</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the strategic importance of the Centre to BBSRC, EPSRC and the applicants' institutions</li> <li>• appropriateness of the proposed pathways to economic and social impact</li> <li>• timeliness and promise</li> <li>• value for money</li> <li>• the training and career development potential offered by the Centre</li> <li>• the long-term sustainability of the Centre</li> </ul> <p>The Panel will generate a rank-ordered list to identify the Centres that are recommended for funding.</p> <p>The IKC call was led by EPSRC. Proposals were assessed by an independent panel of experts in early summer 2013 and announced on 11 July.</p>
Secretariat to explore options for greater interactions between BSS and BBSRC's other Strategy Panels	Complete	Paper circulated to BSS
Secretariat to circulate Bioenergy Public Dialogue policy briefing	Complete	Circulated at the same time as papers were sent out.
Secretariat to send Mr Mulvany the link to the GFS public dialogue work	Complete	
Secretariat to explore inviting Professor Tim Benton (GFS Champion) to attend BSS	Ongoing	Tim Benton was unavailable to attend BSS's September meeting but the Secretariat will explore inviting him in future
Secretariat to draft and circulate meeting minutes and workshop note as soon as possible	Complete	
BSS and Secretariat to develop a workplan and actions before BSS's next meeting	Complete	This has become a paper for the BSS meeting
Secretariat to explain why access to grant applications is restricted for BSS members and clarify how [grant applications] they are made public, including through Freedom of Information	Complete	

## Annex II

### **Note of BSS discussion following a presentation from Professor Richard Owen, University of Exeter on Responsible Innovation (RI)**

1. Professor Owen spoke to the Panel outlining the history and context for 'Responsible Innovation'. He then described the main principles of RI, including being anticipatory, reflexive, deliberative and responsive. The big question to consider is 'What kind of future do we want science and innovation to bring into the world?' and this requires an examination of the purposes, motivations and values around science and innovation.
2. Professor Owen underlined the importance of a true culture change rather than a 'tick box' approach to RI. He also talked about how RI could be implemented and emphasised the fact that it offers a framework for thinking rather than a prescriptive programme and that it will apply in different ways (or not at all) in different situations and with different people.
3. In the following discussions a number of topics were raised and discussed, although no conclusions were reached:
  - How do Research Councils fund truly multidisciplinary projects where many specialists work together?
  - How can a wider range of perspectives be drawn in?
  - People choose their job to fulfil their values and will move out of science when the pervading values don't fit with theirs – is that ok?
  - Education and training would be needed to embed a culture and to give researchers the wide range of skills needed to engage fully in RI
  - Directed programmes may be better placed to begin to implement RI rather than applying it in a blanket way
  - RI will be applied differently at different levels within an organisation
  - There needs to be a recognition of the political landscape in which RI would be implemented
  - RI is happening. BBSRC could engage with it now and make it meaningful for BBSRC.

### **Note of BSS dinner discussion about Responsible Innovation and BBSRC**

1. Sir Roland opened the discussion by posing questions for the Panel about whether BBSRC should adopt RI, and if so whether RI as a phrase should be used and how the principles might be implemented. Some of the ideas discussed are recounted below.
2. The Panel discussed the fact that RI is now being widely used both in the UK and the EU. It is therefore not avoidable but means that the term by itself may not be useful. BBSRC may want to use the term and flesh out the meaning in a BBSRC context. This is still timely as no-one really knows yet what it looks like to actually do RI. However, it was also noted that there is a need to engage with EPSRC and ESRC to link up motivations and agendas between the Research Councils.
3. RI will not be applicable everywhere. BSS discussed the diversity of the BBSRC portfolio and the need to apply RI at different levels, potentially with slightly different definitions. They suggested that it will be more important to apply RI at an organisational level, before projects are funded, rather than with researchers. There was a recognition that RI is a process, not a one-off activity. It was suggested that it would be important to look at where decisions are taken within BBSRC and open them up as they happen, to bring in different voices. It is important to look forwards and make plans for the future rather than retro fit RI to existing activities.
4. There was some discussion around the challenges that RI presents. It requires a willingness to accept that conflict and challenge are inherent to being open. It needs a culture where there is honesty about potential benefits and risks and where it is ok to make mistakes, admit when something isn't working and change it.
5. The Panel also discussed BBSRC's position as a Non-departmental Public Body and how this affects its ability respond to RI.

