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# Readings

## {Torrance, 2006 #5538} When do policy-makers listen to science?

### Basic point here is understanding that it's not “science speaking truth to power” but a more complicated case where the science moves along and then “windows of opportunity” open up where the issue becomes more salient and institutional processes are established that give science more legitimacy. THESE are the processes by which science gets accepted.

# Faith/opinion/knowledge discussion

## During first class, all of you put yourself in one of the 6 categories and that is based on some set of BELIEFS about the world. All of you laid out something you KNOW and something you don’t know about climate change.

## So, for starters:

### How do you know what you know about climate change? How did you learn it?

### Why do you feel unsure about other things?

### Sources of information? Why do you believe some sources?

### What sources of information do you use? How many of you consciously use sources that run contrary to your existing thinking?

### In short, WHY do we believe what we believe?

When does Science influence Policy?

# Successful policy influence

## Requires…

### Salience

### Credibility

### Legitimacy

## Involves a process

# Requirement 1: Salience

## Information relevant to an actor’s decision choices

## Timing matters, not too early or too late for decisions being made

## Right scale & scope, not too narrow or too broad

## Options must be “viable”

# Requirement 1: Salience (no chance of salience)

## Discussing adaptation in 2004

## Optimal gas tax for US policy-makers

## Strategies for building a no-growth economy

# Requirement 1: Salience (potential salience)

## Farmers in Zimbabwe WANT to know

### How to take advantage of rainy years

### What plants do well during rainy years?

### Which years are likely to be rainy?

## What Met Societies give farmers:

### Which years are likely to be droughts?

## Source: Anthony Patt

# Requirement 2: Credibility

## “Worth believing”

### Judged by proxy

### Participants: expertise & trustworthiness

## Process rules: methods & funding

## Even “truth” may be rejected if proposed by those, or in ways, that “can’t be trusted”

# Requirement 3: Legitimacy

## Process must treat concerns and values of those affected (stakeholders) fairly and with respect

## Judged based on:

### Participants: were those with “my” views included?

### Process: were my concerns and values inputs to process and given fair hearing?

# Requirement 3: Legitimacy (little chance of legitimacy)

### Speaking truth to power

### Not invented here:

#### European science in international negotiations on persistent organic pollutants

# How to do policy-relevant science – theory

## Adopt long-term "co-production" perspective

## Integrate scientists, stakeholders, and policymakers in "doing the science":

### Gets questions right (salience)

### Gains access to better data (credibility)

### Respects stakeholders’ concerns (legitimacy)

## Choices about models, facts, beliefs, and options matter

## Science cannot arbitrate when Values differ

# How to do policy-relevant science – practice

## Identify what IS salient, don’t make it salient

## Involve stakeholders in the process and respect their concerns

## Become part of a team; share the credit

## Check in regularly

## Evaluate your process and impact

# How Science has Influenced Policy in Climate Change

## Science hasn’t changed that much since 1975 or so

## US was “first in”, and President Bush went to Rio to sign it, and US ratified it

## But US pushed Kyoto in 1997 and never ratified it

## Prospects in US have gotten worse over time

## But European states have stayed supportive throughout this time

## US is one of only a few countries in which there is real contestation of the science

# Concluding Review

## Salience

## Credibility

## Legitimacy

## Process