

Deliverable Report

Deliverable D3.5	List and description of civil society groups and (re)insurance companies approached
Due date of deliverable	2022/04/30
Approved by MC	2022/06/13 (written procedure)
Actual submission date	2022/06/13 (to EC)
File name	D3.5 – List and description of civil society groups and (re)insurance companies approached

Author(s) and beneficiary acronym:	Lead authors: Véronique Adam (TEMASOL) Beatrice Salieri (TEMASOL) Blanca Suarez (TEMASOL) Devendra Joshi (TEMASOL) Mikko Rissanen (DIALOG BASIS) James Baker (NIA) Steffi Friedrichs (AcumenIST)
Work package/task:	WP3 / Task 3.3
Document status:	draft / <u>final</u>
Confidentiality:	confidential / restricted / <u>public</u>
Key words:	

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Reason of change
1.0	01.03.2022	Blanca Suarez Merino first draft
1.1	09.03.2022	Mikko Rissanen second draft
1.2	28.03.2022	Beatrice Salieri third draft
1.3	04.05.2022	Blanca Suarez Merino fourth draft
1.4	19.05.2022	James Baker fifth draft
1.5	20.05.2022	Steffi Friedrichs sixth draft
1.6	23.05.2022	Susanne Resch final review



Lead beneficiary for this deliverable: TEMAS Solutions GmbH Switzerland

Owner(s) of this document TEMASOL	

Dissemination Level:			
PU	Defined in the DoA	CO	PU PP RE CO
PP		Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE		Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO		Confidential, only for partners of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

1.	Gov4Nano Advisory Board	Yes
2.	NMBP-13 NANORIGO	Yes
3.	NMBP-13 RiskGONE	Yes

Table of Contents

1	Summary	4
2	Description of task	4
3	Description of work & main achievements	4
3.1	Background of the task	4
3.2	Description of the work carried out and methodology	4
3.2.1	Civil Society	4
3.2.2	(Re)insurance companies	6
4	Data management – only for a limited number of tasks relevant	7
5	Deviations from the work plan	7
6	Performance of the partners	7

1 Summary

This deliverable collects and describes the methodology followed together with the contacted list of civil society groups and (re)insurance companies approached to identify the needs and concerns of those groups regarding Nanotechnologies. Further activities which followed are presented in Gov4Nano Deliverable 3.6.

2 Description of task

Task 3.3 aims to interact with interested people from different stakeholder groups, on the one hand, educating them about the organisational form for nano risk governance, and on the other hand, taking into account the feedback provided by the stakeholders and assessing the completeness and representativeness of this organisational form (open innovation, or co-creation process). Throughout the runtime of the Task, trainings, education activities and inspiring lectures from key experts facilitated out-of-the box thinking related to current experimental, informatics and modelling practices, and enabled civil society to form their own non-biased opinion.

Initially we mainly focused on level group 1 (civil society); this is the widest and more complex group so initially it was proposed to break this large group into subgroups based on 1) age (school children, elderly, working professionals, etc.) and 2) content related to final products (chemicals, cosmetics, food, electronics, automotive industry). Task 3.3 started addressing - as a kind of pilot - one particular age group (e.g., young scientists) linked to a high impact content related product (e.g., chemicals). This task worked on key questions for a particular societal group.

Secondly a similar exercise was performed with insurance companies. We focused on the training, education and out-of-the-box thinking of the (re-)insurance industry. Unlike civil societies, (re-)insurers are a professional expert stakeholder, who need to be able to quantify and limit a complex perceived risk into its well-characterised and clearly delineated/limited elements, before it can be formally adopted into a portfolio policy.

Despite these specific requirements and the industry's pivotal role, the insurance industry does not seem to have kept up with the advancement of nanotechnology developments and the adoption of products into the market since the initial studies by Allianz and OECD (2004) and by Swiss-RE (2007). Neither does the industry seem interested or able to spend much time being informed or trained about the developments in nanotechnology.

3 Description of work & main achievements

3.1 Background of the task

The overarching objective of the Gov4nano project is to develop a proof of concept of an efficient and effective risk governance process for nanotechnologies, encouraging a participative and pro-active form of governance. To this aim, the organisational form for nano risk governance will involve all relevant stakeholders, such as consumers, regulators, industry or academia. To achieve the Gov4nano goal we need to understand stakeholder needs and concerns regarding nanotechnologies, so they can be addressed timely. This task set out to develop activities to implement training and education to assist project partners in understanding how training and education can help various audiences build their opinion on nanotechnologies. The activities performed in this task also help raise awareness and involvement from such stakeholders.

3.2 Description of the work carried out and methodology

3.2.1 Civil Society

In the first stages of Task 3.1, available studies and reports on public perception on nanotechnologies (e.g., the Eurobarometer, synthesis report of the project Nanoview of the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment) were compiled and their findings complemented with sociological risk research on the emergence risk perceptions in the civil society. The findings were summarised in the first deliverable of T3.1, D3.1 "Report on parameters, elements and

information forming and influencing the risk perception of different civil society groups". It was noted that a great number of public engagement activities have already been performed by previous projects and that the bulk of knowledge on the preferences of the general public is extensive.

Based on this analysis, it was agreed that the focus of the civil society engagement activities would be set on generating concrete recommendations for possible public communication by the envisaged organisational structure of risk governance of nanotechnologies. Special attention was to be paid to crisis communication in situations where nanomaterials or applications of nanotechnologies would become subject to increased public criticism or in outright crisis situations.