## Notes on horizon scanning workshop 23 May

This Annex is an edited transcript of flipcharts used during the workshop.

Initial topics and issues highlighted in group discussion that BSS could consider over the next few years:

- Culture change, are BBSRC and the science community open to engagement?
- Involvement in training (with respect to concepts such as openness, RI), MSc, BSc
- Digital organisms, open data (linked to Exploiting New Ways of Working Strategy Advisory Panel)
- DIYBio
- Honest broker role
- Balance between effective and interesting research
- Role of intellectual property and whether/how it drives funding choices
- Openness, what it means in the context of open data, open access, motivations and intellectual property?
- Research for 'public good' is an opportunity for discussion – what does it mean?
- Public awareness/knowledge deficit around topics such as the aging population, globalisation, sustainability, waste
- BSS would like to be more involved in BBSRC decision making, they have role to challenge but need to be able to input at the right times. BSS can give guidance on issues or topics to think about – e.g. what is sustainability?
- Help BBSRC think about problems not technologies
- Challenge BBSRC 'rhetoric' e.g. around food security
- Recognise science drivers e.g. publishing models, where the money is
- Continue to ask questions as projects etc. develop so we can identify when something is not delivering as expected and stop funding it. Follow up on claims e.g. around solving problems
- Basic versus challenge led/applied research – what is ok?
- Cross-Council work around 'grand challenges'
- Why hasn't IAASTD influenced BBSRC?

Topics and issues highlighted in breakout groups, with results of prioritisation voting in brackets:

- Help BBSRC be open to challenge e.g. bring Panel Chairs, Directors to BSS for discussion/challenge. Important that the timing is before decisions are made (7)
- Openness about the way decisions are made and justification showing the range of other options that are available. Transparent accountable process open to influence (6)
- BBSRC's role in basic bioscience
  - Encourage cross-fertilisation
  - Develop principles for responsible innovation, how to do research in light of society, an A4 sheet for approval by Council (which can then be built on) (5)
  - Think about how to operationalize responsible innovation
- Education on openness within BBSRC e.g. Research Advisory Panel and with researchers for the long term, e.g. students. Training e.g. in DTPs, also public engagement training. Link with the Bioscience Skills and Careers Panel (3+2, total 5)
- Stakeholder mapping and involvement, what does this mean? (4)
- BSS to help BBSRC to horizon scan upcoming topics (digital organisms and DIYBio) (2)

- How does BBSRC ensure we have really engaged with a wide range of views, not just a slice (1)
- How to help ask questions when BSS don't always have the technical knowledge (1)
- Support BBSRC to articulate (or formulate) challenges in open, reflective ways, increase BSS involvement across BBSRC (1)
- Helping BBSRC, executive and Council etc. to fully engage with and understand being open, openness (1)
- Link to terms of reference, how to do horizon scanning, what are the outputs? (1)
- Interdisciplinarity and link to challenge led research (1)
- How to frame calls so that different people are willing/able to apply or new people apply rather than just rearranging the status quo
- Taking public concerns seriously, and being responsive to them
- Role for BSS in upstream priority setting to encourage accountability and reflexiveness, 'illumination'
- BSS workplan to develop and understand attitudes to openness, prevalence of deficit model
- Increased BSS/wider/diverse representation on other panels and Council – to ensure ongoing questioning and reflection
- Gain understanding of how strategic decision making actually happens, flows etc.
- Openness and public good, what it means, principles, culture
- Defining 'normative' words, sustainable, food security, natural. Challenge BBSRC to explain them, how are they framed?
- Are BSS the right people?
- Paradox, lack of technology, a lot of data, too much technology. Techno fixes. Corrupted, use, store data

