

## *Scientific advice in crises: lessons learned from COVID-19*

### **DRAFT agenda for a virtual Workshop organised by the OECD Global Science Forum (GSF)**

**3-4 March, 2022, 12.30-16.00 CET**

[This workshop](#) is one in a series of international expert workshops organised by the Global Science Forum (GSF) in 2021-2022, as part of a project on Mobilising science in response to crises. The specific focus of this event is on scientific advice. It builds on previous OECD-GSF work on *Scientific Advice for Policy Making: The Role and Responsibility of Expert Bodies and Individual Scientists* ([OECD, 2015](#)) and *Scientific Advice During Crises: Facilitating Transnational Co-operation and Exchange of Information* ([OECD 2018](#)). These reports lay out a broad typology of different science advisory structures and processes, identify key issues and challenges for their effective operation and define a set of principles for developing rigorous and trusted scientific advice. These were considered to be broadly applicable in the early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic ([OECD, 2020](#)) but it is timely to revisit them in the light of the unprecedented ‘pressure test’ and intense scrutiny that scientific advice has been exposed to as the crisis has evolved.

Science advice ecosystems are complex, operate at different scales and involve different actors, including scientists, policy-makers, risk analysts and crisis managers. Covid-19 has highlighted the critical importance of trust between these various actors and the public at large. The workshop will try and integrate perspectives from these different actors in order to identify what worked (and did not work) during the pandemic, how trust was established (and lost) and the implications for science policy.

**Overall aims:** 1. to explore some of the key challenges for ensuring that relevant and rigorous scientific advice informs policy making during the COVID-19 crisis; 2. to identify lessons learned, common principles and good practices that can be adopted in future crises; 3. to consider the implications for science policy

**Registration:** please click [here](#).

## DAY 1, 3 March

12:00 Zoom meeting opens

12:30-13:20

### Session 1. Introduction and Opening Keynote

#### ***Welcome and short introduction (10mins)***

Workshop Co-chairs: Tateo Arimoto (National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Tokyo) and Randolph Kent (African Leadership Centre, Kings College, London), GSF-Expert Group (EG) members

Chair of the OECD Global Science Forum: Amanda Collis (UK Research and Innovation)

Short presentation from the OECD-GSF Secretariat: Carthage Smith

#### ***1.1 Science, policy and politics (20min)***

A number of international comparative studies are exploring how scientific advice is being generated and used during COVID-19. These are beginning to identify the different factors that are making scientific advice more or less effective. Science advice is only one input to policy and decision-making and the weight that is attributed to that advice depends very much on specific national contexts and political considerations. It is difficult to be normative about what makes science advice effective in specific situations and indeed there are legitimately different views on how effectiveness might be measured.

This opening keynote presentation will lay out how science, policy, politics and public trust have been intimately intertwined in the different actions that countries have taken in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

*Keynote Presentation:*

Sheila Jasanoff (S&T Studies, Harvard Kennedy School, United States) - [Comparative Covid response: crisis, knowledge, politics.](#)

#### ***1.2 The operational challenges of making evidence-based policy (20mins)***

Several short oral interventions (4-5 mins each), with a focus on the practical realities and challenges of working at the interface between science and policy in public health crises. [These opening presenters will also participate in subsequent thematic panel discussions.]

*Intervanants:*

Ian Diamond (UK Chief Statistician)

Jet Bussemaker (Council of Public Health and Society; Leiden University, the Netherlands)

Bob Kolasky (Director of the National Risk Management Center, Cyber and Infrastructure Security Agency, United States Department of Homeland Security and Chair of the OECD High-level Risk Forum)

13:20-14:30

## Session 2. Evolving advisory processes, roles and responsibilities of scientific advisors

Previous GSF work ([OECD, 2015](#), [OECD 2018](#)) identified the importance of having a clear remit, with defined roles and responsibilities for the various actors involved in science advisory processes. It was recommended that governments and responsible institutions should define clear and transparent frameworks and rules of procedure for their advisory processes and mechanisms. The 2015 report also highlighted the importance of ensuring the independence/autonomy of scientific advisory processes and being clear on the legal status and responsibilities of advisors and advice.

