

# **Trends in TA: Contested futures and prospective knowledge assessment**

*Armin Grunwald*

*LCA and Governance workshop, Brussels, 27.9.2007*

---

# Overview

1. General Trends in Technology Assessment
  2. TA, Sustainable Development and uncertainty
  3. Contested futures and needs for assessment
  4. Some conclusions
-

# 1. General trends in Technology Assessment

Technology Assessment: „invented“ in the 1960s

Characteristics of TA:

- prospective knowledge for action and decision-making (strategic intelligence)
- policy advice concerning societal questions of science and technology (for example by parliamentary TA)
- multi-perspective approach: stakeholders, experts, laypersons, citizens etc.
- focus on non-intended side-effects (early warning)
- operating (transparently) at the borderline between facts and values

## **General trends**

- shift from a “prognostic” focus to contributing to “shaping technology”
- increasing involvement of ethical reflection instead of restricting TA to a positivistic understanding (main fields: biomedicine as well as sustainability)
- considering entire innovation processes instead of concentrations on technologies
- more emphasis on the roles of knowledge as well as of uncertainty (emerging knowledge society)
- new forms of governance as cross-cutting issue
- reflections on the role of (contested) “futures” and the “validity” of prospective knowledge

## 2. TA, sustainable development and uncertainty

- often there is an ambivalent relationship between technology and SD: positive as well as negative impacts
- need for ex ante assessments of sustainability implications of new technologies
- TA as *prospective sustainability assessment* shall give orientation to SD governance and policies
- the entire life cycle of products or systems influences the sustainability balance
- highly diverse criteria of sustainable development
- problems of measurement and availability of data
- necessity to deal with high uncertainties

**The substantial (“What”-)Rules of Sustainability (Kopfmüller et al. 2001)**

| <b>Goals<br/>Rules</b> | <b>1. Securing<br/>Mankind’s<br/>Existence</b>  | <b>2. Upholding<br/>Society’s Pro-<br/>ductive Potential</b>   | <b>3. Keeping Options<br/>for Development<br/>and Action open</b>   |
|------------------------|---|--|---|
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Protection of Human Health</li> <li>(2) Securing the Satisfaction of Basic Needs</li> <li>(3) Autonomous Self-Support</li> <li>(4) Just Distribution of Chances for Using Natural Resources</li> <li>(5) Compensation of Extreme Differences in Income and Wealth</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Sustainable Use of Renewable Resources</li> <li>(2) Sustainable Use of Non-Renewable Resources</li> <li>(3) Sustainable Use of the Environment as a Sink</li> <li>(4) Avoidance of Unacceptable Technical Risks</li> <li>(5) Sustainable Development of Real, Human, and Knowledge Capital</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Equal Access to Education, Information, and Occupation</li> <li>(2) Participation in Societal Decision-Making Processes</li> <li>(3) Conservation of the Cultural Heritage and of Cultural Diversity</li> <li>(4) Conservation of Nature’s Cultural Functions</li> <li>(5) Conservation of “Social Resources”</li> </ul> |

## Sustainability assessments - origins of uncertainty

- *inseparability* issue: co-evolution of technology and society; inadequacy of closed models → increased complexity and systemic feedback loops
  - *incompleteness* issue: unlimited manifold of sustainability aspects through the complete life-cycle → decisions on relevance and priorities required showing own risks
  - *incommensurability* issue: no common scale available for measuring sustainability effects → *necessity but limited utility* of quantitative approaches
  - *prediction* issue: future developments influence the life cycle data → uncertainties due to the prospective nature of SD assessments
- necessity of dealing with different and frequently „contested“ futures in analytical and empirical respect

### 3. **Contested futures and the need for prospective assessment**

- increasing contingency in modern societies – search for orientation by looking at „futures“ (e.g. Luhmann)
  - this is exact the way by which TA (and every decision-support activity) operates
  - prospective LCA also operates with „futures“
  - these „futures“ frequently are contested and controversial
  - example: the energy debate (which regained societal attention recently) is highly determined by futures involved
- **if decisions have to be legitimised by looking at the future (for example by prospective LCA) – which „future“ shall be selected as a basis for decisions?**



## **Methodical challenges**

- prospective knowledge always is more than prospective knowledge
- prospective knowledge is embedded in broader pictures of the future: assumptions about social developments like production or consumption patterns or lifestyles, about the possibility of simple extrapolation of current trends, about political stability etc.
- futures are *constructions* – including pieces of knowledge, assumptions, values, premises etc.
- futures form a medium of controversial societal debates, according to values, preferences and interests
- TA (and LCA): necessity of transparently investigating and assessing the “futures” involved

## **Debate in TA on prospective knowledge assessment**

- epistemological analysis: cognitive aspects, identifying limits of knowledge and areas of uncertainties, characterising uncertainties, isolating and analysing quantitative and qualitative ingredients of the futures etc.
- normative analysis (ethics): desires and hopes, values involved, images of human nature and of society etc.
- empirical analysis (social sciences): genesis of “futures”, deliberation processes, power issues, interests etc.
- strategic analysis: who are the actors in constructing futures, why do they select specific futures, and in which way do they use futures?
- organisation of processes: participatory assessments including results of the various types of analysis (learning from foresight exercises should be possible)

## **4. Some conclusions**

- similar challenges with respect to governance issues in TA and LCA
- dealing with uncertainties is a key challenge for SD governance
- three-fold reflexivity required in SD governance:
  - provide and take seriously „meta-knowledge“ on the premises, limitations, normative grounds etc. of prospective sustainability assessments (including LCA)
  - design SD governance processes in a way that learning during the process is possible to the largest possible extent
  - quantitative approaches are simultaneously indispensable and problematic: main issues are the problem of „futures“ and the incommensurability issue
- a lot of possibilities for co-operation between the LCA and the TA community

**Thank you for your attention!**

---