In Task 3.1, the Gov5Nano Beneficiary DIALOG BASIS accordingly interviewed experts working with public communication of nanotechnologies (representatives of existing consumer information platforms, public authorities, industry and civil society organisations) as well as bloggers and social media influencers not primarily focused on nanotechnologies. Based on the interviews, task leader DIALOG BASIS formulated eleven concrete recommendations for lay-people oriented communication with the civil society (D3.2 "Report and best-practice guidelines for communication, information provision and engagement").

More activities performed under Gov4nano also identified a list of organisations from different backgrounds and countries which were invited to various webinars organised by NIA (Table 1), though as agreed at the time, the names of the institutes should remain anonymous.

Table 1 Types of institutes engaged at different stakeholder events organised by NIA.

Type of organisation	Location
NGO	France
Standards	UK
Standards	Germany
Standards	The Netherlands
Industry	Belgium
Consultancy	UK
NGO	Belgium
NGO	Belgium
Academia	UK
Consultancy	UK

In order to involve external stakeholders in the conclusions of WP3 and Task 3.1 on civil society communication of nanomaterials, DIALOG BASIS presented the results in a joint webinar "Talking about nanomaterials: Challenges and recommendations" of NIA and the EU NanoSafety Cluster in January 2022.

In addition to these activities, BNN and DIALOG BASIS took part in the joint NMBP-13 project dissemination activities in the European Researchers' Night (ERN) 2020 on 27 November 2020. Working together with the organisers of the "Nacht der Wissenschaft" in Kiel, Germany, DIALOG BASIS organised and moderated a public digital workshop with approximately 40 participants on consumer preferences and responsible development of nanomaterials. BNN organised a 45 minutes workshop with more than 70 participants (lay people from age 14+) during the "Life is Science" in Graz, Austria.

3.2.2 (Re)insurance companies

Insurance companies were identified based on personal contacts, company contacts and internet searchers (including workshops, webinars, presentations at key events and publications). It was generally difficult to identify the relevant individual and this led to many unfruitful calls. Those calls which were successful generally met some uninterested staff who did not want to evaluate the benefits or downfalls of Risk Governance in the nanotechnology sector. A script was developed as presented in Gov4nano D3.6 to set the scene prior to a potential training event. At three occasions only (Table 2) those initial telephone contacts were successful. The companies contacted by TEMASOL were identified around a German speaking area (Switzerland, Austria, Germany) and consisted of (re)insurance and insurance companies of different sizes (global and local companies). TEMASOL reached out and was welcome by the Swiss Insurance Association, which represents several insurance companies in Switzerland and our training material was presented at some of their events. Unfortunately Risk Governance of Nanotechnology was not received with interest at those events and conversations were not pursued any further.

Table 2 List of (re) insurance companies contacted, as well as the staff from TEMAS Solutions responsible for starting the conversations. Positive responses which led to an interview are highlighted in green.

Short Name	Organisation	City	Contacted by
SVV	Swiss insurance Association	Zürich (CH)	Blanca Suarez-Merino
Swissi	Swissi AG	Wallisellen (CH)	Blanca Suarez-Merino
FHR	FHR anlagenbau GmbH	Ottendorf.Okrilla (DE)	Deven Joshi
VLV	Vorarlberger Landes-Versicherung VaG	Bregenz (AT)	Deven Joshi
RVT	RVT Versicherungs-Teruhand AG	Oberriet (CH)	Blanca Suarez-Merino
GRAWE	Grazer Wechselseitige Versicherung AG	Graz (AT)	Deven Joshi
Allianz Suisse	Allianz Suisse	Wallisellen (CH)	Blanca Suarez-Merino
Allianz Trieste S.p.A	Allianz S.p.A.	Trieste (IT)	Blanca Suarez-Merino
Allianz München	Allianz Global Corporate & Specialty AG	München (DE)	Deven Joshi
Mobiliar Versicherung	Schweizerische Mobiliar Versicherungsgesellschaft	St Gallen (CH)	Deven Joshi
Munich Re	Münchener Rückversicherungs-Gesellschaft	Munich (DE)	Deven Joshi
Qatar re	Qatar Reinsurance Company Limited Zürich branch	Zürich (CH)	Blanca Suarez-Merino

Conclusions:

The conclusions collected are the result of the views of individuals; these may not represent the views of their corresponding companies:

Nanotechnology was perceived as a sector with large potential, but not necessarily a target for the (re)insurance sector. It was generally understood that companies dealing with nanomaterials should keep themselves updated with upcoming regulation. On this front the nanotechnology sector may face similar problems to those of the Genetically Modified Foods and therefore it is in their interest to make sure the risk assessment on their premises and their products is up to the

latest recommendations. On this front it was generally highlighted that relevant ISO standards already exist and should be followed, if possible, during the whole life cycle of the product. As a source to such standards the reader is directed to the StatNano repository (<https://statnano.com/standards/search>).

The (re)insurance sector welcomed a two-way dialogue regarding risk, and, on this front, the idea of a “supra” organisation leading discussions and conversations at all levels (such as initially planned as a result of the NMBP-13 Project) was welcome. It was generally perceived that any potential risks coming from the nanotechnology sector were already covered by current regulations, so it was up to the companies to comply with their obligations, however open discussions raising public awareness were welcomed to reassure the public that risk management was in place.

4 Data management – only for a limited number of tasks relevant

No experimental work was performed, and no data-management has to be reported.

5 Deviations from the work plan

No deviations to be reported

6 Performance of the partners

All partners performed as per agreement under the Grant Agreement.