The COVID-19 pandemic poses a number of challenges that extend well beyond the conventional framework of infectious disease countermeasures. It is a complex cascading global crisis that has affected all sectors of economy and society in different way at different times and at different scales. The requirements for scientific evidence, the nature and the adequacy of that evidence have changed over time as has the capacity and willingness of policy makers and citizens to take account of scientific advice in their decision-making.

This session will explore how different national advisory systems – centralised and decentralised – responded in the face of the COVID-19 Pandemic and how they needed to adapt as the crisis evolved.

Key questions:

1. What advisory structures were in place prior to the crisis and what role did these play during the crisis? What new structures or mechanisms were put in place and how did these perform?
2. Aside from the scientific advice coming via formal government mandated advisory structures, what other scientific advice informed policy-making and how did this interact with formal mechanisms? What level of plurality/disagreement in terms of science advice is optimal/desirable?
3. How was scientific autonomy maintained and how were conflicts of interest managed in advisory processes? What measures are in place to ‘protect’ scientists, who provide advice from abuse or legal prosecution?

**Panel discussion** with key individuals involved in science advisory processes in different countries and experience of working across the interface between science advice and policy making. Panellists to focus on at least one of the 3 key questions in their opening interventions (5mins each) followed by moderated discussion.

Moderator – Marie Delnord (EG member and Sciensano, Belgium)

*Panellists:*

So Young Kim (Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Korea)

Marion Koopmans (Head of Viroscience, Erasmus University, the Netherlands)

Petr Smejkal (Chief Epidemiologist, IKEM, Prague, Czech Republic)

Dominique Costagliola (Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique, Paris, France)

Patrick Fafard (Global Strategy Lab, University of Ottawa, Canada)

**14.30-14:50 Break**

14:50- 16:00

**Session 3. Ensuring a holistic/multidisciplinary evidence base**

*[This session will have a particular thematic focus on disease monitoring and public health and social interventions]*

The 2015 OECD report highlighted the importance of involving relevant actors- scientists, policy-makers and other stakeholders, as appropriate, in scientific advisory processes.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, a broad range of scientific expertise has been required to provide advice on an expanding range of issues. In addition to biomedical and public health expertise, knowledge from social sciences and behavioural sciences and humanities has increasingly been called upon to address the impact of policy measures on society, taking into account the interests and values of various (public and private-sector) stakeholders.

This session will explore how key policy questions were formulated and who was involved in this process. It will also explore how evidence from different scientific domains and disciplines has been included in science advisory processes during the pandemic and how effective this has been in addressing policy questions.

Key questions:

1. How were policy concerns and priorities incorporated into advisory processes and translated into scientific questions? Was there a co-design process and, if so, who was involved and how did this operate? Has this changed during the course of the pandemic?
2. How were different disciplinary perspectives including biomedical, social and behavioural sciences taken into account? What weight was given to different sources of evidence and did this evolve over time?
3. How were trusted data sources selected and what quality control measures were implemented? How was big-data, e.g. from social media that was not specifically collected for research, used in scientific advice/policy making?

**Panel discussion** with key individuals involved in science advisory processes in different countries with different disciplinary and stakeholder perspectives. Panellists to focus on at least one of the 3 key questions in their opening interventions (5mins each) followed by moderated discussion.

Moderator – Frans Brom, EG member (Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) and Ethics Institute of Utrecht University, the Netherlands)

*Panellists*

Muto Kaori (Department of Public Policy, Institute of Medical Science, University of Tokyo, Japan)

Marijn de Bruin (Head of Research, Behavioural medicine, National Institute of Public Health and Environment, Netherlands)

Geoff Mulgan (Science policy University College London, United Kingdom)

Rémi Quirion (Chief Science Advisor, Quebec)

Bob Kolasky (Director of the National Risk Management Center, Cyber and Infrastructure Security Agency, United States Department of Homeland Security and Chair of the OECD High Level Risk Forum)

#### 15.40 *End of day 1*

### DAY 2, 4 March

12:00 Zoom meeting opens

12:30-13:40

#### Session 4. Communication of scientific advice, building trust

*[This session will have a particular thematic focus on vaccination and therapeutics]*

Transparency and accountability have been highlighted in the earlier OECD work, as critical factors for ensuring public trust in scientific advice. This has important implications for how formal advisory processes operate and a lack of openness in some countries has led to strong criticism and the development of alternative advisory structures, which do not have government mandates. At the same time, conflicting scientific viewpoints –and their public communication in traditional and social media – have led to confusion and lack of trust in scientific advice.