---

The top six prioritised topics were discussed again to identify what BSS might do to move the issues forward:

**Help BBSRC be open to challenge** e.g. bring Panel Chairs, Directors to BSS for discussion/challenge

- Not oppositional, two-way discussion 'dialogue'
- Requires good briefing for BSS and guests
- Options for format/length and opportunity for an informal element
- Important that the timing is before decisions are made
- What fits the BSS meeting cycle? Who should come and when?

**Openness about the way decisions are made.** Justification showing the range of other options that are available and reasons why they were rejected. Transparent accountable process open to influence.

- Make plans around openness
- BSS guidelines/expectations towards strategy setting
- Reflexivity mechanism for strategies developed short term
- Requirement for other Panels to open agenda/minutes, BSS could publish papers too
- Larger pool of views or expertise, a consultative group
- Project for BSS to define what openness is
- Lay membership of Panels could be an alternative to publishing only heavily redacted minutes

**Develop principles for 'responsible innovation'**, how to do research in light of society, an A4 sheet for approval by Council (which can then be built on)

- Aspirations, things by which to 'regulate' ourselves
- Having them is not enough, principles must inform process, process should reflect principles
- Principles will be applicable in different ways by different people – could draw up a table with examples
- Principles would need to have enough detail to be useful
- We would need to draw in different voices to inform the development of principles
- The principles should be understandable by a lay person
- We already have principles but are we clear what they mean and are they implemented? We should extract those principles and look at whether we are implementing them, ask questions, find out who to challenge
  - Reflexive
  - Anticipatory
  - Mutually responsive
  - Deliberative
  - Inclusive
  - Transparent, open
  - Systematic approach
  - Clarity of purpose
  - Effective/influential
  - Justify action (or inaction)
  - Dissemination of what is going on
- There are links with the Exploiting New Ways of Working Panel and their discussion on trust
- Clarity is needed on BSS's role in decision making
- Lay summaries could be improved – there could be a role for BSS in reviewing and returning poor lay summaries

### **Education and training**

- Need a wide view of where BBSRC should be involved, from BSc, MSc and PhD
- Could require certain kinds of certified training before allowing students onto a PhD programme, as ESRC do
- Links with other Strategy Panels include Exploiting New Ways of Working and Bioscience Skills and Careers (BSS have already been asked to comment on the BBSRC Skills statement)
- Engage with the BBSRC Skills and Careers Unit around Doctoral Training Partnerships and current requirements and opportunities

### **Stakeholder mapping and involvement**

- Set up a working group to develop a starter paper
- Examine how and why BBSRC currently do stakeholder engagement at the levels of BBSRC, Institutes, Programmes (e.g. GFS) and responsive mode
- Look at the literature, best practice
- Question on application form
- How involved are stakeholders, consult/shape etc. and when are they involved
- Existing lists of stakeholders for specific issues
- Where does the public voice sit?
- How are stakeholders chosen? Are they representative or illustrative? What about the 'hard to reach' or 'less heard'? How are stakeholders involved when the sizes of the organisations vary considerably?
- When is stakeholder engagement appropriate, especially basic versus applied research (link with interdisciplinarity)

**BSS to help BBSRC to horizon scan upcoming topics**

- A two-yearly face-to-face exercise based on stakeholder work, data about BBSRC's portfolio. Particularly to explore the edges of what BBSRC does, what happens next
- Make the process formalised, robust, open
- Use BSS's expertise but also recommend others to help
- Maintain awareness of other foresight reports
- How to translate outcomes into actions
- Could trial with a topic such as big data, DIYBio, digital organisms, citizen science – prepare a starter paper on this
- Use scenario planning