As the pandemic has progressed and affected all citizens, science has been in the spotlight and ‘follow the science’ is a mantra that has been used and abused in different settings. In many instances, it has been important to go beyond the traditional science-policy interface to build a science-policy-public interface. The effectiveness of even the best evidence-based countermeasures depends on having the support of people with diverse values, backgrounds, and interests. The roles of science advisors and the science community more broadly in public engagement during the pandemic has important implications for science policy and trust in science in the future.

This session will explore how science advisory structures have engaged with the public(s) and the role of mainstream and social media in this engagement.

Key questions:

1. How can openness and accountability be ensured and what can be done to effectively communicate scientific advice and its associated uncertainties in a way that promotes public trust?
2. How can conflicting scientific viewpoints and advice be best managed within formal advisory processes? And in the public debate more broadly?
3. How can science advice be best communicated to the public using traditional and/or social media? What is the role of the scientists who are involved in formal science advisory processes in communicating this advice to the public and how does this relate to the role of the authorities responsible for crisis response and politicians?

**Panel discussion** with individuals involved in communicating science advice to the public in different countries and/or studying the process of communication. Panellists to focus on

at least one of the 3 key questions in their opening interventions (5mins each) followed by moderated discussion.

Moderator – Tereza Stockelova, EG member, Institute of Sociology, Czech Republic

*Panellists:*

Mikihito Tanaka (Political Science and Economics, Waseda University, Japan)

Michael Bang Peterson (Political Science, Aarhus University, Denmark)

Camilla Stoltenberg (Director, Norwegian Institute of Public Health)

Henrique Barros (Public health, University of Porto, Portugal)

### **13.40-14:00 Break**

14:00-15:10

## **Session 5. Scientific advice at different scales: coordination and contextualization**

The relationship between national, regional and global science advisory mechanisms has been explored in earlier work (OECD, 2018), in which it was noted that whilst most OECD countries primarily rely on their own national advisory structures they also have links to international bodies, such as WHO, and the individual scientists who are providing advice also have their own international networks. Nevertheless, during the pandemic the science advice across different countries and from international and national structures has often been contradictory and the ‘science based’ policies for managing the pandemic even more so.

The differences between centralised and federalised countries in terms of where the primary crisis management responsibilities reside and how related science advisory mechanisms operate has been hi-lighted in earlier OECD work. Ensuring consistent science advice across different regions is important and yet this also needs to be contextualised to take account of local specificities.

At all scales, the quality of scientific advice depends on scientific capacity and access to relevant data and information. These vary enormously across countries and regions within a country. International and inter-regional linkages between scientists/science institutions can to some extent compensate for these differences but there are also significant barriers to scientific exchange across different jurisdictions.

In some countries or regions, governments or public authorities have very limited influence and the main decision-makers can be a variety of community leaders, non-governmental organisations, international organisations or other locally-respected institutions. These ‘neglected regions’, which include a significant proportion of the world population, tend to be poorly represented in pandemic data collections and have very limited scientific capacity.

This session will explore the science advice at different scales and in different contexts can operate effectively and the appropriate balance between the inter-dependence and autonomy of different advisory processes.

Key questions:

1. How can national and international science advisory mechanisms complement each-other and work together most effectively?

2. How can national and sub-regional, including municipal and local, science advisory mechanisms be best coordinated?
3. How can science advice be used to support community decision makers and key actors in regions or situations, where traditional governmental authority is absent?

**Panel discussion** with scientists and policy advisors who have been working in different contexts and at different scales to try and inform decision-making during COVID-19. Panellists to focus on at least one of the 3 key questions in their opening interventions (5mins each) followed by moderated discussion.

Moderator – David Castle (EG member, University of Victoria, Canada)

*Panellists*

Melanie Davern (Associate Professor, RMIT University and Director, Australian Urban Observatory)

Christian Léonard (Strategic Director of Sciensano, Belgian Public Health Institute)

David Nabarro (4SD, former WHO Director and former UN special envoy on pandemics)

Nicole Grobert (Chair, EC Scientific Advisory Mechanism)

Ian Diamond (UK Chief Statistician)

15:10-16:10

## Session 6: Implications for science advice in future crises

Session moderators – meeting Co-chairs

### ***6.1 Reflections on the workshop from operational perspective***

Two of the workshop discussants, who have experience of operating on both sides of the science-policy interface, are invited to briefly reflect (3-4 mins each) on the workshop discussions and future implications for science advice

Key question: What are the 3 key messages coming out of the workshop and what are their future implications from an operational perspective?

Ian Diamond (UK Chief Statistician)

Another tbc

### ***6.2. What are the implications for science policy (and for scientists)?***

Scientists and scientific institutions are the principal actors in generating science advice, yet many of the key challenges for optimising this advice and associated policy-making during crises might be considered as beyond the traditional remit of science policy. At the same time, the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted both the importance of science for policy making and the difficulties that science systems are confronted with in responding to policy needs and societal demands in crisis situations.

Addressing the structural and systemic challenges that have become evident during the COVID-19 pandemic will be important not only for responding to future emergencies, but also for responding to complex longer-term crises (e.g. environmental change) and implementing the socio-technological transformations that are required to build sustainable and resilient societies.

Key questions:

1. What science policy actions can be taken to improve the preparedness of science systems to effectively inform policy-making in future emergencies?
2. What science policy actions are necessary to ensure that the necessary scientific evidence and advice is effectively provided to policy makers (and citizens) to inform solutions to future pandemics? To what extent can this be extrapolated to other complex crises and chronic societal challenges?

**Panel discussion** with representatives from science ministries, scientific institutions and science funding agencies. 3-4 min initial interventions followed by moderated discussion

*Panellists*

John-Arne Røttingen (Ambassador for global health, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway)

Kiyoshi Kurokawa (emeritus Professor, University of Tokyo)

Helena Pereira (President of the Board of Directors, FCT, Portugal)

Daan Du Toit (Deputy DG, Dept. Science and Technology, S. Africa)

Rebecca Bunnell (Chief Science Officer/Director, CDC Office of Science, Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, United States)

**Closing remarks** from Co-chairs (5mins)

## Biographies for contributors<sup>1</sup> to the OECD GSF workshop, *Scientific advice in crises: lessons learned from COVID-19*, 3-4 March 2022

### Scientific advice in crises: lessons learned from COVID-19

Co-chairs: Randolph Kent and Tateo Arimoto

- **Randolph Kent**

Dr. Randolph Kent is a Visiting Professor at the African Leadership Centre at King's College, London, Honorary Professor at University College, London's Institute for Risk and Disaster Reduction as well as a Senior Associate Fellow at the Royal United Services Institute, where he has been leading a project entitled, *Towards An International Architecture for Managing Global Threats*. Prior to those appointments, he directed the **Humanitarian Futures Programme** at Kings College, London, where he and his staff worked from 2004 to 2016 with a wide range of multilateral, bilateral and non-governmental organizations to strengthen their strategic and planning capacities for dealing with longer-term humanitarian threats. Dr. Kent accepted his post at King's College, London, after completing his assignment as UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator for Somalia in April 2003. Prior to his assignment in Somalia, he served as UN Humanitarian Coordinator in Kosovo [1999], UN Humanitarian Coordinator in Rwanda [1994-1995], Chief of the UN Emergency Unit in Sudan [1989-1991] and Chief of Emergency Prevention and Preparedness in Ethiopia [1987-1989]. Since graduating from the London School of Economics, Dr Kent has written over 60 articles and various chapters on subjects principally pertaining to humanitarian crises, and systems dynamics and organisational behaviour relating to crisis response. He is the author of ***Anatomy of Disaster Relief: The International Network in Action***, and soon will be completing a book entitled, ***Planning from the Future: Why it Matters***.

- **Tateo Arimoto**

Tateo Arimoto is Visiting Professor, STI Policy, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS); Principal Fellow, Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST); and Chief Research Fellow, International Institute for Advanced Studies (IIAS). He served as Director General of S&T Policy Bureau of the Ministry of Education and Science, Executive Research Fellow of Economic and Social Research Institute at the Cabinet Office, and Director of Research Institute of S&T for Society at JST. He has played an active role in public policy making and implementation of STI in Japan and in developing the Science of STI policy using a transdisciplinary approach. He has been an Expert Group member of the OECD study projects on "Scientific Advice", "Research Funding Systems", "Transdisciplinary Research" and "Mission Oriented Innovation Policy". He is a board member of International Network for Government Science Advice (INGSA), and

---

<sup>1</sup> Where contributors have not provided dedicated biographies, links have been provided to web sources. However the accuracy of all the information sources has not been verified and it should be considered accordingly.

a member of the Committee of Science Diplomacy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, and United Nations STI for SDGs Forum.

---

### Session 1.1. Keynote presentation

- **Sheila Jasanoff**

Sheila Jasanoff is Pforzheimer Professor of Science and Technology Studies at the Harvard Kennedy School. A pioneer in the social sciences, she explores the role of science and technology in the law, politics, and policy of modern democracies. Her books include *The Fifth Branch*, *Science at the Bar*, *Designs on Nature*, *The Ethics of Invention*, and *Can Science Make Sense of Life?* She founded and directs the STS Program at Harvard; previously, she was founding chair of the STS Department at Cornell. She has held distinguished visiting professorships at leading universities in Europe, Asia, Australia, and the US. Jasanoff served on the AAAS Board of Directors and as President of the Society for Social Studies of Science. Her honours include the SSRC's Hirschman prize, the Humboldt Foundation's Reimar-Lüst award, and a Guggenheim Fellowship. She is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Philosophical Society, foreign member of the British Academy and the Royal Danish Academy, and member of the Council on Foreign Relations. She holds AB, JD, and PhD degrees from Harvard, and honorary doctorates from the Universities of Twente and Liège.

### Session 1.2.

- [Ian Diamond](#)
- [Jet Bussemaker](#)
- [Bob Kolasky](#)
- [Mona Nemer](#) (tbc)

---

### Session 2.

#### Moderator: Marie Delnord

Dr. Marie Delnord is an EU public health researcher and epidemiologist at Sciensano, the Belgian Institute of Health. Her research is focused on implementation science, and the use of health information in policy and practice. She is currently active in EU projects on cancer control, and COVID-19. She holds an MA in Child Development from Tufts University, a MSc in Paediatrics and community health from University College London, a PhD in Epidemiology from Paris Descartes University, and an Executive Diploma in Diplomatic Practice from UNITAR. She completed a Marie-Skłodowska Curie Postdoctoral Fellowship, is Section editor for *Archives of Public Health*, International Scientific Committee member for the European Public Health Association, and member of the OECD-Global Science Forum Expert group on Mobilising Science in Crises.

**Panellists:**

- **So Young Kim**

As an academic and a public intellectual interested in high-stake issues at the interface of S&T and public policy, Prof. Kim has conducted large-scale S&T policy projects on basic science funding, R&D evaluation, emerging technology governance, S&T workforce, science ODA, etc., and served numerous committees providing S&T policy-related advice for the South Korean government. Most recently, chairing the Spent Nuclear Fuel Policy Committee, Prof. Kim played a pivotal role in deriving the recommendations for the spent fuel storage issue, which is the nation's longest unresolved problems in S&T policy. Her work has been recognized by various awards including the National Assembly Award for the Contribution to S&T Policy.

- **Marion Koopmans**

Professor Marion Koopmans, DVM PhD focuses on global population level impact of rapidly spreading zoonotic virus infections, with special emphasis on foodborne transmission. Her research focuses on unravelling the modes of transmission of viruses among animals and between animals and humans, and the use of pathogenic genomic information to unravel these pathways and to signal changes in transmission or disease impact. She is co-PI in the FP7 funded PREPARE project ([www.prepare-europe.eu](http://www.prepare-europe.eu)) aimed at building a pan-European operational network for rapid and large-scale European clinical research in response to infectious disease outbreaks with epidemic potential. She is the director of the WHO collaborating centre for emerging infectious diseases at Erasmus, and Scientific Director "Emerging infectious diseases" of the Netherlands Centre for One Health ([www.ncoh.nl](http://www.ncoh.nl)). She has received the Infectious disease award of the Dutch Association for Infectious Diseases and is the recipient of the Stevin Premium 2018. In 2019, she became a member of the KNAW (Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences). She has co-authored >500 papers that have been cited > 20.000 times.

- **Petr Smejkal**

Petr Smejkal, MD is the chief of infectious disease and epidemiology at IKEM hospital, main transplant and cardiac centre of the Czech Republic in Prague. He teaches at the Department of Epidemiology, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic and also works as Infection Control Committee Chairman of Maine Coast Memorial Hospital, Ellsworth, USA. He is the member of the epidemiology section of NIZP (National Institute for the Management of the Pandemic), main body advising the Czech government with how to deal with the SARS-CoV2 pandemic. Born 1972, graduate of the Charles University, Prague in 1997, residency in internal medicine at St. Vincent's Hospital affiliated with Columbia University, USA, postgraduate at Charles University, Prague, Czech republic. Lives in the Czech republic and USA. Does both clinical work attending COVID patients and epidemiology at a hospital and state level. Founder of MESES (Interdisciplinary Group for Epidemic Situations), main non-profit non-governmental organization covering and stressing the importance of all aspects of the pandemic situation in the Czech republic (economy, sociology, epidemiology, medicine etc).

- **Dominique Costagliola**

Dominique Costagliola, biostatistician and epidemiologist, is INSERM Emeritus Senior Researcher at the Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health (Sorbonne Université, INSERM), where she served as Director from 2014 to 2018, and as Deputy Director from 2019 to August 2021. She was awarded the INSERM Research Prize in 2013 for her research on HIV/AIDS infection started in 1986 and has been a member of the Academy of Sciences since 2017. In 2020 she was awarded the INSERM grand prize for her involvement in COVID-19 research. She studies the hidden parameters of HIV infection (incidence, timing of mother-to-child transmission, cascade, ...), strategies for the use of antiretroviral treatments, and severe morbidity, especially cancers and cardiovascular diseases in people living with HIV. More recently she has been working in the area of HIV and STI prevention. She is co-leader of a work-package entitled EU-SolidAct: an adaptive pandemic and emerging infection platform trial of the European project EU-Response aiming at setting up an operational clinical research network in Europe in the field of emerging communicable diseases. In addition to her research activity, she is strongly involved in expertise and decision support in health matters for the Ministry of Health and the different Agencies and in scientific evaluation in France and in Europe. During the COVID-19 epidemic, she was a member of the Covid-19 Scientific Committee of the ANRS MIE (formerly REACTing) and was deeply involved in the evaluation of research projects on the disease in France and in Europe. She is a member of the Scientific Advisory Board of ANRS-MIE and of the High-Level European Expert Group Proposing A Roadmap Towards Stabilization Of The Covid-19 Pandemic In The European Region.

- **Patrick Fafard**

Patrick Fafard is Senior Investigator with the [Global Strategy Lab](#), University of Ottawa/York University and Full Professor at the University of Ottawa cross-appointed to the Faculties of Social Sciences and Medicine. His current research includes the [governance of organ donation and transplantation](#) and a variety of projects on public health policy and governance including a [comparative study of public health leadership](#), and [developing public health political science](#). Earlier in his career he has served in senior management positions with the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan.

---

### Session 3.

#### Moderator: Frans W.A. Brom

Frans W.A. Brom is secretary of the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) and director of its office. The Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy is an independent scientific advisory body for government policy. Its task is to provide the Dutch government, parliament and the broader society on with science-based strategic advice on issues that are likely to have important political and societal consequences. In conjunction with the WRR he holds a professorship 'Normativity of Scientific Policy Advice' at the Ethics Institute of Utrecht University, the Netherlands. He is co-author of 'Navigating and anticipating in uncertain times', future scenarios for the course of the Covid-19 pandemic (September 2021). <https://english.wrr.nl/publications/publications/2021/11/16/navigating-and-anticipating-in-uncertain-times>

**Panellists:**

- **Muto Kaori**
- **Marijn de Bruin**

Marijn de Bruin is professor of Behavioural Medicine and Health Psychology at the Radboud University Medical Centre (Netherlands), honorary professor at the University of Aberdeen (Scotland), and Chief Scientist of the Corona Behavioural Unit at the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM, Netherlands). His University research focuses on developing behavioural interventions, improving research methodology, and more recently a systems approach to implementing behavioural science expertise in health services. He co-founded the Corona Behavioural Unit at the RIVM and serves as its Chief Scientist. This has involved developing the Unit's research strategy, setting up an independent scientific advisory board, producing actionable research with very tight deadlines, offering scientific input to policy makers and communication professionals, and frequent media appearances. Prof. de Bruin is also member of the World Health Organisations Technical Advisory Group on Behavioural Insights and Sciences for Health.

- [Geoff Mulgan](#)
- [Rémi Quirion](#)
- [Bob Kolasky](#)

---

**Session 4**
**Moderator : Tereza Stöckelová**

Dr. Tereza Stöckelová is a researcher at the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, and an associate professor at the Department of Sociocultural Anthropology, Charles University. Her work is situated in-between sociology, social anthropology and science and technology studies (STS), and draws upon actor network theory and related material semiotic methodologies. Her current research is concerned with microbiological citizenship and it maps out how embodied subjectivities, biosocialities, and state governance are being (re)configured in relation to microbial and fungal agents. Since 2020 she is a member of the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology, an advisory body and forum of reflection set up by UNESCO.

**Panellists:**

- **Mikihito Tanaka**

Mikihito Tanaka is currently a visiting scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a Professor in the Graduate School of Political Science, Waseda University, Japan. He researches public arguments and communications about scientific risk in mass/social media. Since February 2020, he has been involved in the risk communication matters about COVID-19 in the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, and the Tokyo Government.

- **Michael Bang Petersen**

Michael Bang Petersen is a professor of political science at Aarhus University in Denmark. He leads the HOPE-project, a large-scale research project on "How Democracies Cope with COVID-19", covering the non-medical aspects of the corona crisis in Denmark and beyond. He is a member of the Danish Royal Society of Sciences and Letters and has received the Erik Erikson Award for early contributions to political psychology. During the COVID-19 pandemic, he has served as one of the main advisors on behavioral science to the Danish government and has been one of the most cited researchers in Danish media.

- **Camilla Stoltenberg**

Dr. Camilla Stoltenberg (born 1958) is the Director-General of the Norwegian Institute of Public Health. She is a medical doctor and epidemiologist, and an adjunct professor at the University of Bergen. Stoltenberg holds a number of positions in national and international boards and networks, including the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) of the Pan-European Commission on Health and Sustainable Development, the Global Health Summit scientific expert panel and the Executive Board of the International Association of National Public Health Institutes (IANPHI). Stoltenberg chaired a governmental commission on the gender gap in education, producing a white paper that was finalized in February 2019.

- **Henrique Barros**

Henrique Barros is President of the National Health Council, Full Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, President of the Institute of Public Health at the University of Porto and Past-President of the International Epidemiology Association. He is responsible for the design and implementation of the three Portuguese population-based cohorts in progress, which follow adults (EpiPorto), adolescents (EpiTeen) and newborns (Generation21).

- [Jet Bussemaker](#)

---

## Session 5.

**Moderator: David Castle**

**Dr. David Castle** is a Professor of science, technology and innovation policy in the School of Public Administration and the Gustavson School of Business at the University of Victoria. He is also a Research in Residence at the Office of the Chief Science Advisor to the Prime Minister of Canada. He Chairs the Science Advisory Committee of the Council of Canadian Academies and is the Chair of the Scientific Committee of the International Science Council's World Data System (WDS). He contributed to OECD Global Science Forum' *Building Digital Workforce Capacity and Skills for Data Intensive Science (2020)*.

#### **Panellists:**

- **Melanie Davern**

**Associate Professor Melanie Davern** is Director of the [Australian Urban Observatory](#) at the Centre for Urban Research, RMIT University and a Vice Chancellor's Senior Research Fellow. Melanie has specific expertise in liveability, indicator development and application, and the cross disciplines of applied public health and urban planning. Her interdisciplinary research practice includes qualitative, quantitative and spatial research methods with a focus on the translation of research knowledge into policy and planning practice.

- **Christian Léonard**

Christian Léonard has been director general of Sciensano, the national Institute of Public Health and also a research center since January 2020. Christian is a health economist and ethicist by training and has extensive experience in the field of health care. Prior to Sciensano, Christian worked at the Belgian Healthcare Knowledge Center (KCE) as a health economist and general director. He is also professor of health economics and ethics at the UCL (Catholic University of Leuven) in Belgium.

- **David Nabarro**

David Nabarro is the Co-Director of the Imperial College Institute of Global Health Innovation and supports systems leadership for sustainable development through his Switzerland based social enterprise [4SD](#) (Skills, Systems and Synergies for Sustainable Development). Currently David is Special Envoy of WHO on COVID-19 and Senior Advisor to the United Nations Food Systems Summit. David secured his medical qualification in 1974 and has worked in over 50 countries in multiple positions. In October 2018, David received the World Food Prize together with Lawrence Haddad for their leadership in building coalitions for action for better nutrition across the Sustainable Development Goals.

- [Nicole Grobert](#)

- [Ian Diamond](#)

---

**Session 6**

- **John-Arne Røttingen**

John-Arne Røttingen is Ambassador for Global Health, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway. He is Adjunct Scientific Director at the Norwegian Institute of Public Health and Visiting Fellow of Practice at Blavatnik School of Government, Oxford University. He has been founding CEO of CEPI (Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations); Chief Executive, Research Council of Norway; Executive Director of Infection Control and Environmental Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health; Professor of Health Policy, University of Oslo; and Adjunct Professor, Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health. He is member of the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters and the US National Academy of Medicine. He holds MD PhD from University of Oslo, MSc from Oxford University and MPA from Harvard University.

- **Kiyoshi Kurokawa**

Kiyoshi Kurokawa, MD, is Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Tokai University and National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies. A graduate of the University of Tokyo School of Medicine, a physician; spent 15 years of his medical career at University of Pennsylvania, UCLA and University of Southern California; professor of Medicine at UCLA, University of Tokyo, Dean of Tokai University of Medical School; served as Vice President and President of Science Council of Japan (1996-2002), Science Advisor to Prime Ministers of Japan (2002-04, PM Abe and Fukuda), foreign member of the US National Academy; Chaired Fukushima Nuclear Accident Independent Investigation Commission by the National Diet of Japan, first time of this kind in Japan, awarded "2012 Scientific Freedom and Responsibility Award" of AAAS for this leadership. Currently, serve as Vice President of World Dementia Council created in 2013 by G8 Summit hosted by David Cameron ; Chair of Corona Epidemic 'AI Analyses and Simulation' and Hideyo Noguchi Africa Prize, both of the Government of Japan; Founder and Chair of the Board of Health and Global Policy Institute, a top ranked independent think-tank of the world.

- **Helena Pereira**

Helena Pereira is a full professor at Instituto Superior de Agronomia – ISA - School of Agriculture. She is Chairman of the Board of Directors of Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia – FCT since 2019, and Vice President from 2017-2019. She has been granted several scientific and academic awards and in 2022 she was distinguished with the national Award Maria de Lurdes Pintassilgo in the category of role model. She has held multiple academic and scientific leadership positions. From 2007 to 2011, she was vice-rector of the Technical University of Lisbon, and rector from 2011 to 2012. From 1989 to 1992, she was pro-rector of the University of Algarve (UAlg), and President of the Installing Committee of the Aquatic Resources Sciences and Technology Unit of UAlg. She was also President of the Installing Committee of the Higher School of Technology of the Polytechnical Institute of Faro, and of the Scientific Council of ISA. From 2008 to 2020, she presided the AMONET Association – Associação Portuguesa de Mulheres Cientistas. Her research area has been the forest and forest products, including

bioenergy and bio-refinery. She has a degree on Chemical-Industrial Engineering by the Instituto Superior Técnico – Técnico Lisboa, and a Ph. D (Dr. rer. nat.) by the Biology Faculty of the Hamburg University, Germany. She was born in 1949, in CoimbraDu Toit

- **Rebecca Bunnell**

Dr. Rebecca Bunnell is CDC's Chief Science Officer and the Director for CDC's Office of Science. In that capacity she oversees CDC's scientific portfolio to ensure quality, ethical integrity, and innovation and provides strategic direction, leadership, and training for CDC's 11,000 scientists. She co-leads CDC's work on Health Equity and is working across CDC on transformative changes to advance health equity science. Becky has over 30 years of public health experience, including 17 years stationed internationally in Uganda, Kenya, and Honduras working for CDC as well as for Médecins sans Frontières (MSF/Doctors without Borders), the UK Medical Research Council, Peace Corps (Honduras), USAID, and local NGOs. She has held leadership positions for major infectious and chronic disease prevention initiatives, including the Community Putting Prevention to Work Initiative, and has worked on multiple outbreak investigations, including COVID-19 and the 2014 West African Ebola Outbreak. Dr. Bunnell completed CDC's two year Epidemic Intelligence Service and earned a Doctorate from the Harvard School of Public Health, a Masters from University of Massachusetts/Amherst, and her B.A. from Yale University. She has conducted numerous epidemiologic, surveillance, behavioral, and economic studies and has authored over 130 scientific publications.